THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

I - Incredulity

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

I

Iamblichus

SEE JAIMBLICHUS.

Ibarra, Joaquin

a Spanish printer celebrated for his magnificent editions (of the Bible and Arabic liturgies, was born at Saragossa in 1725, and died at Madrid in 1785. His printing-house was established at the latter place. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, *25*, 724.

Ibas

(῎Ιβας), bishop of Edessa, in Syria, from 435 to 457, distinguished himself by the translation of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia into the Syriac. His lenient policy towards the Nestorians and the fact that he distributed the translation of Theodore extensively throughout Persia and Syria, caused several priests of his diocese to accuse him before the emperor Theodosius II, and before the archbishops of Antioch and Constantinople, for favoring Nestorianism. The emperor appointed the bishops Uranius of Himera, Photius of Tyre, Eusthate of Berytus, and the prefect of Damascus a commission to try-him. Two Synods, held respectively at Berytus and Tyre in 448, failed to convict him, and he was left undisturbed until the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), when he was finally deposed from his diocese. He appealed to the Council of Chalcedon, and was restored to his bishopric in 451. Long after his death, in 553, the fifth general Council of Constantinople condemned him as a Nestorian, in spite of the efforts of pope Vigilius. The principal ground for this accusation was a letter written by him to the Persian bishop Maris, in which he blames his predecessor, Rabulas, for having condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia. The greater part of this letter is contained in the *Recueil des Conciles, 4,* 661. See Baronius, *Annales,* an. 448, 449, 451, 553; Dupin, *Biblioth. eccles. duc 5^{me} Sicile;* Cave, *Hist. litter.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé*, *25,* 727: Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v. Chalcedon; Neander, *Church History*, 2, 538-552.

Ibbetson, James, D.D.

an English divine, was born in 1717, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He filled successively the rectorate of Bushey, in Hertfordshire, and the archdeaconry of St. Alban's, and died in 1781. His works are, *Epistola ad Phil-Hebrceos Oxonienses* (1746): — *Short History of the Province of Canterbury;* and several other theological treatises and sermons. — Hook, *Eccles. Biog. 6, 2*41.

Ibbot Benjamin, D.D.

a learned English divine, born at Beachamwell, Norfolk, in 1680, was educated at Clare Hall and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He became treasurer of Wells Cathedral and rector of St. Vedast, London, in 1708; was some time after appointed rector of St. Pald, Shadwell; chaplain of George I in 1716; and, finally, prebendary of Westminster in 1724. He died April 15, 1725. His principal works are, *A Course of Sermons preached for the Boyle Lecture* (1713, 1714), in which he refutes the infidel objections of Collins (Lond. 1727, *8vo): — Thirty-six Discourses on practical Subjects* (Lond. 1776, 2 vols. 8vo); and a translation of Puffendorf's *De Habitu Religionis Christiance ad vitam civilem* (1719). See Chalmers, *Genesis Biog. Dict.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25,* 727; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica,* 2, 1601.

Iberians

an Asiatic nation inhabiting the Caucasian isthmus, described by Virgil, Horace, and Lucan as a warlike, cruel, and uncivilized people, while Strabo speaks of them as a very quiet and religious people. Rufinus and Moses of Chorene relate that, during the reign of the emperor Constantine, the great Christina, probably a Christian woman (some call her Nino, others Nunia), was made prisoner by the Iberians, and became a slave. Her piety soon won for her the esteem and consideration not only of her master, but of the Iberians generally; and being on one occasion asked to cure a sick child of royal rank, she told the people that Christ her God, alone could effect the cure. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. She is next said to have cured the queen by her prayers. The king, Miraus, and his queen were converted, and did their utmost to spread Christianity through their dominions. The country has since remained Christian, though the true religion was long mixed with many old superstitions. Some claim that Christina was from Byzantium, on the ground that Procopius (5, 9)

mentions an old convent preserved in Jerusalem, and rebuilt by Justinian in the 6th century, which was called Iberian or Iwerian. Moses of Chorene, moreover, says that she was an Armenian, and that teachers were demanded of the Armenian bishop Gregory, not of Rome. The Iberians spread Christianity among the surrounding nations. Their country is now called *Georgia* (q.v.), and they hold ecclesiastical relations with the Greek Church (q.v.).Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon,* s.v.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. 6,* 27 sq.

Ibex

Picture for Ibex

the ancient name of the *Boeuquetin* or *Steinbok* of the Alps, an animal generally thought to be designated by the Heb. ![](l[e; *yaél'* (always in the plur., A.V. "wild goats"), represented as well known, and inhabiting the highest and most inaccessible steeps (see <18B10D>Job 31:1; <19A418>Psalm 104:18). Several species have been described by naturalists as inhabiting the different mountain ranges of the East (e.g. Arabia, Forskal, *Descrip. Animr.* praef. 4; Ruppell, *Abyss.* 1, 126; and Palestine, Seetzen, 18, 435), all of them slightly varying from the European form *(Cepra ibex),* and known among the Arabs by the general name of *beden.* Among the Sinai mountains the chase is pursued in much the same manner and under much the same circumstances as that of the chamois in the Alps and the Tyrol. The hunters exercise great vigilance and hardihood, taking vast circuits to get above their quarry, and especially aiming to surprise them at early day. Like most mountain quadrupeds that are gregarious, they have a leader who acts as sentinel, and gives the alarm on the occurrence of any suspicious sight, sound, or smell, when the whole flock makes off for a loftier peak. Their numbers are said to have much decreased of late years; for the Arabs report them so abundant fifty years ago, that if a stranger sought hospitality at a Bedouin's tent, and the owner had no sheep to kill, he would without hesitation take his gun and go confidently to shoot a *beden.* The flesh is excellent, with a flavor similar to that of venison. The Bedouins make water bottles of their skins, as of those of the domestic goats, and rings of their horns, which they wear on their thumbs. Dogs easily catch them when surprised in the plains, but in the abrupt precipices and chasms of the rocks the ibex is said to elude pursuit by the tremendous leaps, which it makes. It is likely that this species is identical with that which bears the name of *poseng (Caprus aegagrius),* and which inhabits all

the loftier ranges that traverse Asia, from the Taurus and Caucasus to China. It is very robust, and much larger than any domestic goat; its general color iron-gray, shaded with brown with a black line down the back and across the withers, and a white patch on the crupper. The horns of the male are very large, compressed, and slightly diverging as they arch over the back; their front side makes an obtuse edge, and is marked by a series of knobs, with deep hollows between. *SEE WILD GOAT*; *SEE HIND*, etc.

Ib'har

(Heb. *Yibcha-r',* r j bY; *chosenz;* Sept. Ἰβεάρ, Ἰεβαὰρ [cod.Vat. Ἐβεάρ, Εβααρ]; Josephus Ἰεβάρ, *Ant. 7,* 3, 3), one of the sons of David (by a secondary wife, 1Ch 3:9) born to him in Jerusalem, mentioned next after Solomon and before Elishua (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 3:6; 14:5). B.C. post 1044. *SEE DAVID*.

Ibis

Picture for Ibis

a genus of birds of the family *Ardeidae,* or, according to some ornithologists, of *Scolopacidae*, and perhaps to be regarded as a connecting link between them. The bill is long, slender, curved, thick at the base; the point rather obtuse; the upper mandible deeply grooved throughout its length. The face, and generally the greater part of the head, and sometimes even the neck, are destitute of feathers, at least in adult birds. The neck is long. The legs are rather long, naked above the tarsal joint, with three partially united toes in front and one behind; the swings are moderately long; the tail is very short. The Sacred or Egyptian ibis *(Ibis religiosa)* is an African bird, two feet six inches in length, although the body is little larger than that of a common fowl. It was one of the birds worshipped by the ancient Egyptians, and called by them *Hab* or *Hib*, and by the modern Egyptians *Abtu-Hesnes* (i.e. Father John). It is represented on the monuments as a bird with long beak and legs, and a heart-shaped body, covered with black and white plumage. It was supposed, from the color of its feathers, to symbolize the light and shade of the moon, its body to represent the heart: its legs described a triangle, and with its beak it performed a medical operation; from all which esoterical ideas it was the avatar of the god Thoth or Hermes (q.v.), who escaped in that shape the

pursuit of Typhon, as the hawk was that of Ra, or Horus, the sun. Its feathers were supposed to scare, and even kill, the crocodile. It appeared in Egypt at the rise, and disappeared at the inundation of the Nile, and was thought, at that time, to deliver Egypt from the winged and other serpents which came from Arabia in certain narrow passes. As it did not make its nest in Egypt, it was thought to be self-engendering, and to lay eggs for a lunar month. According to some, the basilisk was engendered by it. It was celebrated for its purity, and only drank from the purest water, and the most strict of the priesthood only drank of the pools where it had been seen; besides which, it was fabled to entertain the most invincible love of Egypt, and to die of self-starvation if transported elsewhere. Its flesh was thought to be incorruptible after death, and to kill it was punishable with death. Ibises were kept in the temples, and unmolested in the neighborhood of cities. After death they were mummied, and there is no animal of which so many remains have been found at Thebes, Memphis, Hermopolis Magna, or Eshmun, and at Ibiu or Ibeurn, fourteen miles north of the same place. They are made up into a conical shape, the wings flat, the legs bent back to the breast, the head placed on the left side, and the beak under the tail; were prepared as other mummies, and wrapped up in linen bandages, which are sometimes plaited in patterns externally. At Thebes they are found in linen bandages only; well preserved at Hermopolis in wooden or stone boxes of oblong form, sometimes in form of the bird itself, or the god Thoth; at Memphis, in conical sugar-loaf-shaped red earthenware jars, the tail downwards, the cover of convex form, cemented by lime. There appear to be two sorts of embalmed ibises-a smaller one of the size of a corncrake, very black, and the other black and white-the *Ibis Nuenzius,* or *Ibis religiosa.* This last is usually found with its eggs, and sometimes with its insect food, the *Pimlelia pilosa, Akis reflexa,* and portions of snakes, in the stomach. (Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs,* 5, 7, 217; Passoloegua, *Catalogue Raisone,* p. 255; Pettigrew, *History of Mummies,* p. 205; *Horapollo,* 1, c. 30,. 36.)

Ib'leäm

(Heb. *Yibleaim',* µ[;lÞ¥æ*people-waster;* Sept. Ἰαβλαάμ, Ἰεβλαάμ [but some codd. occasionally omit]), a city (with suburban towns) within the natural precincts of Issachar, but (with five others) assigned to Manasseh (<06071>Joshua 17:11, where it is mentioned between Beth-shean and Dor), but from which the Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites (<07012>Judges

1:27, where it is mentioned between Dor and Megiddo); lying near the pass of Gur, in the vicinity of Megiddo, where Jehu slew Ahaziah (2 Kings 9:27). It was assigned as a Levitical city to the family of Kohath (1 Chronicles 6:70, where it is less correctly called BILEAM and mentioned along with Aner as lying within Manasseh); compare Joshua 21:25, where it is called GATH-RIMMON (apparently by error; see the Sept., and comp. 1 Chronicles 6:69). According to Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 148), it is the modern village *Jubla,* south-west (north-west) of Beth-shean, and about two English miles south of the village Kefrah; but no map has this place, and the indications require a different position. *SEE GUR*. The site is probably represented by that of *Jelanseh,* a small village about two and a half miles north of Jenin (Robinson, *Researches, 3,* 161).

Ibn-Aknin, Joseph ben-Juhudah

called in Arabic *Abulhagag Jussuff ibn-Jahja Ibn-Shimun Alsabti Almaghrebi,* a Jewish philosopher and commentator of some note, was born at Ceuta (Arab. *Sebta),* in Arabia, about 1160. His first religious training was, at least to all outside appearances, in the Mohammedan religion, but he was at a very early age also taught Hebrew, and instructed in the Talmud and Hebrew Scriptures, so that, as soon as he arrived at years of maturity, he might forsake the religion forced upon him by the law of the country that gave him birth, and return to the faith of his forefathers. About 1185, having previously decided in favor of the Jewish religion, he fled to Alexandria, and there became a zealous disciple of the great Moses Maimonides, whose attention had been called to Ibn-Aknin by a scientific work of his, and by his *Makamen,* which he had sent to Maimonides. Although he remained with this celebrated Jewish savant only a little over a year, then removing to Aleppo to practice medicine, he had nevertheless endeared himself so much to him that Maimonides loved him as his own son, and ever afterwards labored to promote the interests of his beloved disciple, and the philosophical work *Moreh-Nebochim (Doctor perplecorum),* which Maimonides (q.v.) published in 1190, is often asserted to have had for its principal aim the removal of certain sceptical opinions which Ibn-Aknin cherished at that time. In 1192, notwithstanding the frequent counsels of Maimonides to the contrary, Ibn-Aknin went to Bagdad, and there founded a rabbinic college. After the decease of his great master he figured quite prominently at the court of the sultan Azzahir Ghasi of Damascus, and he delivered lectures at the high schools on medicine and philosophy. He died about 1226. Besides a number of works

on medicine and metaphysics, he wrote *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (in Arabic), now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Pococke, p. 189). He espouses the notion of the Talmud, that the Song of Songs is *the most sacred* of all the twenty-four canonical books of the O.T., and accordingly explains it allegorically as representing the relationship of God to his people Israel. "There are," he says, "three different modes of explaining this book:

1. The *literal,* which is to be found in the philologians or grammarians, e.g. Saadia, Abu Sacharja Jahja ben-Davi — el Fasi (Chajug), Abulvalid Ibn Ganach of Saragossa (Ibu--Ganach), the Nagid R. Samuel Ha-Levi ben-Nagdilah, Abn-Ibi-ahim ben-Baran (Isaac ben-Joseph), Jehudah ben-Balaam (Ibn-Balaam), and Moses Ibn-Gikatilla Ita-Cohen (Gikatilla);

2. The *allegorical,* to be found in the Midrash Chasit, the Talmud, and in some of the ancient interpretations; and,

3. The *philosophical* interpretation, which regards this book as referring to *the active intellect* [νοῆς ποιητικός], here worked out for the first time, and which, though the last in point of time, is the first of all in point of merit. These three different explanations correspond, in reverse order, to the three different natures of man, namely, to his physical, vital, and spiritual natures." Ibn-Aknin always gives the first and second explanations first, and then the philosophical interpretation. The commentary is invaluable to the history of Biblical literature and exegesis, inasmuch as all the interpreters therein enumerated have, with the exception of Saadia, hitherto not been known as commentators of the Song of Songs. These expositors form an important addition to the history of interpretation given by Ginsbrg *(Historical and Critical Commentary of the Song of Songs,* Longman, 1857). See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden, 6,* 354, 362; 7, 7, 43; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums u.s. Setesn,* 2, 457; 3, 11; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Liter.* ii, 349 sq.; the ably written monograph of Munk, *Notice sur Joseph b.-Jeihsda* (Paris, 1842); and the very elaborate article of Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopadie,* s.v. Joseph Ibn-Aknin.

Ibn-Balaam, Jehudah

(in Arabic *Jaola Abu Zakaria),* a very distinguished Jewish philologian and commentator, was born at Seville, in Spain about 1030. He was especially

prominent as a defender of the authority of the Massora (q.v.). He died about 1100. His works (in Hebrew) are:

1. On *the Accents of the Bible*, edited by Jo Mercer *(De accentibus scripturce prosaicis,* Paris, 1565). Some portions of this book Heidenheim (q.v.) incorporated in his yfEPVjmapaymaEFhi —

2. *One the poetical Accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms* (Paris, 1556). It has recently been reedited, with remarks of the most ancient grammarians upon these peculiar accents, notes, and an introduction, by J. G. Polak (Amsterdam, 1858): —

3. *On the denominative Verbs in the Hebrew Language.* The denominatives are arranged in alphabetical order, and commented upon in Arabic. This work has not yet been published, but specimens of it, in Hebrew, have been printed by Leopold Dukes in the *Literaturblatt des Orients,* 1846, No. 42: —

4. *A Treatise on the Hebrews Particles,* in alphabetical order. This work, too, has not as yet been printed, but specimens of it have been published both by Dukes and Furst in the *Literaturblatt des Orients,* Nos. 29 and 42: —

5. *A Treatise on the Hebrew Homonyms,* in alphabetical order, of which extracts have been published by Dukes in the *Literaturblatt des Orients,* 1846, No. 4

6. *Commentary on the Pentateuch,* written in Arabic. Though this work has long been known through AbenEzra, who quotes it in his commentary on ‹0140›Genesis 49:6; ‹0159›Exodus 5:19, yet it is only lately (1851) that Dr. Steinschneider discovered a MS. in the Bodleian Library containing a commentary on *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy*. “Ibln-Balaam always gives the grammatical explanation of the words first; he then enters into a minute disquisition on Saadia’s translation and exposition of the Pentateuch, which he generally rejects, then explains the passage according to its context, and finally sets forth the Halachic and the judicial interpretation of the Talmud. A specimen of this commentary, which is extremely important to the Hebrew text and the Massora, has been communicated by Adolph Neubauer in the *Journal Asiatique* of December, 1861. It is on ‹0516›Deuteronomy 5:6, upon which Ibn-Balaam remarks, ‘As to the different readings of the two Decalogues (i.e. ‹2012›Exodus 20:2-17, and

(Deuteronomy 5:6-21), Saadia is of opinion that they contain two different revelations. He entertains the same view respecting those Psalms which occur twice, with some verbal variations (e.g. Psalm 14 and 51), and respecting the different readings of the Babylonian and Palestinian codices.' We thus learn of a remarkable variation between the Western and Eastern codices which is not mentioned elsewhere, namely, that the words awhh µwyb (Zechariah 14:2) are omitted in the latter; we discover why the Syriac version has not these words; and we, moreover, see in what light Saadia and others regarded the various readings" (Ginsburg in Kitto):-

7. *Commentary on the Psalms,* frequently quoted by Aben-Ezra: —

8. *Commentary on the Song of Songs,* which, according to Ibn-Aknin (q.v.), who quotes it, gives a literal exposition of this book: —

9. *Commentary on Isaiah,* quoted by Joseph Albo *(Ikarin,* sec. 1, 1). "Ibn-Balaam, here, contrary to the generally received opinion, explains away the Messianic prophecies, and interprets Isaiah 11 as referring to Hezekiah. From AbenEzra's quotation on Zechariah 9:7 and Daniel 10:1, it seems as if he had also written commentaries on these books. Ibn-Balaam is one of the most liberal interpreters, and quotes Christian commentators and the Koran in his expositions." See Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden, 6:*83 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte ces Judenthums u. s. Sekte?,* 2, 406; *Fürst, Biblioth. ud.* 1, 81; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana,* col. 1292-1297; *He-Chaluz* (Lemberg, 1853), 1, 60 sq.; Leopold Dukes, *Betrage zur Geschichte der alfesten Auslegung - Spracherklarung des Aifen Testamentes* (Stuttgart, 1844), 2, 186 sq.; Geiger, in the *Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben,* 1862, p. 292 sq.

Ibn-Baruch, Baruch

a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished at Venice in the 16th century. But little is known of the history of his life. He published a twofold commentary on Ecclesiastes, called both bqo[tl;hq; *(the Congregation of Jacob)* and vdqol ae rcy; *(Holy Israel)* (Venice, 1599), the first of which is discursive and diffuse, and the second exegetical and brief. "Based upon the first verse, 'the words of Coheleth, son of David, king in Jerusalem,' he maintains that two persons are speaking in its book, a skeptic named *Coheleth,* and a believer called *Ben-David,* and accordingly treats the whole as a dialogue, in which these two characters

are shown to discuss the most important problems of moral philosophy, and the philosophic systems of Greece and Arabia are made to furnish the two heroes of the dialogue with the necessary philosophic materials." — Gisburg in Kitto. The '*Quaestiones disputat de d'Animna* of Thomas Aquinas, which were translated into Hebrew by Ali Xabillo, are used in this work both to put objections into the mouth of the skeptic and to furnish the believer with terse replies (comp. also *Commentary*, 65, a; 71, b; 96, a; 97, c; 117, a; 118, b; 119, a). It is a very valuable aid to the study of Jewish philosophy. See Jellineck, *Thoman s v. Aquino i. d. jüd. Lit.* (Lpz. 1853), p. 2 (13) and 7. (J. H.W.)

Ibn-Caspi or Caspe, Joseph ben-Abba Mari

(also called *Bonafoux de l'Argentiere)*, an able Jewish writer, was born of r. wealthy family about 1280 at Argentiere, in France. He removed while quite young to Tarascon, and devoted his time mainly to Biblical studies. When only seventeen years old, he published as a result commentaries on Aben-Ezra's exposition of the Pentateuch, and on Ibn-Ganach's grammatical work. When about thirty years old he extended his range of study to metaphysical subjects, and thereafter became an ardent admirer of Maimonides, whose method of interpretation he also adopted. Indeed, so far was he carried away in his admiration for the great philosopher that he emigrated to Egypt, having decided to study under the descendants of Maimonides. But he failed to meet there that great fountain of knowledge which he supposed the followers of the second great Moses capable of supplying, and, after a few months' travel in Egypt and the East, he returned to France. In 1327 he again set out on a journey to promote his studies by a residence at foreign high-schools, and he visited Catalonia, Mallorca, Aragonia, and Valencia, and at one time even desired to go to Fez, having been informed that in that African city several noted Jewish scholars resided, whose instructions he coveted. Towards the latter part of 1332 Ibn-Caspi returned to his native country, and devoted himself to the production of a number of valuable exegetical works. He died about 1340. In all he wrote some thirty-six works, most remaining to us only in MS. form, of which lists may be found in S. Jellineck, µyqyt[µyrbd, vol. 2, 1846; Delitzsch and Zunz, *Catal. MS.;* and in Fiurst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 1, 147. Besides a commentary on Maimonides's *Alore Nebochim*, his most valuable works are, twçrç ãsk (or twçrç only, the word {sk, *silver*, being an allusion to his own name, ypsk, which is found in the titles of all

his works) *(small silver chains* or *roots),* a Hebrew Dictionary, which is one of his most interesting and important works. “He starts from the principle that every root has only one general idea as its basis and logically deduces from it all the other shades of meaning. A copy of this work in MS., 2 vols. 4to, is in the Paris library, and another in the Angelica at Rome. Abrabanel frequently quotes it in his commentary on the Pentateuch (comp. p. 7), on Isaiah (comp. Isaiah 45:3; 66:17), etc.; Wolf gives a specimen of it *(Bibliotheca Hebrcea,* 1, 1543); Richard Simon used the Paris MS. *(Hist. Crit.* lib. 1, cap. 31), and Leopold Dukes printed extracts from it *(Literturblatt des Orients,* 1847, p. 486): — A Commentary on Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. “Of the commentary on Proverbs, which is one of Ibn-Caspi’s most valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis, the beginning and end have been published by Werblumer (comp. ãsk txwbq, 1846, p. 19, etc.); an analysis of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given by Ginsburg (compare *Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes,* Longman, 1861, p. 60, etc.), and the brief commentary on, or, rather, introduction to the Song of Songs, which was published in 1577, but which is rarer than the MSS., has been reprinted with an English translation by Ginsburg in his *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs* (London, 1857, p. 47, etc.):”- ãsk twfm *(silver staves),* or commentary on eight prophets, in which he attacks with great severity those who explain these prophecies as referring to the Messiah *SEE IBN-DANAN*:-- ãsk [ykg (a *silver cup),* or commentary on the miracles and other mysteries found in the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa. His principles’ of interpretation he laid down clearly in his commentary on the Proverbs above mentioned in these words: “The sacred Scriptures must be explained according to their plain and literal sense; and a recondite meaning can as little be introduced into them as into Aristotle’s writings on logic and natural history. Only where the literal meaning is not sufficient, and reason rejects it, a deeper sense must be resorted to. If we once attempt to allegorize a simple and intelligible passage, then we might just as well do it with the whole contents of the Bible.” “The logical division of sentences is the most indispensable and best auxiliary to the right understanding of the Bible, and the criterion to the proper order of the words are the *Massora* and the *accents.”* It is evident from this extract that Ibn-Caspi anticipated the hermeneutical rules of modern criticism at a time when the schoolmen and the depositaries of Christian learning were engaged in hair-splitting and in allegorizing every

fact of the Bible. It is greatly to be regretted that most of his exegetical works are left unpublished. See Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 351 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 7:*361 sq.; Kirchheim, *Werblumler's Edition of Ibn-Caspi's Commentary an Maimonides's More Nebochim* (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1848), p. 10 sq.; Leopold Dukes, in the *Litersaturb. des Orients,* 1848; and Schneider, in Ersch u. Gruber's *Allgen. Encyklop.* sec. 2, 31:58 sq.

Ibn-Chajim, Aaron

a Jewish commentator, was born at Fez, Africa, about 1570. But little is known of his personal history. His works are, a *Commentary on Joshua* (Venice, 1608-9), from which a selection was made by Frankfurter (q.v.) in his great Rabbinic Bible: — a commentary on Sifra (tradition of Leviticus), published under the title of *The Oblation of Aaron* (Venice, 1609-11.): — The *Rules of Aaron,* a treatise on R. Ishmael's (q.v.) thirteen rules for interpreting the O.T. Scriptures (Ven. 1609, Dres. 1712). — Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 352.

Ibn-Darnan, Saadia ben-Maimon

a Jewish writer of some distinction, was Rabbi to the congregation at Granada previous to the cession of this country by the Moors to Ferdinand and Isabella, and the expatriation of the Jews. He was born in the first half of the 15th century, and flourished at Granada from 1460 to 1502. He was especially given to the study of the Talmud and history, and as a result of the former we have several works on the interpretation of the O.T. Scriptures, and the elucidation of the language of the original. His exegetical works are, a *Commentary on* ◁2501▷*Isaiah* 53:13 (MS. Michael, 412), in which he takes ground against Ibn-Caspi (q.v.): — a *Hebrew Lexicon* (written in Arabic). This work, which he is thought to have completed in 1468, also remains only in MS. form, but an extract from it has been printed by Pinsker in his *Likute Kadmonioth* (Vienna, 1860), p. 74. His historical works are, *A short History of the Jews to the Days of Moses Maimonides* (rwdh rap), which he originally intended for his own pupils, of whom he seems to have had a number. See Gritz, *Geschichte d. Juden, 8,* 345 sq.: Edelmann, *Chemda Genuzsa,* Introd. p. 17 sq., and Text, p. 13 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 352. (J. H. W.)

Ibn-Daud

SEE CHAUG.

Ibn-Djanah

SEE IBN-GANACH.

Ibnei’ah

(Heb. *Yibneqah’*, hyqbyæ *Jehovah will build* him up; Sept. Ἰεβναά), a son of Jeroham, who, with other Benjamites, returned to Jerusalem after the Captivity (1 Chronicles 9:8). B.C. 536.

Ibn-Ezra

SEE ABEN-EZRA.

Ibn-Ganach, Abulwalid Merwan or Jonah Djanah

(in Hebrew called *Jonah),* one of the most distinguished Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cordova about 995. While yet a boy he evinced his fondness for Hebrew by writing verses in that language, but as he continued in his studies he determined to devote his whole life to the advancement of the Hebrew as a philological study, and even abandoned the practice of medicine, which he had chosen as his profession after his removal to Saragossa in 1015, whither he had been forced by the persecutions which the Jews of Cordova suffered at the hand of Al-Mostain Suleimall since his occupation of that place in 1013. He soon acquired a proficiency, which even in our day has not been excelled, and he deserves greater praise than any other Jewish scholar on account of the impulse he gave both to his contemporaries and to his immediate successors (among them the two Kimnchis and AbeonEzra), who have frequently acknowledged their obligations to him. The thorough manner in which he conducted his investigations enabled him to accomplish much more than his illustrious predecessor Chajug (q.v.), and by his criticism of Chajug’s works, in which he readily acknowledged all that was meritorious, he frequently encountered the ardent followers of that great master, and became entangled in a number of controversies, which finally resulted beneficially to Hebrew philology. He died about 1050. His first great work in linguistics is his *Kitab el-Tankieh* (“book of inquiry”), written in Arabic (the native tongue in his day of that part of Spain),

consisting of two great parts, the first, *Kitub el-Leuma'* ("book of variegated fields"), treating at length of Hebrew grammar, and the second, *Kitacb el-Azul* ("book of roots"), a Hebrew Dictionary, which was afterwards translated into Hebrew by several Jewish scholars, but of which only the translations made by Ibn-Parchon and by Ibn-Tibbon are preserved. The original is at Oxford (MS. Ure, No. 456, 457), and was extensively used by Gesenius in his *Thesazurus.* Specimens of it, which Gesenius gave in his *Dict. of the Heb. Lezan.* were translated by Dr. Robinson, and published in the *Amec Bib. Repository*, 1833. That part of this work which refers to Hebrew grammar was published by Kirchheim (Frankf. A.M. 1856, 8vo). "This gigantic work is the most important philological production in Jewish literature of the Middle Ages. The mastery of the science of the Hebrew language in all its delicate points which Ibn-Ganach therein displays, the lucid manner in which he explains every grammatical difficulty, and the sound exegetical rules which he therein propounds, have few parallels up to the present day. He was not only the creator of the Hebrew syntax, but almost brought it to perfection. He was the first who pointed out the ellipses and the transposition of letters, words, and verses in the Hebrew Bible, and explained in a simple and natural manner more than two hundred obscure passages, which had up to his time greatly perplexed all interpreters, by showing that the sacred writers used abnormal for normal expressions (compare hmqrh rps, ch. 28; Aben-Ezra's *Commentary on* <2010>*Daniel* 1:1, and tyjx rps, ed. Lippmann, p. 72, note). Though his faith in the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures was absolute, yet he maintained that, being addressed to men, they are subject to the laws of language, and hence urged that the abnormal expressions and forms in the Bible are not to be ascribed to the ignorance of transcribers and punctuators, nor to willful corruption, but are owing to the fact that the sacred writers, being human, paid the tribute of humanity." But also in metaphysics Ibn-Ganach was no tyro, and he speaks of Plato and Aristotle like one who had studied them diligently. He wrote a work on logic, Aristotelian, in principle, and strenuously opposed the efforts of his contemporaries, especially Ibn-Gebirol, in their metaphysical investigations on the relation of God to the world, holding that these inquiries only endangered the belief in the Scriptures. See Munk, *Notice sur A. i1. Ibn-Djanah* (Paris, 1851); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 6,* 25 sq., 205 sq.; Furst, *Hebr. Dict.* Introd. p. 30 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2, 354 sq.; First *Biblioth. Jud.* 1, 315.

Ibn-Gebirol or Gabirol, Salomon ben-Jehrdah

a very distinguished Jewish philosopher, commentator, and grammarian, as well as hymnologist, was born at Malaga, in Spain, about 1021. When only nineteen years of age he evinced his great skill as a poet, and his thorough acquaintance with Hebrew grammar by writing a grammar of the Hebrew language in Hebrew verse. It has never been printed entire, but parts of it have been published by Parchon in his *Hebrew Lexicon* (Paris, 1844), and by Leop. Dukes, in his *Shire Shelomo* (Hannov. 1858). About 1045 Ibn-Gebirol published his first philosophical work, which was translated by Ibn-Tibbon into Hebrew, entitled vpNhit/DmæWQTæ (published in 1550 and often). He propounds in this work "a peculiar theory of the human temperament and passions, enumerates twenty propensities corresponding to the four dispositions multiplied by the five senses, and shows how the leaning of the soul to the one side may be brought to the moral equipoise by observing the declarations of Scripture, and ethical sayings of the Talmud, which he largely quotes, and which he intersperses with the chief sayings of 'the divine' Socrates, his pupil Plato, Aristotle, the Arabic philosophers, and especially with the maxims of a Jewish moral philosopher called Chefez Al-Kute, who is the author of an Arabic paraphrase of the Psalms in rhyme (Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* [Lond. 1857], p. 101)." But as this work contained also personal allusions to some leading men of Saragossa, he was expatriated in 1046. After traveling from one place to another, he finally found a protector in the celebrated Samuel Ha-Nagid, a Jew also, then prime minister of Spain, and he was enabled to continue his philosophical studies, as the result of which he produced *The Fountain of Life,* his greatest work. Fragments of a Hebrew translation and an entire Latin version of it were published by Munk in his *Melanges de philosophie Nizte et Ara be* (Paris, 1857-59). He died in 1070. The influence which Ibn-Gebirol exerted on Arabian and Jewish philosophy cannot be too highly estimated. He certainly deserves to be called "the Jewish Plato," as Graitz chooses to name him; but the assertion that he was the *first* philosopher of the Middle Ages, and that his philosophical treatises were used by the scholastic philosophers, is an error, as Lewis *(History of Philosophy,* ii, 63) fully proves, although Imunk, and after him Gratz, fell into the same mistake, as also Ginsburg, the writer of the article on Ibn-Gebirol in Kitto *(Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 356). From frequent quotations in Aben-Ezra's commentaries, it seems that Ibn-Gebirol must also have written some expositions of the Old-Test. Scriptures, though none such are known

to us at present existing. Ibn-Gebirol also had a natural talent for verse making. One of his hymns, entitled *The royal Diadem*, "a beautiful and pathetic poetical composition of profound philosophical sentiments and great devotion, forms an important part of the divine service on the evening preceding the great Day of Atonement with the devout Jews to the present day." See Gratz, *Geschichte de. Jude, 6,* 31 sq.; Sachs, *Religiise Poesie d. Juden i. Spanien* (Berl. 1845), p. 3 sq. 213, etc.; Ztuz, *Syncacogcale Poesie der Mittelalters*, p, 222; First, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 320 sq.

Ibn-Giath, Isaac ben-Juhudah

a Jewish Rabbi of a very distinguished family who resided in Lucena, not far from Cordova, was born about 1030. He was a very able philosopher and hymnologist, and well conversant with the Talmud. He is said to have written a *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, which has not as yet come to light. From the frequent quotations made from it by the best interpreters and lexicographers, it appears that it contained important contributions to the critical exposition of this difficult book. From the references to his writings made by Aben-Ezra (comp. comment. on <051007>Deuteronomy 10:7; <190703>Psalm 147:3), Kimchi (Lexicon, under articles qrç, hn[, tm[, rws, [bn, rkz), and Solomon ben-Melech (comment. on <102236>2 Samuel 22:36), it is evident that Ibn-Giath most have also written some other exegetical and grammatical treatises, and that he materially contributed to the development of Biblical exegesis. This devotional poetry, which is rather inferior to Ibn-Gebirol's (q.v.), is used in the Jewish service to the present day. He lied in 1089. See Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, p. 225 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud. 1*, 332 sq.; Sachs, *Die Religiose Poesie d. Juden in Spanien* (Berlin, 1845), p. 46, etc., 255, etc.; Landshut, *Amude Aboda* (Berl. 1857), fasciculus 1, 111, etc.; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden, 6,* 74.

Ibn-Gikatilla

SEE JOSEPH IBN-CHIQUITILLA.

Ibni'jah

(Heb. *Yibniyah'*, hYnIbiy;, q.q. *Ibneiah;* Sept. Ἰεβαναάί), the father of Reuel, which latter was the grandfather of the Meshullam, another Benjamite, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (<130908>1 Chronicles 9:8). B.C. long ante 536.

Ibn-Jachja, David

a Jewish scholar, was born about 1440. He was a Rabbi at Lisbon, in Portugal, and had gained great celebrity by his scholarship when he was suddenly accused of giving aid to the Spanish Maranes (q.v.), who, having witnessed the *peculiar* practices of the Spanish disciples of Christ, preferred to return to the faith of their fathers. Ibn-Jachja was condemned to death, and barely escaped the punishment by a flight to Naples. Later, he removed to Constantinople, and taught the sciences. He died in 1504. His works are, *Leshon Limmodim,* a large Hebrew grammar; and *Shekel Hakkodesh,* on the metric and poetical laws of the new Hebrew dialect. See Carmoly, *Die Jachjiden,* p. 17; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden, 9,* 3; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 462; First, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 2 sq.

Ibn-Jachja, Gedalja

a Jewish historian, was born at Imola about 1515. He deserves mention here on account of his work *Shalsheleth Hakkabala,* or *Chain of Tradition* (Zolkiew, 1804). It is a history of the Jews, and is divided into three parts, of which part first only is the *Shalsheleth,* or literary chronicle of rabbinism; the other parts treat not only of history proper, but include also natural history, pneumatology, and economics. He died about 1587. — Carmoly, *Die Jachjiden,* p. 33 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden, 9,* 435; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 452; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 3.

Ibn-Jachja, Joseph b.-David

a distinguished Jewish commentator, was born at Florence in 1494. His ancestors were citizens of Spain, but had fled from the Iberian Peninsula on account of the religious persecutions which the Jews had to suffer, especially under John II. His education he received first at Verona, then at Imola and Padua, and he settled at Imola. He died, exhausted by excessive studies, in 1539. His works are, commentaries on the *Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes,* and *Esther; Psalms, Proverbs,* and *Daniel* (transl. into Latin by Constantin l'Empereur [Amsterdam, 1633], with the Hebrew text and a refutation of anti-Christian passages). A special feature of these commentaries, which are all inserted in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible, is the midrashic lore contained in them, which is valuable to the historicocritical exegetist. Ibn-Jachja wrote also *Torah,* or *"The Law of Light"* (Bologla, 1538), a very valuable work on the theology of Judaism, in which he rejects the introduction of philosophy in the consideration of

religious topics. See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 9, 235; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 452; Jost, *Israelitische Annalen*, 2, 393 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's *Algem. Encyklop.* sec. 2, 31:81 sq.;. Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2, 356; First, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 4.

Ibn-Jaish, Baruch

a Jewish scholar, flourished at Cordova, in Spain, in the 15th century. He wrote commentaries on the Song of Songs *(The blessed Fountain,* etc., Constantinople, 1576), and on Ecclesiastes and Job *(The blessed Fountain of Job and Ecclesiastes,* Constantinople, 1576). "He generally gives the literal explanation of every passage according to the context, and tries to solve the grammatical difficulties of the text." — Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Literature*, 2, 357; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 12.

Ibn-Kastor

SEE ITZCHAKI.

Ibn-Koreish, Jehudah

one of the earliest Jewish lexicographers, flourished in the latter half of the 9th century at Tuhart or Tahort, in Africa, and was one of the first who wrote on comparative philology. He was thoroughly conversant not only with the Berber tongue, but also with the three Shemitic languages; he had carefully studied the traditions of the Jews and the Mohammedans, and was eminently qualified to write on the Hebrew language, and introduce frequent comparisons with the other Shemitic tongues. His works are, ˆ/rGaæa *Hebrew Lexicon* in alphabetical order, but with that peculiar arrangement which all works of this class were subject to at that time, viz. each group of words belonging to a letter was accompanied by introductions, one on those words which have only the letter in question for a radical theme, and another on the changes of that letter. The work has been lost, but its existence is attested by the fact that not only the author himself refers to it in another of his works, but also the great scholars of his and subsequent periods; — Risalet (Heb. hlasr), or a letter addressed to his Jewish brethren at Fez, in which he exhorts them to continue the study of the Aramaic Targum, and of the Aramaic as well as the Shemitic languages, without a thorough knowledge of which the Old-Test. Scriptures can only be imperfectly comprehended. After the introduction he divided the work into three parts. In Part I he arranged in alphabetic

order all difficult Hebrew words that could only be properly understood from the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel. Pait II contained an explanation of Biblical Hebrew words found also in the Mishna and the Talmud. In Part III he instituted a comparison with the Arabic of all analogous Hebrew roots, forms of expressions, prefixes and suffixes, etc. This work is certainly a very important contribution to Hebrew philology, and it is only to be regretted that we do not possess it completely, since the first part breaks up with letter k, and does not begin again till letter t, from which Furst *(Hebr. Dict.* vol. 23) infers that the author intended it only as a continuation of his (lost) *Hebrew Dictionary.* It has lately been published in the Arabic under the title *Epistola de studii Targum cutilitate et de linguce Chaldaicae, Misnicae, Talmudice, Arabicae, vocabulorum item nonnullorum barbaricorum convenientia cum Hebrea;* ediderunt J. J. L. Barges et D. R. Goldberg (Paris, 1857). The introduction, with specimens from the work, have been published in Arabic, with a German translation by Schnurrer, in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibliothek d. Biblisch. Literatur* (Lpz. 1790), 3:951 sq.; the introduction has also been published with a German translation by Wetstein in the *Literaturblatt des Orients* (1845), 3:2; and extracts are given by Ewald and Dukes, *Beitrage zur Geschichte d. Aeltesten Auslegeng und Spracherklairung d. A. Test.* (Stuttgart, 1844), 1, 116-23; 2, 117, 118. He wrote alsqWDqÞæpse a Hebrew grammar, which Aben-Ezra used in the preparation of his own work. See, besides the works already referred to, Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden,* 5, 293; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Lit.* 2, 357; First, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 203.

Ibn-Latifor Allatif, Isaac ben-Abraham

a Jewish philosopher, was born in Southern Spain about 1270. But little is known of his personal history. He devoted much of his time to the study of the Cabala, and became one of its most celebrated exponents in Spain. With greater correctness than Cabalists who preceded him, he advocated the doctrine that the worlds of spirit and of matter are closely allied, and likewise God and his creation. The divine is in everything, and everything in the divine. He also believed in the power of prayer, but that man, in order to be accepted of God, must approach at least perfection; hence the most perfect of men, the prophets, interceded by prayer for the people. The development of the self-revelation of the divinity in the world, of' the spirits, spheres, and bodies, Ibn-Latif explains by mathematical formulas.

He died about 1290. Of his works, which are quite numerous, the following have been printed: *Iggereth hat-Toshubah,* replies to the questions of Judah ben-Naason (Prague, 1839, 8vo): — a Heb. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (Constantinople, s. a. 8vo). See Gratz, *Geschichte d. Juden, 7,* 220; Furst, *Biblioth. Judaica,* 2, 224; Carmoly, *Revue Orientale,* 1, 61 sq.

Ibn-Librat

SEE DUNASH.

Ibn-Saktar

SEE ITZCHAKI.

Ibn-Sargado, Aaron

also called AAROS HACOHEN BEN-JOSEPH, a Jewish scholar, flourished in Bagdad towards the middle of the 10th century. He was a wealthy merchant, but very fond of study, and, taking ground against Saadia (q.v.), for whose deposition from the "Gaonate" he expended large sums of money, shortly after Saadia's decease he was elected Gaon (spiritual head) of the academy at Pumbadita (943), and by his zeal for learning and his great wealth greatly furthered the interests of this academy at the expense of the Suran school, over which Saadia had presided. Ibn-Sargado, during the eighteen years of his presidency, devoted himself not only to the exposition of the O.-Test. Scriptures, but also quite extensively to the study of philosophy (comp. Munk, *Guide des egares,* 1, 462). He wrote a philosophical work and a *Commentary on the Pentateuch,* but they are not as yet known to us. From the fragments of the latter preserved by Aben-Ezra (comp. Genesis 18:28; 34:30; 49:6, 7; Exodus 10:12; Leviticus 18:6), we see that, though abiding by the traditional explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures, Ibn-Sargado was by no means a slavish follower of ancient opinions. See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden, v,* 335 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* 2, 357; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud. 3,* 246; Geiger, *Judische Zeitschrifufur Wissenschaft und Leben* (1862), p. 297; Zunz, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift,* vol. 4 (Stuttg. 1839), p. 389, etc.

Ibn-Saruk

SEE MENACHEM

Ibn-Shoeib, Joel

a Jewish commentator, flourished at Tudela in the latter half of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history. His works show him to have been a man of considerable culture and great liberality of mind. He wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, entitled *The Holocaust of Sabbath* (Ven. 1577); on the Psalms, entitled *Fearful in Praises* (Salonaica, 1568-69); on the Song of Songs, entitled *A brief Exposition* (Sabionetta, 1558); and an *Exposition of Lamentations* (Venice, 1589). In his commentary on the Psalms he maintained that pious Gentiles would have a share in the world to come, which, when we consider the severe persecutions they inflicted at this time on the Jews, is by no means a small concession on the part of Ion-Shoeib. — Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* 2, 358; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berl. 1845), p. 384. (J. H.W.)

Ibn-Sitta

(afyz ^b), a distinguished Jew, flourished at Irak towards the close of the 9th century. He wrote a commentary on the Scriptures, of which fragments only are left. Such we find in Aben-Ezra (on Exodus 21:24, 35; 22:28). Saadia Gaon thought Ibn-Sitta of sufficient importance to refute his interpretations, while Aben-Ezra exercises his withering sarcasm upon him. — Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2, 358; Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmonioth* (Vienna, 1860), p. 43; Furst, *Gesch. d. Karaerthums* (Lpz. 1862), p. 100,173.

Ibn-Thofeil

an Arabian philosopher who flourished in the 12th century, wrote a work in which the existence of God is proved in so able a manner that the arguments remain unrefuted to this day. It was translated into Persian, Hebrew, and Latin. The last-named, by Ed. Pococke, was entitled *Philosophus autodidactus, sive epistola Abi Jaafor Ebn-Tophail de Hai Ebbn-Yokdham* (Oxf. 1671 and 1700, 4to; and also in English by S. Ockley, Lend. 1708, 1731, 8vo, and other modern languages). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25*, 752.

Ibn-Tibbon, Jehudah ben-Saul

a Jewish scholar of Spanish descent, was born at Lunel, France, about 1120. He was educated a physician, but his ardent love for the study of

Hebrew led him to abandon the practice of his profession, and he devoted himself mainly to the translation into Hebrew of some of the most valuable works of able Jews written in Arabic. He died about 1190. His translations are *The Duties of the Heart* of Joseph b.-Bechai, the *Ethics* of Ibn-Gebiroi, the *Kusari* of Judah Ha-Levi, the *A Moral Philosophy* of Saadia Gaon, and the grammatical and lexicographical work of Ibn-Ganach (q.v.). All his translations bear his own pedantic character: they are literal, and therefore clumsy, and we can hardly see why he should have gained the surname of *prince of translators,* unless it was for the service which he rendered by presenting the Jews translations of works not otherwise accessible to them. He is also said to have written a work on the purity of the Hebrew language (twjx dws ˆwçlh), which Is lost. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* 2, 358; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (col. 1374-76); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 6,* 241; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud. 3,* 401 sq.

Ibn-Tibbon, Samuel

son of the preceding, was born about 1160. He was educated by his father both in the Hebrew and cognate languages, and followed him in the practice of medicine. He was wild and even reckless in his youth, but finally became interested in his studies, and evinced greater skill as a translator than his father. He died about 1230. Besides translating philosophical works both of Jewish and heathen authors, among whom were Aristotle and Alfarabi he wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (tlhq çwryp), which exists in MS. in several of the European libraries; and a commentary on  Genesis 1:1-9, entitled µymh wwqy rmam (Presburg, 1837), being a dissertation on the creation, Gratz *Gesch. d. Juden, 6,* 242; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* 2, 358; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud. 3,* 402 sq.

Ibn-Tumart, Abdullah

a religious enthusiast, flourished in the second half of the 12th century in Northern Africa. He appeared before the simple-minded hordes of Barbary, and preached against the Sunnitical doctrine of the Mohammedan orthodoxy *SEE SUNNITES*, and the literal interpretation of the verses of the Koran, and the Mohammedan belief that God feels and acts like man. His followers, on account of their belief in the strict unity of God without corporeal representation *(Tauchid),.* called themselves *Almowachids,* or *Almohads.* Ibn-Tumart they recognized as *Mahdi,* or the God-sent Imam

of Islam. Like Mohammed, he went forth to conquer by the sword the territories of the Almoravids, and his doctrine soon found followers throughout Northwest. Africa. *SEE MOHAMMEDANS*. (J. H.W.)

Ib'ri

(Heb. *Ibri'*, yrib][;an. *Eberite* or "Hebrew;" Sept. has Ὠβδί v.r. Ἀβαΐ), the last named of "the sons of Merari by Jaaziah," i.e., apparently a descendant of Levi in the time of David (1Ch 24:27). B.C. 1014.

Ibum

is a name for the Jewish ceremony of the marriage of a childless widow by the brother of the deceased husband. *SEE LEVIRATE LAW*.

Ib'zan

(Heb. *Ibtsan'*, ^xbu][;from bu[; to *shine*, hence *illustrious;* but accord. to Gesen. perh. *of tin*, or *grievous*, from the Chald.; Sept. Ἐβεσάν v.r. Ἀβαισσάν; Joseph. Ἀψάνης, *Ant.* 5, 7, 13), the tenth "judge of Israel" (Jg 12:8-10). He was of Bethlehem probably the Bethlehem of Zebulun (so Michaelis and Hezel), and not of Judah (as Josephus says). He governed seven years, B.C. 1249-1243. The prosperity of Ibzan is marked by the great number of his children (thirty sons and thirty daughters), and his wealth by their marriages-for they were all married. Some have held, with little probability, that Ibzan was the same with Boaz.-Kitto.

Icard, Charles

a French Protestant divine, was born at St. Hippolyte, Languedoc, in February, 1636. He attended school at Anduze, Orange, and Nimes, and concluded his theological studies at Geneva from 165558, and in 1659 went to Paris. After ordination by the provincial synod of Ay he was appointed pastor of La Norville, where he remained until 1668, when he accepted a pastorship at Nimes. Under the influence of the persecutions which heralded the approaching revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Protestants, at the suggestion of Claude Brousson, formed a central committee for the protection of their general interests, and Icard was chosen to represent it at the Synod of Lower Languedoc, assembled at Uzes in 1632. In the mean time, the population of a part of Vivarais and

Lower Languedoc having risen in arms to resist the persecution, the insurrection was extinguished in blood, and the members of the central committee, accused of being the instigators, were proceeded against with the utmost severity. Icard succeeded in reaching Geneva, and thence went to Neufchatel for greater security. While on his way, at Yverdun, he learned that he had been condemned, June 26, 1682, as contumacious, to die on the rack. He remained as pastor at Neufchatel until 1688, when he went to Bremen, and supplied a French congregation there. He died June 9,1715. Icard wrote two *Sermons, Avis salutaire aux Eglises reformees de France* (Amst. 1685, 12mo), exhorting the Protestants not to give way under persecution. He also edited an edition of the *Institutions de Calvin* (first two books, Bremen, 1696,1697, to the whole, Bremen, 1713, fol.); and an edition of the *Entretiens d'un Pere et de son Fils sur le Changement de Religion, par Josue de La Place.* See Hossat, *Detail abrgi de la Vie de Charles Icard* (in *Hist. crit. de la Republique des Lettres* (1717), 14, 283301; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 25,* 768.

Ice

(קרח, *ke'rach,* so called from its *smoothness,* Job 6:16; 28:29; elsewhere *cold,* "frost," Genesis 31:40; Jeremiah 36:30; i.e. ice, Job 37:10; but *"crystal"* in Ezekiel 1:32; or קרקף, *ko'rach,* id., poet. for *hail,* Psalm 147:17). See the above terms, and *climate und*er *SEE PALESTINE*.

Iceland

an island belonging to Denmark, situated between the North Atlantic and the Arctic Oceans, distant 130 miles from the south-east coast of Greenland, and about 850 miles west of Norway, extending between lat. 630 24' and 660 33' N., and long. 130 31' and 240. The area is 39,756 square miles, of which only 15,300 are cultivated. The total population of Iceland was, according to the statistics of 1888, about 72,000 souls.

As early as 795 the eastern coast of Iceland was inhabited by some Irish monks, but it did not receive a settled population until 860, when king Harald Harfagr, of Norway, after conquering the other kings, made himself sole sovereign of the country, and induced large numbers of the malcontents to emigrate to Iceland. Nearly all the newcomers were pagans,

and thus the republic which was established by them was thoroughly pagan. The legislation of Ulfliot (about 927) created the Althing, an assembly of the wisest men of all districts, which met annually to discuss the affairs of the country, and to give the necessary laws. The first Christian missionary among the Icelanders was Thorvaldr Kodransson (981-985), with the same Vidforli ("who has made wide journeys"), who was supported by Frederick, according to the legend, a Saxon bishop. With great vigor the missionary work was subsequently continued by king Olaf Tryggvason of Norway, who not only tried by persuasion, bribery, and intimidation to gain for the Christian religion all the Icelanders who came to Norway, but also sent missionaries to Iceland, and supported their labors by the whole influence which he could command. The first to go was the Icelander Stefnir Thorgilsson (996-997), followed by the Saxon priest Dankbrand, who, after many adventures, had become court chaplain of the king (997-999); two noble Icelanders, the "White Gizur," and Hjalti Skegjason, succeeded finally in effecting a compromise with the pagan chief functionary of the island, Thorgair of Ljosavatu, according to which Christianity was made the state religion of Iceland, while many reservations were made in favor of paganism (1000). The whole people were then baptized, part of them reluctantly, yet without open resistance. A few years later, king Olaf Haraldsson caused the last remnants of paganism to be effaced from the laws. Some traces, however, of the former religion remained in the faith and usages of the Christian Icelanders, particularly in their Church constitution. During the pagan period the erection and possession of a temple had been a private affair; as there was no separate order of priests, divine worship had been held in every temple by its owner; subsequently, when the political constitution of the island was regulated (965), a limited number (thirty-nine) of temples obtained a political importance, and every Icelander was obliged to connect himself with the owner of the principal temple as his subject, and to pay a contribution for the maintenance of the temple. Private temples were maintained beside the public, and the latter remained likewise the private property of the chiefs. The idea of chief temples ceased with the introduction of Christianity but erection, donation, and maintenance of the temples remained a private affair. The law only provided that the erection of a church involved the duty of maintaining it; and the clergy could compel the dotation of a church by delaying its consecration until dotation was provided for. Otherwise the administration of the property of the church by its owner was very arbitrary, and he had only to take care of the maintenance of the church

and of the holding of divine worship. He either could take orders himself or hire another priest. In the former case the priest was more of a peasant, merchant, or a judge than a clergyman; in the latter he was financially dependent upon the owner of the temple, and, like other servants, obliged to perform domestic or military services. Iceland received its own and native bishop in 1055, having up to that time been only visited by missionary bishops. The bishop enjoyed the benefit of the old temple duties; otherwise he had to live out of his own means. Under the second bishop, Gizur, the see was endowed, and permanently established at Skalahold; subsequently (about 1106) a second see was established at Holar, to which was given the jurisdiction of the northern district, while the three other districts remained subject to the bishop of Skalahold. The bishops were elected by the people; the priests by the owners of the several churches. Thus the clergy were less independent than in other countries, and consequently less powerful. Their influence somewhat increased when bishop Gizur, in 1097, prevailed upon the National Assembly to introduce the tithe, and when the bishops Thorlakr Runolfson and Retill Thorsteinson, by compiling the Church laws, gained a firm basis (1123: it was published in 1776 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title *Jus ecclesiasticum vetus, sive Thorlaco-Ketillianum,* or *Kristinreur him gamli).* Still the condition of the Icelandic Church continued to remain in many particulars different from that of other churches. Lay patronage was recognized to its fullest extent; no celibacy separated the clergy from the people; even the bishops were generally married. The bishops, though they had a seat in the National Assembly, had no sepal rate ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and marriage and other affairs were regulated contrary to Church law.

The Church of Iceland was at first subordinate to the archbishopric of Bremen and Hamburg; when the archoishopric of Lund was established (1103), Iceland was transferred to it finally, it was transferred to the new archbishopric of Nidaros. About the middle of the 11th century the island became subject to the crown of Norway, and was consequently affected by the war between Church and State, which took place in that country. This chiefly concerned the patronage of laymen, and sided with the adoption of a new Church law introduced about 1297 by bishop Arni. (This Church law was published in 1777 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title *Jus ecclesiasticusm novum sive Arncanum,* or *Kristinnrettr inn nyi.)*

The inner condition of the people was anything but satisfactory, as immorality and other vices appear to have prevailed to a large extent among the laity as well as among the clergy. The convents which had arisen since the 12th century fully participated in the general degeneration. Externally all classes of the people showed a strong attachment to the Church of Rome, and three natives of the island obtained a place among the saints of the Church-Thorlakr, Jon, and Gutdmundr; the last named, however, was not formally canonized.

The Reformation soon found a number of adherents; among the earliest and most devoted was Oddr Gottschalksson, the author of the first translation of the New Testament into Icelandic (printed at Roeskilde, 1540). The Danish government, of which Iceland formed a dependency since the union of Norway with Denmark (1397), endeavored to introduce the Reformation, which in 1536 had been declared to be the religion of the state by the Diet of Copenhagen, by force; but the bishops, especially bishop Arason of Holar, made a determined, and at length an armed opposition, which, however, finally (1550) ended in his capture and execution. This put an end to the Church of Rome in Iceland, and in the next year (1551) the Reformation was fully carried through.

The real improvement in the condition of the Church was, however, only gradual. Many of the customs of the mediaeval Church, such as the use of the Latin language at divine service, maintained themselves for a long time; and the same was the case with the ignorance and the immorality of the clergy and the people. But gradually these defects were remedied by the establishment of learned schools in connection with the two cathedrals (1552); by the establishment of a printing-press at Holar by the excellent bishop Gudbrandr Thorlakson (1574); and in particular by the new translation of the Bible by this bishop, a service that contributed largely to a thorough reform of the Church, which now belongs to the best-educated portions of the Protestant world.

As regards the present constitution of the Church of Iceland, it resembles in its principal features that of Denmark, yet not without preserving some of its own peculiarities. The sovereign is the chief bishop *(summus episcopus)*, who exercises his authority partly through the bishops, partly through secular officers. The bishops, in the election of whom the people take part, occupy the position of superintendents, and still have an extended jurisdiction. At the close of the 18th century the see of Skalahold

was transferred to Reykjavik, and somewhat later (1825) a cathedral was established at Langanies, near Reykjavik. The episcopal see of Holar had previously (in 1801) been abolished, and the whole island placed under one bishop. Next to the bishops are the provosts, whose office was in the Middle Ages chiefly of a financial nature, and therefore I sometimes occupied by laymen. Since the Reformation (1573-1574) the dignity has been wholly of an ecclesiastical character, and includes the right and duty of superintending large districts. On the whole, there are 19 provosts, each of whom is placed over a number of parishes. The pastors were at first appointed by the bishops, contrary to the provisions of the Danish Church constitution, but since 1563 they have been elected, in accordance therewith, by the congregation, under the superintendence of the provost. To the royal bailiff was reserved the right of investing the pastor elect with his office. Subsequently the manner of appointment was somewhat modified, the appointing power being given to the bailiff, and a right of co-operation to the bishop. To the king of Denmark was reserved the right of sanctioning the appointment to one of the forty-seven benefices, whose yearly income is from 40 to 100 dollars annually. Only five of the 299 churches yield an income higher than 100 dollars. Some clergymen have an income of no more than five dollars annually. All have therefore to depend for their support chiefly on fees and on the proceeds of the lands connected with the churches. See Maurer, in Herzog, *Real-Encylopadie, 7:*90; Finnus Johannaeus, *Histor. Eccles. Islandice* (tom. 4:Havnise, 1772-78; extending to the year 1740, and continued till 1840 under the same. title by Petur Peturson, Copenhagen, 1841); M'tinter, *Kirchengesch. von Denmark u. Norwegen,* vol. 1-3 (Leipzig, 1823-33); Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des norweg. Stammes zum Christenhume* (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols.); Harbon, *Om reformationen i Island* (Copenh. 1843). (A. J. S.).

Ich'abod

(Heb. *I-kabdd'* d/bk;Ayaæ *Where* is the *glory?* i.q. There is *no glory,* i.e. *inglorious;* Sept. Ἰωχαβήδ v.r. Ἐχαβώδ, and even Οὐαιχαβώδ, etc.), the son of Phinehas and grandson of Eli. The pains of labor came upon his mother when she heard that the ark of God was taken, that her husband was slain in battle, and that these tidings had proved fatal to his father Eli. They were death-pains to her; and when those around sought to cheer her, saying, "Fear not, for thou hast borne a son," she only answered by giving him the name of Ichabod, adding, "The glory is departed from Israel" (1 Sam 4:19-21).

Samuel 4:19-22). B.C. 1125. The name again occurs in ⁽⁰¹⁴⁰⁾1 Samuel 14:3; where his son Ahitub is mentioned as the father of the priest Ahiah.

Ichthys

(Greek, ἰχθύς, *a fish),* in Christian archeology a symbol of Christ. The word is found en many seals, rings, lamps, and tombstones belonging to the earliest Christian times. It is formed of the initial letters of our Savior's names and titles in Greek: Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ ῾Υιός, Σωτήρ, *Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior.* Tertullian speaks of Christians accustomed to please themselves with the n-me *pisciculi;* "fishes," to denote that they were born again into Christ's religion by water. He says, "Nos pisciculi se, cundum ἰχθύν, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur" *(De Bapt.* 1, 2). *SEE FISH*. Baptismal fonts were often ornamented with the figure of a fish; several such remain in French cathedrals. Optatus, bishop of Milesia, in the 4th century, first pointed out the word ἰχθύς as formed of the initials of Christ's titles as above given, and from that time forward "Oriental subtlety repeated to satiety" religious similitudes drawn from the sea. Julius Africanus calls Christ "the great fish taken by the fish-hook of God, and whose flesh nourishes the whole world." Augustine says that "ἰχθύς is the mystical name of Christ, because he descended alive into the depths of this mortal life-into the abyss of waters" *(De Civit. Dei).* See Didron, *Christian Iconography,* 1, 344 sq.; Munter, *Sinnbilder d. alt Christen* I (Alt. 1825); Augusti, *Archaöl.* 1, 121 sq.; Pearson, *On the Creed;* Riddle, *Christ. Antiquit.* p. 184. *SEE ICONGRAPHY*.

Ico'nium

(Ἰκόνιον, of unknown derivation), a town, formerly the capital of Lycaonia (according to Ptol. 5, 6,16; but Phrygia according to Strabo, 12, 568; Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 2, 19; Pliny, 5, 25; and even Pisidia according to Ammian. Marcel. 14, 2), as it is now, by the name of *Koniyeh,* of Karamania, in Asia Minor. It is situated in N. lat. 37° 51, E. long. 320 40', about 120 miles inland from the Mediterranean. It was on the great line of communication between Ephesus and the western coast of the peninsula on one side, and Tarsus, Antioch, and the Euphrates on the other. We see this indicated by the narrative of Xenophon (i.e.) and the letters of Cicero *(ad Famz. 3,* 8; 5, 20; 15:4). When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important roads intersected one another at this point, as

may be seen from the map in Leake's *Asia Minor*. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (<44130>Acts 13:50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (14:1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (ibid.). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (<44143>Acts 14:3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia (<44146>Acts 14:6). Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (<44149>Acts 14:19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and encouraging the Church which he had founded there (<44142>Acts 14:21, 22). A.D. 47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in <550311>2 Timothy 3:11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the Syrian Antioch, in company with Silas (<44150>Acts 15:40), on his second missionary circuit; and, traveling through Cilicia (<44154>Acts 15:41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (<44160>Acts 16:1, 2). Though apparently a native of Lystra, Timothy was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (<44162>Acts 16:2); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (<44163>Acts 16:3) and ordination (<540118>1 Timothy 1:18; 4:14; 6:12: <550106>2 Timothy 1:6) took place there. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party traveled to the northwest; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited by the apostle again in the early part of his third circuit (<44823>Acts 18:23). From its position it could not fail to be an important center of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be entirely passed by. The "Acta Pauli et Theclae" are given in full by Grabe *(Spicil.* vol. 1), and by Jones *(On the Canon*, 2, 353-411); and in brief by Conybeare and Towsons *(St. Paul*, 1, 197). The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish (Hierocles, p. 675) until, by the persecutions of the Saracens, and afterwards of the

Seljukians, who made it one of their sultanies, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

Picture for Ico'nium

Koniyeh is situated at the foot of Mount Taurus (Mannert, 6:1, p. 195 sq.), upon the border of the lake Trogitis, in a fertile plain, rich in valuable productions, particularly apricots, wine, cotton, flax, and grain. The circumference of the town is between two and three miles, and beyond these are suburbs not much less populous than the town itself, which has in all about 30,000 inhabitants, but according to others 80,000. The walls, strong and lofty, and flanked with square towers, which, at the gates, are placed close together, were built by the Seljukian sultans of iconium, who seem to have taken considerable pains to exhibit the Greek inscriptions, and the remains of architecture and sculpture belonging to the ancient Iconium, which they made use of in building the walls. The town, suburbs, and gardens are plentifully supplied with water from streams which flow from some hills to the westward, and which, to the north-east, join the lake, which varies in size with the season of the year. In the town carpets are manufactured and blue and yellow leathers are tanned and dried. Cotton, wool, hides, and a few of the other raw productions which enrich the superior industry and skill of the manufacturers of Europe, are sent to Smyrna by caravans. The most remarkable building in Koniyeh is the tomb of a priest highly revered throughout Turkey, called Hazrit Mevlana, the founder of the Mevlevt Dervishes. The city, like all those renowned for superior sanctity, abounds with dervishes, who meet the passenger at every turning of the streets, and demand paras with the greatest clamor and insolence. The bazaars and houses have little to recommend them to notice. (Kinneir's *Travels in Asia Minor;* Leake's *Geography of Asia Minor;* Arundell's *Tour in Asia Minor;* Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1, 113, 149; Hassel, *EL'rdbeschlr. Asiens,* 2, 197; Rosenmuller, *Bib. Geog.* 1, 1, p. 201, 207; Hamilton's *Researches in Asia Minor,* 2, 205 sq.; etc. For the early and Grecian history of this place, and the fanciful etymologies of the name, see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s.v.)

Iconoclasm, or Image-breaking

*(*εἰκών*, image;* κλάζειν*, to break),* is a name for the struggle in the Christian Church in the Middle Ages., which, as its name indicates, had for its object the destruction of all images used for worship in the churches. From the age of Constantine the reverence for pictures and images constantly increased, as they were supposed to possess a certain sanctity or miraculous power; and at so early an age as that of Augustine we hear him confess that many had fallen into the superstition of adoring pictures rather than the Deity. But the Iconoclastic controversy assumed a more serious aspect in the 8th century, when the emperor Leo III, the Isaurian (717741), who, previous to his accession to the throne, had associated much with Jews and Mohammedans, on talking the side of the Iconoclasts in the tenth year of his reign, issued an edict against the use of images in churches. He was influenced, no doubt, by a desire to draw into the Christian Church the Mohammedans and Jews, who, aside from their simple theistic faith, were debarred from joining the Christians by an aversion to the use of images. But the people-who felt that "it swept away from their churches objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration" rose up in masses against the edict, and violent disturbances, especially at Constantinople, where the patriarch himself sided with them, were of daily occurrence. The superior power of the government, however, soon made itself felt, the pictures were destroyed, the insurrectionists slain or banished, and order restored, after a fearful massacre. Yet, notwithstanding all the penalties which, by order of Leo, were inflicted on the opponents of Iconoclasm, champions in favor of the use of images in churches rose up. Among them was the great John of Damascus (q.v.), who, after adducing the ordinary arguments for images with greater elegance and ingenuity than any other writer of his day, went forth in bitter invectives against the Iconoclasts as enemies of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. "Pictures are standing memorials of triumph over the devil; whosoever destroys them is a friend *of* the devil, a Manichean, and a Docetist." The pope himself, Gregory III, put all the opposers of images under ban; but, despite this and other efforts on his part, Leo's successor, Constantinus Copronymus, went even further than Leo. Having obtained the condemnation of image worship in the Synod of Constantinople in A.D. 754, he enforced it against the clergy and the most noted of the monks. Many monks, who, together with the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were in favor of

the images, and were unwilling to subscribe to the decrees of the council, were cruelly persecuted. The emperor Leo IV also enforced this law; but his widow, Irene, one of the basest of women, used the tendency of the people in favor of image worship to enable her to ascend the throne. With the aid of the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, Terasios, she called a synod at Nicaea in 787, wherein the adoration of images by prostration, kissing, and incensing was reestablished. Matters remained in this state during the reigns of the emperors Nicephorus and Michael (802-813), although there still were Iconoclasts to be found. But as, during the strife, the adoration of images had passed into the grossest idolatry, Leo V (813-821) caused it to be abolished by the Synod of Constantinople, and punished those who persisted in it (mostly monks, with Theodoros Studita at their head). Michael II (821-824), who overthrew Leo, tolerated the worship of images without thereby satisfying the image worshippers; but Theophilus, his son (829-842), on his sole accession to the government, renewed all the edicts against them. After his death, his widow restored image-worship in 842, and instituted the festival of the Orthodoxy, which is yet kept by the Greek Church in remembrance of this restoration (see Buddaeus, De *festo orthodoxo,* Jena, 1726). The Greek Christians have since retained images in their churches, but without worshipping them. The Latins also decided that the images should be retained, but not worshipped; while the French Church declared most positively against image-worship in the Synod of Gentiliacum in 767, and in 790 Charlemagne presented to the Council of Nicaea a memorial, *De inmpio imne qunzcum cultu (Libri Carolini).* Thereupon images were allowed to be retained for purposes of education only. At the Synod of Frankfort in 794, Charlemagne, with the assent of the English Church, caused image-worship to be condemned. After the 9th century the popes were gradually more inclined towards image-worship, and it soon became general throughout the West. The Roman Catholic Church continued to favor the practice, an-d the Council of Trent decided formally in its twenty-fifth session that the images of Christ, of the holy Virgin, and of other saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent; so that the people, by kissing the images, bowing to them, etc., pray to Christ and honor the saints whom the images represent. This image-worship led to pilgrimages to the shrines of saints great in repute for their power. The Greek Church admits only the painted and raised images, not carved figures, like the Church of Rome. All the

Christian sects in the East are given to image-worship with the exception of the Nestorians, the Christians of St. Thomas, and the Russian Roskolniki. The German Reformers, although opposing image-worship, held somewhat different opinions on the subject: thus Luther tolerated images as an ornament, and also as edifying mementoes, and condemned the destruction of the images and the altars at Wittenberg in 1522. The Swiss Reformers opposed images in any shape or for any purpose, and had them taken out of all the churches-often with great violence, as in the Netherlands. They are not even now tolerated in the Reformed Church, nor in the particular denominations that have sprung from it. Mohammedanism proscribes image-worship; it even forbids the reproduction of the image of any living being, though it be not for the purpose of worshipping it. See Wessenberg, *Die christlichen Bilder, ein Beforderungs mittel d. christ. Sinnes* (Constanz, 1827, 2 vols.); Schlosser, *Gesch. der Bilderstürmenden Kaiser* (Frankf. ad. M. 1812); Marx, *Der Bilderstreit der Byzantinischen Kaiser* (Trier, 1839); *Ketzer Lex.* 2, 287; Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of Romans Emp.* 5, 10 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity,* 2, 293 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon,* s.v. Bilder; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book 8, ch. 8; Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Phila. 1868), 1, 860 sq. Ranke, *History of the Popes,* 1, 19-25. *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*. (J. H.W.)

Iconoclasts

SEE ICONOCLASM.

Iconodulists

SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Iconography

*(*εἰκών*, image,* and γράφω*, I describe),* the science of so-called "Christian art" in the Middle Ages. It includes, therefore, the history and description of images, pictures, mosaics, gems, emblems, etc. There exist in our day many exquisite specimens of Christian iconography, which are preserved in libraries and museums, and are invaluable to us in determining the exact history of this "Christian art." The character of the illustrations, the form of the letters, suffice to determine the age and country where the work was produced. Thus a comparison of MSS. of Eastern and Western Europe brings before us the several stages which mark the growth of Christian iconography. *SEE ILLUMINATION, ART OF*. The most important modem

work on the subject is Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie Chretienne* (Paris, 1845, 8vo); trans. into English, *Christian Iconography*, vol. 1 (London, 1851, 12mo). Older works are, Paleotti, *De Imag. sacr. et profanis* (Ingolst. 1594, 4to); Molanus, *De Pict. et Imagg. Sacris* (Louv. 1570); *De Historia Sacr. Imagg. et Picturarum* (1619, 12mo); Miinter, *Sinnbilder der Alten Christen* (Altona, 1825, 2 vols. 4to); Wessenberg, *Die Christl Bilder* (Constance, 1827). *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*. (J. H.W.)

Iconolatry

*(*εἰκών, *image,* and λατρεία, *worship),* the worship or adoration of images. Hence image-worshippers are called *Iconolatrce,* or Iconolaters. *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*.

Iconomachy

SEE ICONOCLASM. Iconostasis *(*εἰκονόστασις*)* is that part of an Eastern church which corresponds to the *altar-rails in* English churches. It is often mistaken for the roodscreen (q.v.), which in its general arrangement it resembles, only (the mysteries being absolutely to be veiled from the eyes of the people) the panels are solid to the top. The roodscreen separates nave and choir; the iconostasis, however, separates choir and bema. "It has three doors; that it the center conducting directly to the *bema;* that to the right to the *diaconicon;* that of the left to the *prothesis,* through which, of course, the great entrance is made. On the right of the central door, on entering, is the icon of our Lord; on the left, that of the mother of God; the others are arranged according to the taste or devotion of the architect or founder." The earliest iconostasis is believed to be the one remaining in the Arian crypt-church of Tepekerman, in the Crimea, which probably dates from about A.D. 350. — Neale, *Hist. Eastern Church,* Introd. 1, 191 sq.

Ida

first abbess of the convent of Argensoles, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. She was a remarkable woman, very learned, and acknowledged to have disputed on the most intricate theological questions with great ability. She died in 1226. Her life was written by a monk of Citeaux, but remains in MS. form. — *Histoire Litt. de la France, 18,* 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26,* 174.

Id'alah

(Heb. *Yidalah',* hl;a}dyæ, probably *exalted;* Sept. Ἰαδηλά*),* a city near the western border of Zebulon, mentioned between Shimron and Bethlehem (Joshua 19:15). According to Schwarz, it is called *Chirii* in the Talmud, and is identical with the village *Kelluh al. Chire,* six English miles southwest of Shimron or Semunie *(Palestine,* p. 172). He doubtless refers to the niace marked on Robinson's map as *Kulat el-Kireh,* in the valley of the Kishon, south-west of Semunieh or imonias; a position not improbable. especially if marked by the ruins on the north side of the river. Dr. Robinson, who afterwards visited it, calls it "*Jeida,* a miserable village with no traces of antiquity" *(Later Researches,* p. 113); but Van de Velde shows that it actually has many marks, although now much obliterated, of being an off site *(Memoir,* p. 322).

Idacius or Idathius

surnamed CLARUS, a Spanish prelate, was born in the first half of the 4th century. After his accession to the bishopric of Emerida he distinguished himself by the intemperate zeal with which, together with Ithacius (q.v.), bishop of Ossonoba, he opposed the heresy of Priscillian (q.v.). He wrote a refutation of the latter's doctrine under the title *Apologeticus,* which is now lost. In 388, after the death of the emperor Maximus, who had persecuted the Priscillianists, Idacius resigned his bishopric. Having subsequently attempted to regain it, he was exiled, and died about the year 392. According to Sulpitius Severus, Idacius's conduct was less severely judged by his contemporaries than that of Ithacius. The writings ascribed to him are given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum,* vol. 5. See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra;* Isidore of Seville, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis;* Antonio, *Bibl. Hispana vetus,* 1, 172; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé, 29:*775; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 111 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 214 sq. *SEE PRISCILLIANISTS.*

Idacius of Lamego

(Lamecenzsis), who became bishop of Gallicia in 427, distinguished himself by his opposition to the Manichaeans, whom he sought to drive from Spain. He is supposed to have died is 469. He is the author of a history, a continuation of the Chronicles of St. Hieronymus, beginning with the year 379 and ending with 468. The assertion that this work originated with

Pelagius, bishop of Osiedo, in the 12th century, is by no means satisfactorily proved. It has often been printed and annotated, as by Sirmond, *Opp.* vol. 2; Bouquet, *Script. Franc.* vol. 1; and best by Florez Espann. *Sagradca, 4,* 345 sq. He is also supposed to be the author of *Fasti consulares. — Aschbach, Kirch. — Lex. 3,* 402.

Id'bash

(Heb. *Yidbash',* vB;d]y:, *prob. honeyed;* Sept. Ἰγαβής v.r. Ἰεβδάς, Vulg. *Jedebos),* a descendant of Judah, who, with his two brothers and a sister *(the Tselelponite),* are said (1 Chronicles 4:3, according to the Auth. Vers.) to be "of the father of Etam," probably meaning of the lineage of the founder of that place, or perhaps they were themselves its settlers. B.C. cir. 1612. *SEE JEZREEL* 2.

Id'do

the name of several men in the Old Testament, of different forms in the Hebrew.

1. *Iddo'* (/D[;, *timely,* or born to a *festival;* Sept. Αδδί, *Vulg. Addo),* a Levite, son of Joah and father of Zerah (1 Chronicles 6:21); called more accurately perhaps ANDAIA. in Ver. 41.

2. *Yiddo'* (/Dy:d, *lovely;* Sept. Ἰαδδαΐ, Vulg. *Jaddo),* son of Zechariah, and David's viceroy of the half tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chronicles 27:21). B.C. 1014.

3. *Iddo'* (a/D[;, a prolonged form of No. 1; Sept. Αδδώ,Vulg. *Addo),* the father of Ahinadab, which latter was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Mahanaim (1 Kings 4:14). B.C. cir. 995.

4. *Iddo'* (/D[;, same as first name, 2 Chronicles 12:15; 13:22; Sept. Ἀδδώ, Vulg. *Addo)* or *Yedo' (*/D[y, 2 Chronicles 9:29, margin, but *Yedi',* /D[y, text; both less accurate forms for the last name; Sept. has Ἰωήλ, Vulg. *Addo,* A. Vers. "Iddo"), a prophet of Judah, who wrote the history of Rehoboam and Abijah; or rather, perhaps, who, in conjunction with Seraiah, kept the public rolls during their reigns (2 Chronicles 12:15); and who in that capacity recorded certain predictions against Jeroboam (2 Chronicles 9:29; although Bertheau, ad loc., and Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.,* 3rd ed., i, 216, think this a different person). B.C. post 953. It

seems from 2 Chronicles 13:22 that he named his book vr;dIm;æ *Midradh*, or "Exposition." Josephus *(Ant. 8:*9, 1) states that this Iddo (Ἰαδών) was the prophet who was sent to Jeroboam at Bethel, and consequently the same that was slain by a lion for disobedience to his instructions (1 Kings 13) and many commentators have followed this statement Kitto. He is also identified with Oded (see Jerome on 2 Chronicles 15:1).

5. *Iddo'* (/D[;æ same name as last, Zechariah 1:1, elsewhere a/D[;æ id.; but ayDi[;æ *Iddi'*, apparently by error, in Nehemiah 12:16; Sept. Ἀδδώ, but Ἀδαΐας in Nehemiah 12:4, and Ἀδαδαΐ in Nehemiah 12:16; Vulg. *Addo*, but *Adaja* in Nehemiah 12:16), the father of Barachiah and grandfather of the prophet Zechariah (Zechariah 1:1, 7; comp. Ezra 5:1; 6:14; Nehemiah 12:16). He was one of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Nehemiah 12:4). B.C. 536.

6. *Iddo'* (/Da;æ *Hanishap;* Sept. omits, Vulg. *Eddo)*, chief of the Jews of the Captivity established at Casiphia, a place of which it is difficult to determine the position. It was to him that Ezra sent a requisition for Levites and Nethinim, none of whom had yet joined his caravan. Thirty-eight Levites and 250 Nethinim responded to his call (Ezra 8:17-20). B.C. 459. It would seem from this that Iddo was a chief person of the Nethinim, descended from those Gibeonites who were charged with the servile labors of the tabernacle and Temple. This is one of several circumstances which indicate that the Jews, in their several colonies under the Exile, were still ruled by the heads of their nations and allowed the free exercise of their worship.

7. *SEE JADAN*. Idealism (from *idea)* is a term given to several systems of philosophy, and therefore varying in its signification according to the meaning which they severally attach to the word *idea.* Until the 17th century, when Descartes came forward with his *Discourse on Method* (1637), it had the signification which Plato gave to it, and was understood to refer to the Platonic doctrine of eternal forms (ἰδέαι) existing in the divine mind, according to which the world and all sensible things were framed. "Plato agreed with the rest of the ancient philosophers in this-that all things consist of matter and form, and that the matter of which all things were made existed from eternity without form; but he likewise believed that there are eternal forms of all possible things which exist without

matter, and to those eternal and immaterial forms he gave the name of ideas. In the Platonic sense, then, *ideas* were the patterns according to which the deity fashioned the phenomenal or ectypal world" (Reid, *Intellectual Powers.* Ess. 1, chap. 2). The word was used in this sense not only in philosophy, but also in literature, down to the 17th century, as in Spenser, Shakspeare, Hooker, and Milton. Thus Milton in his *Paradise Lost:*

"God saw his works were good,
***Answering his fair* idea."**

Sir William Hamilton, who informs us that the change of signification of *idea* was first introduced by David Buchanan in 1636, one year earlier than Descartes, says in his *Discussions,* p. 70: "The fortune of this word is curious. Employed by Plato to express the real forms of the intelligible world, in lofty contrast with the unreal images of the sensible, it was lowered by Descartes, who extended it to the objects of our consciousness in general. When, after Gassendi, the school of Condillac had analyzed our highest faculties into our lowest, the *idea* was still more deeply degraded from its high original. Like a fallen angel, it was relegated from the sphere of divine intelligence to the atmosphere of human sense, till at last *ideologie* (more correctly *idealogie), a* word which could only *properly* suggest an a *priori* scheme, deducing our knowledge from the intellect, has in France become the name peculiarly distinctive of that philosophy of mind which exclusively derives our knowledge from the senses." Instead of employing the terms *image, species, phantasm,* etc., with reference to the mental representation of external things, as had previously been done, Descartes adopted the word *idea.* In this use of the word he was followed by other philosophers, as Leibnitz and Locke, who desired the word to stand for "whatever is the object of the understanding when a man thinks." Jence the mental impression that we are supposed to have when thinking of the sun. without seeing the actual object, is called our idea of the sun. The idea is thus in contrast with the sensation, or the feeling that we have when the senses are engaged directly or immediately upon the thing itself. The sensation is the result of the pressure of the object, and declares an external reality; the impression persisting after the thing has gone, and recoverable by mental causes without the original, is the idea. Although the word in this application may be so guarded as to lead to no bad consequences, Reid *(Intellectual Powers* Ess. 1, chap. 1) most vehemently protested against its use in such a sense, holding that it gave countenance to the setting up of a

new and fictitious element in the operations of the mind.. But this raises the great question of metaphysics, namely, the exact nature of our knowledge of an external world. Bishop Berkeley (q.v.), however, must be regarded as the true representative of modern idealism. He held that “the qualities of supposed objects cannot be perceived distinct from the mind that perceives them; and these qualities, it will be allowed, are all that we can know of such objects. If, therefore, there were external bodies, it is impossible we should ever know it; and if there were not, we should have exactly the same reason for believing there were as we now have. All, therefore, which really exists is spirit, or ‘the thinking principle’ ourselves, our fellow-men, and God. What we call ideas are presented to us by God in a certain order of succession, which order of successive presentation is what we mean by the laws of nature.” This mode of speculation of bishop Berkeley, which he defended with so much acuteness, and which Lewis *(Hist. of Philippians* 2, 283) now goes forth to defend, claiming that the bishop’s critics misunderstood him, he held to be the only possible true view of our nature and the government of God. But there is no question that, whatever benefits it may have bestowed upon the bishop and his immediate disciples, it has been found, practically, to lead to *skepticism.* “By taking away the grounds of a belief which is both natural and universal, and which cannot, at first, be even doubted without a severe exercise of thought, it shook men’s faith in all those primary truths which are at once the basis of their knowledge and the guides of their conduct. It *seemed to* throw distrust on the evidence of the senses, as it really invalidated the spontaneous conclusions which every man inevitably forms from that evidence.” This theory is conclusively proved by the conduct of Hume; for, if a main pillar of the edifice could so easily be shaken, what was there to hinder from throwing down the whole fabric? Beginning where Berkeley began, Hume proceeded much farther, and left unassailed hardly one article of human faith. He denied the reality not only of the object perceived, but of the mind perceiving. He reduced all thinking existence to a succession of rapidly fleeting ideas, each one being known only at the instant of its manifestation to consciousness, and then fading away, leaving no surely recognizable trace of itself on the memory, and affording no ground for an anticipation of the future. We do not even know, he maintains, that any one thing depends upon another in the relation of an effect to its cause. We know no true cause whatever, and our only idea of power is a fiction and a blunder. The conclusion of the whole matter, according to his philosophy, is, not the mere negation of this or that positive belief, but universal distrust of the

human faculties, considered as means for the acquisition of truth. They contradict each other, and leave nothing certain except that nothing can be known. *SEE HUME*; *SEE REID*. The German philosophers Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, who are often classed among the idealistic school, used the word *idea* in the Platonic or transcendental sense. Hegel, on the other hand, modified the use of the word to such an extent that his idealism does not only deserve to be called *absolute-idealism,* but much more properly pantheistic, no less than the doctrine of the Eleatics anciently, or of Spinoza in modern times. It is thus apparent, from the looseness of the application of the word *idea,* and the danger of its not conveying a *definite* signification, that we need a general word in the English language which may more accurately express the contrast to sensation or to actuality. But, as no better has yet been found, it is difficult to avoid the use of *ideality,* "being what is common to memory and to imagination, and expressing the mind as not under the present impression of real objects, but as, by its own tenacity and associating powers, having those objects to all practical ends before its view. Thus all our sensations, whether of sight, hearing, touch, taste, or smell, and all the feelings that we have in the exercise of our moving energies, become transformed into ideas when, without the real presence of the original agency, we can deal with them in the way of pursuit or avoidance, or can discriminate and compare them, nearly as if in their first condition as sensation." Sir W. Hamilton, in his *Lectures on Logic* (1, 126), has endeavored to avoid employing the word, but other writers on mental philosophy have freely adopted it in the above acceptation. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 510 sq.; Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 222 sq.; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art,* ii, 189; Morell, *History of Philos.* p. 55 sq.; Lewis, *Hist. of Philos.* (enlarged ed.), see Index; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought,* p. 422; M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind,* p. 317 sq.; Morell's Tennemann, *Hist. of Philos.* see Index; *N. A. Rev.* No. 76, p. 60 sq.; *Jour. Sac. Lit. 20,* 298 sq. *SEE NIHILISM*; *SEE REALISM*. (J. H.W.)

Idiotae

(ἰδιῶται, *private men),* a term applied by some early writers to laymen in distinction from ministers *(*κλῆροι*).* Chrysostom *(Homil.* 35) and Theodoret *(Comm.* in 1 Corinthians) employ the word in this signification, and show that the apostle Paul (1 Corinthians 14:16) thus designates a private person, whether learned or unlearned. So also Origen, *Contra Cels. 7,* p. 334. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 1, ch. 5, § 6. *SEE LAITY*.

Idiotes

(Gr. ἰδιότης) is a term sometimes used in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead to designate the *properly (Lat. proprietas)* of each divine person. This must, however, not be confounded with the divine *attributes* (eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence, etc.), for they are inherent in the divine *essence*, and are the common possession of all the divine hypostases, while the idiotes, on the other hand, is a peculiarity of the *hypostasis*, and therefore cannot be communicated or transferred from one to another. — Schaff. *Ch. Hist. 3*, 679. *SEE TRINITY*.

Idle

(hY;maæ; *slothful*, also *deceitful;* hp;r; to *be weak*, in Niph. to *be lazy*, <021518>Exodus 5:8, 17; tWlx][i *indolence*, <202727>Proverbs 31:27; tWlp]væ *remissness*, <211018>Ecclesiastes 10:18; fqiv; to *rest*, <261649>Ezekiel 16:49; ἀργός, *not working*, literally, <402003>Matthew 20:3, 6; <540513>1 Timothy 5:13; *unfruitful*, <610108>2 Peter 1:8; *stupid*, <560112>Titus 1:12; morally, <401236>Matthew 12:36; λῆρος, an "*idle tale*," <422411>Luke 24:11). Of the foregoing instances of the use of this word, the only one requiring special consideration is <401236>Matthew 12:36, "I say unto you. that *every idle word* that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment," where there has been considerable difference of opinion as to the interpretation of ῥῆμα ἀργόν, translated "idle word." To the ordinary explanation, which makes the phrase here equivalent to vain, and hence *wicked* language, J. A. H. Tittman, in an extended criticism *(On the principal Causes of Forced Interpret. of the N.T.*, printed in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* for 1831, p. 481-484), objects that it violates the native meaning of the word, which rather denotes an empty, inconsiderate, and hence insincere conversation or statement, appealing to the context which is aimed at the hypocritical Pharisees. On the other hand, the usual interpretation is supported by the actual occurrence of πονηρόν, *wicked*, in the parallel verse 35, and by the usage of other Greek writers, e.g., Symmachus in <031907>Leviticus 19:7, for LwGPæ, where Sept. ἄδυτον; Xenoph. *Mem.* 1,2,57; Cicero, *de Fat.* 12. (See Kuinol, ad loc.) The term is probably intended to be of wide signification, so as to include both these senses, namely, *levity* and *calumny*, as being both species of untruth and heedlessly uttered, yet productive of mischief.

aversion from labor. The idle man is, in every view, both foolish and criminal. He lives not to God. Idleness was not made for man, nor man for idleness. A small measure of reflection might convince every one that for some useful purpose he was sent into the world. Man is placed at the head of all things here below. He is furnished with a great preparation of faculties and powers. He is enlightened by reason with many important discoveries; even taught by revelation to consider himself as ransomed by the death of Christ from misery, and intended to rise to a still higher rank in the universe of God. In such a situation, thus distinguished, thus favored, and assisted by his Creator does he answer the end of his being if he aim at no improvement, if he pursue no useful design, if he live for no other purpose than to indulge in sloth, to consume the fruits of the earth, and spend his days in a dream of vanity? Existence is a sacred trust, and he who thus misemploys and squanders it away is treacherous to its author. Look around, and you will behold the whole universe full of active powers. Action is, so to speak, the genius of nature. By motion and exertion the system of being is preserved in vigor. By its different parts always acting in subordination to each other, the perfection of the whole is carried on. The heavenly bodies perpetually revolve. Day and night incessantly repeat their appointed course. Continual operations are performing oil the earth and in the waters. Nothing stands still. All is alive and stirring throughout the universe. In the midst of this animated and busy scene, is man alone to remain idle in his place? Belongs it to him to be the sole inactive and slothful being in the creation, when in so many ways he might improve his own nature, might advance the glory of the God who made him, and contribute his part to the general good? The idle live not to the world and their fellow-creatures anymore than to God. If any man had a title to stand alone, and to be independent of his fellows, he might consider himself as at liberty to indulge in solitary ease and sloth, without being responsible to others for the manner in which he chooses to live. But there is no such person in the world. We are connected with each other by various relations, which create a chain of mutual dependence that reaches from the highest to the lowest station in society. Without a perpetual circulation of active duties and offices, which all are required to perform in their turn, the order and happiness of the world could not be maintained. Superiors are no more independent of their inferiors than these inferiors of them. Each have demands and claims upon the other; and he who, in any situation of life,

refuses to act his part, and to contribute his share to the general stock of felicity, deserves to be proscribed from society as an unworthy member. “If any man will not work,” says Paul (2 Thessalonians 3:10), “neither shall he eat.” If he will do nothing to advance the purposes of society, he has no right to enjoy its benefits.

The idle man lives not to himself with any more advantage than he lives to the world. Though he imagines that he leaves to others the drudgery of life, and betakes himself to enjoyment and ease, yet he enjoys no true pleasure. He shuts the door against improvement of every kind, whether of mind, body, or fortune. Sloth enfeebles equally the bodily and the mental powers. His character falls into contempt. His fortune is consumed. Disorder, confusion, and embarrassment mark his whole situation. Idleness is the inlet to licentiousness, vice, and immorality. It destroys the principles of religion, and opens a door to sin and wickedness. Every man who recollects his conduct must know that his hours of idleness always proved the hours most dangerous to virtue. It was then that criminal desires arose guilty passions were suggested, and designs were formed, which, in their issue, disquiet and embitter his whole life. Habitual idleness, by a silent and secret progress, undermines every virtue in the soul. More violent passions run their course and terminate. They are like rapid torrents, which foam, and swell, and bear down everything before them; but, after having overflowed their banks, their impetuosity subsides, and they return, by degrees, into their natural channel. Sloth resembles the slowly flowing putrid stream, which stagnates in the marsh, produces venomous animals and poisonous plants, and infects with pestilential vapors the whole surrounding country. Having once tainted the soul, it leaves no part of it sound, and, at the same time, it gives not to conscience those alarms which the eruptions of bolder and fiercer emotions often occasion, Nothing is so great an enemy to the lively and spirited enjoyment of life as a relaxed and indolent habit of mind. He who knows not what it is to labor, knows not what it is to enjoy. The happiness of human life depends on the regular prosecution of some laudable purpose or object, which keeps awake and enlivens all our powers. Rest is agreeable, but it is only from preceding labors that rest acquires its true relish. When the mind is suffered to remain in continued inaction, all its powers decay: it soon languishes and sickens; and the pleasures which it proposed to obtain from rest terminate in tediousness and insipidity. See Blair, *Sermons,* Sermon 39; Warner, *System*

of Divinity and Morality, 3, 151; Logan, *Sermons,* Sermon 4; Robinson, *Theological Dictionary,* s.v.

Idol

properly an outward object adored as divine, or as the symbol of deity. *SEE IDOLATRY*.

I. *Classification of Scriptural terms having physical reference to such objects. — As* a large number of different Hebrew words have been rendered in the A.V. either by idol or image, and that by no means uniformly (besides one or more in Greek more uniformly translated), it will be of some advantage to attempt to discriminate between them, and assign, as nearly as the two languages will allow, the English equivalents for each. *SEE IMAGE*.

(I.) Abstract terms, which, with a deep moral significance, express the degradation associated with idolatry, and stand out as a protest of the language against its enormities.

(1.) General terms of *doubtful* signification. —

1. לִילִא; *elil',* is thought by some to have a sense akin to that of רָקְשׁ, *she'ker,* "falsehood," with which it stands in parallelism in <18D104>Job 13:4, and would therefore much resemble *aven,* as applied to an idol. It is generally derived from the unused root לָלָא; to *be empty* or vain. Delitzsch (on <38218>Habakkuk 2:18) derives it from the negative particle לַא; *al,* "die Nichtigen;" but according to Furst *(Handw.* s.v.) it is a diminutive of לֵא, "god," the additional syllable indicating the greatest contempt. In this case the signification above mentioned is a subsidiary one. The same authority asserts that the word denotes a small image of the god, which was consulted as an oracle among the Egyptians and Phoenicians (<23B03>Isaiah 19:3; <24414>Jeremiah 14:14). It is certainly used of the idols of Noph or Memphis (<26D03>Ezekiel 30:13). In strong contrast with Jehovah, it appears in <19D05>Psalm 90:5; 97:7, the contrast probably being heightened by the resemblance between *elilim* and *elohim.* A somewhat similar play upon words is observable in <38218>Habakkuk 2:18, לֵא־לִי לִא; *elilim illemim,* A.V. "dumb idols." See EL.

2. µyl'WGa; *gill'ulim',* also a term of contempt, of uncertain origin (<260613>Ezekiel 30:13), but probably derived from llG; to *roll,* as *dung,* hence *refuse.* The Rabbinical authorities, referring to such passages as <260402>Ezekiel 4:2; <360117>Zephaniah 1:17, have favored the interpretation given in the margin of the A.V. to <052917>Deuteronomy 29:17, "dungy gods" (Vulg. "sordes," "sordes idolorum," <111512>1 Kings 15:12). Jahn, connecting it with llG; *galal,* "to roll," applies it to the stocks of trees of which idols were made, and in mockery called *gilluim,* "rolling things" *(a volvendo,* he says, though it is difficult to see the point of his remark). Gesenius, repudiating the derivation from the Arabic *jalla,* "to be great, illustrious," gives his preference to the rendering "stones, stone gods," thus deriving it from lG; *gal,* "a heap of stones;" and in this he is followed by First, who translates *gillil* by the German "Steinhaufe." The expression is applied, principally in Ezekiel, to false gods and their symbols (<052917>Deuteronomy 29:17; <260810>Ezekiel 8:10, etc.). It stands side by side with other contemptuous terms in <261636>Ezekiel 16:36; 20:8, as, for example, /qv, *shekets,* "filth," "abomination" (<260810>Ezekiel 8:10), and cognate terms. *SEE DUNG.* May not µyl'WGa; mean *scarabaei,* the commonest of Egyptian idols? The sense of dung is appropriate to the dung-beetle; that of rolling is doubtful, for, if the meaning of the verb be retained, we should, in this form, rather expect a passive sense, "a thing rolled;" but it may be observed that these grammatical rules of the sense of derivatives are not always to be strictly insisted on, for Sidon, ^/dyxa; though held to signify "the place of fishing," is, in the list of the Noachians, the name of a man, "the fisherman," Ἁλιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. That a specially-applicable word is used may perhaps be conjectured from the occurrence of µyliyla, which, if meaning little gods, would aptly describe the pigmy PTEH-SEKER-HESAR, Ptah-Sokari-Osiris, of Memphis. Ezekiel uses the term µylwlg of the idols of Egypt which the Israelites were commanded to put away at or about the time of the Exodus, but did not, and seem to have carried into the Desert, for the same word is used, unqualified by the mention of any country, of those worshipped by them in the Desert (<122007>Exodus 20:7, 8, 16,18, 24); it is, however, apparently employed also for all the idols worshipped in Canaan by the Israelites (ver. 31; 23:37). Scarabaei were so abundant among the Egyptians and Phoenicians that there is no reason why they may not have been employed also in the worship of the Canaanitish false gods;

but it cannot be safely supposed, without further evidence, that the idols of Canaan were virtually termed scarabtei. *SEE BEETLE*.

(2.) General terms of *known* signification. —

3. ˆwa; *a'ven*, rendered elsewhere "nought," "vanity," "iniquity," "wickedness," "sorrow," etc., and only once "idol" (<236603>Isaiah 66:3). The primary idea of the root seems to be *emptiness*, nothingness, as of breath or vapor; and, by a natural transition, in a moral sense, wickedness in its active form of mischief; and then, as the result, sorrow and trouble. Hence *aven* denotes a vain, false, wicked thing, and expresses at once the essential nature 3f idols, and the consequences of their worship. The character of the word may be learnt from its associates. It stands in parallelism with spa, *e'phes* (<234129>Isaiah 41:29), which, after undergoing various modifications, comes at length to signify "nothing;" with lbh, *he'bel*, "breath" or "vapor," itself applied as a term of contempt to the objects of idolatrous reverence (<053221>Deuteronomy 32:21; <111613>1 Kings 16:13; <193106>Psalm 31:6; <240819>Jeremiah 8:19; 10:8); with awv; *shav*, "nothingness, "vanity;" and with rqv, *she'ker*, "falsehood" (<381002>Zechariah 10:2): all indicating the utter worthlessness of the idols to whom homage was paid, and the false and delusive nature of their worship. It is employed in an abstract sense, to denote idolatry in general, in <091523>1 Samuel 15:23. There is much significance in the change of name from Bethel to Beth-aven, the great centre of idolatry in Israel (<280415>Hosea 4:15). *SEE BETHAVEN*.

4. /WQvs; *shik-k-ts'*, "filth," "impurity," especially applied, like the cognate /qv, *she'kets*, to that which produced ceremonial uncleanness (<263723>Ezekiel 37:23; <340306>Nahum 3:6), such as food offered in sacrifice to idols (<381907>Zechariah 9:7; comp. <441520>Acts 15:20, 29). As referring to the idols themselves, it primarily denotes the obscene rites with which their worship was associated, and hence, by metonymy, is applied both to the objects of worship and also to their worshippers, who partook of the impurity, and thus "became loathsome like their love," the foul Baal-Peor (<280910>Hosea 9:10). *SEE ABOMINATION*.

5. In the same connection must be noticed, though not actually rendered "image" or 'idol," tvB, *bo'sheth*, "shame," or "shameful thing" (A.V. <241113>Jeremiah 11:13; <280910>Hosea 9:10), applied to Baal or Baal-Peor, as characterizing the obscenity of his worship. *SEE BAAL-PEOR*.

6. hmyaeי *eynnzah'*, "horror" or "terror," and hence an object of horror or terror (Jeremiah 1, 38), in reference either to the hideousness of the idols or to the gross character of their worship. In this respect it is closely connected with —

7. tx,lpmi *miphle'tseth*, a "fright," "horror," applied to the idol of Maachah, probably of wood, which Asa cut down and burned (<11153>1 Kings 15:13'; <14516>2 Chronicles 15:16), and which was unquestionably the-Phallus, the symbol of the productive power of nature (Movers, *Phon.* 1, 571 Selden, *de Dis Syr.* 2, 5), and the nature-goddess Ashera. Allusion is supposed to be made to this in <24005>Jeremiah 10:5, and Epist. of Jeremiah 70. In <14516>2 Chronicles 15:16 the Vulg. render "simulacrum Priapi" (comp. Horace, "furum aviumque maxima *formido")*. The Sept. had a different reading, which it is not easy to determine. They translate, in <11153>1 Kings 15:13, the same word both by σύνοδος (with which corresponds the Syriac *'ido*, "a festival," reading, perhaps, trx,[} *'atsereth*, as in <12010>2 Kings 10:20; <24912>Jeremiah 9:2) and καταδύσεις, while in Chronicles it is εἴδωλον. Possibly in <11153>1 Kings 15:13 they may have read Htlxm; *metsullathah*, for HTxlpmi *miphlatstah*, as the Vulg. *specum*, of which "sinulacrum turpissimum" is a correction. *SEE GROVE*.

(II.) We now come to the consideration of those words which more directly apply to the images or idols as the outward symbols of the deity who was worshipped through them.

(1.) Terms indicating the *form* of idols. —

8. lms, or lmse *s'mel*, with which Gesenius compares as cognate lvm; *mashal*, and µlx, *tselen;* the Lat. *sinilis* and Gr. ὁμαλός, signifies a "likeness," "semblance." The Targum in <05046>Deuteronomy 4:16 gives arwx, *tsirda*, "figure," as the equivalent, while in <26603>Ezekiel 8:3, 5 it is rendered by µlix] *tselan*, "image." In the latter passages the Syriac has *koimto*, "a statue" (the στήλη *of* the Septuagint) which more properly corresponds to *matstsebah* (see No. 13, below); and in Deuteronomy genes, "kind" (=γένος). The passage in <14337>2 Chronicles 33:7 is rendered "images of four faces," the latter words representing the one under consideration. In <14315>2 Chronicles 33:15 it appears as "carved images," following the Sept. τὸ γλυπτόν. On the whole, the Gr. εἰκών of <05046>Deuteronomy 4:16; <14337>2 Chronicles 33:7, and the "simulacrum" of the

Vulg. (2 Chronicles 33:15) most nearly resemble the Heb. *semel*. *SEE CARVED*.

9. µlx, *fse'lem* (Chald. *id.* and µlix] *tselam'),* is by all lexicographers, ancient and modern, connected with lxe *tsel,* "a shadow." It is the "image" of God in which man was created (Genesis 1:27; comp. Wisd. 2, 23), distinguished from tWmD] *demuth,* or "likeness," as the "image" from the "idea" which it represents (Schmidt, *De Imag. Dei in Hom.* p. 84), though it would be rash to insist upon this distinction. In the N.T. εἰκών appears to represent the letter (Colossians 3:10; compare the Sept. at Genesis 5, 1), as ὁμοίωμα the former of the two words (Romans 1:23; 8:29; Philippians 2:7), but in Hebrews 10:1, εἰκών is opposed to σκία as the substance to the substantial form, of which it is the perfect representative. The Sept. render *demzth* by ὁμοίωσις, ὁμοίωμα, εἰκών, ὅμοιος, and *tselem* most frequently by εἰκών, though ὁμοίωμα, εἴδωλον, and τύπος also occur. But, whatever abstract term may best define the meaning of *tselem,* it is unquestionably used to denote the visible forms of external objects, and is applied to figures of gold and silver (1 Samuel 6:5; Numbers 33:52; Daniel 3:1), such as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as well as to those painted upon walls (Ezekiel 33:14). *"Image"* perhaps most nearly represents it in all passages. Applied to the human countenance (Dan. 3:19), it signifies the "expression," and corresponds to the ἰδέα of Matthew 28:3, though *demuth* agrees rather with the Platonic usage of the latter word. *SEE GRAVEN*.

10. hnWmT] *temundh',* rendered "image" in Job 4:16; elsewhere "similitude" (Deuteronomy 4:12), "likeness" (Deuteronomy 5, 8): "form," or "shape" would be better. In Deuteronomy 4:16 it is in parallelism with tynbTi *tabnith',* literally "build;" hence "plan" or "model" (2 Kings 16:10; compare Exodus 20:4; Numbers 12:8).

11. bxe[; *atsab',* bxe[, *e'tseb* (Jeremiah 22:28), or bxe[o *o'tseb* (Isaiah 48:5), "a figure," all derived from a root bxi[; *atsab,* "to work" or "fashion" (akin to bxij; *chatsab,* and the like), are terms applied to idols as expressing that their origin was due to the labor of man. The verb in its derived senses indicates the sorrow and trouble consequent upon severe labor, but the latter seems to be the radical idea. If the notion of sorrow were most prominent, the words as applied to idols might be compared with *aven* above. Isaiah 58:3 is rendered in the Peshito Syriac

"idols" (A.V. "labors"), but the reading was evidently different. In (19:92) Psalm 129:24, bxeqÇ dÆrD, is "idolatry."

12. ryxa, *etsir*, once only applied to an idol ((23:16) Isaiah 45:16; Sept. νῆσοι, as if De, µyYaæ). The word usually denotes "a pang," but in this instance is probably connected with the roots rWx, *tsar*, and rxy; *yatsar*, and signifies "a shape" or "mould," and hence an "idol."

13. hbXem; *matstsebah'*, anything set up, a "statue" (=byxa! *netsib*, (24:13) Jeremiah 43:13), applied to a memorial stone like those erected by Jacob on four several occasions ((01:28) Genesis 28:18; 31:45; 35:14, 20) to commemorate a crisis in his life, or to mark the grave of Rachel. Such were the stones set up by Joshua ((04:09) Joshua 4:9) after the passage of the Jordan, and at Shechem ((16:26) Joshua 24:26), and by Samuel when victorious over the Philistines ((09:12) 1 Samuel 7:12). When solemnly dedicated they were anointed with oil, and libations were poured upon them. The word is applied to denote the obelisks which stood at the entrance to the temple of the sun at Heliopolis ((24:13) Jeremiah 43:13), two of which were a hundred cubits high and eight broad, each of a single stone (Herod. 2, 11). It is also used of the statues of Baal ((12:01) 2 Kings 3:2), whether of stone ((12:07) 2 Kings 10:27) or wood (id. 26), which stood in the innermost recess of the temple at Samaria. Movers *(Phon.* 1, 674) conjectures that the latter were statues or columns distinct from that of Baal, which was of stone and conical (p. 673), like the "meta" of Paphos (Tacit. *H.* 2, 3), and probably, therefore, belonging to other deities, who were his πάρεδροι or σύμβωμοι. The Phoenicians consecrated and anointed stones like that at Bethel, which were called, as some think, from this circumstance, *Baetylia.* Many such are said to have been seen on Mt. Lebanon, near Heliopolis, dedicated to various gods, and many prodigies are related of them (Damascius in Photius, quoted by Bochart, *Canaan,* 2, 2). The same authority describes them as aerolites, of a whitish and sometimes purple color, spherical in shape, and about a span in diameter. The Palladium of Troy, the black stone in the Kaaba at Mecca, said to have been brought from heaven by the angel Gabriel, and the stone at Ephesus "which fell down from Jupiter" ((44:35) Acts 19:35), are examples of the belief, anciently so common, that the gods sent down their images upon earth. In the older worship of Greece, stones, according to Pausanias (7, 22, § 4), occupied the place of images. Those at Pharae, about thirty in number, and quadrangular in shape, near the statue of Hermes, received divine honors from the Pharians, and each

had the name of some god conferred upon it. The stone in the temple of Jupiter Ammon ("umbilico maxime similis"), enriched with emeralds and gems (Curtius, 4:7, § 31); that at Delphi, which Saturn was said to have swallowed (Pausan. *Phoc.* 24, § 6); the black stone of pyramidal shape in the temple of Juggernaut, and the holy stone at Pessinus, in Galatia, sacred to Cybele, show how widely spread and almost universal were these ancient objects of worship. *SEE PILLAR*.

Closely connected with these "statues" of Baal, whether in the form of obelisks or otherwise, were

14. µynmj; *chammanim'*. rendered in the margin of most passages "sun-images." The word has given rise to much discussion. In the Vulg. it is translated thrice *simulacra*, thrice *delubra*, and *oncefana*. The Sept. gives τεμένη twice, εἴδωλα twice, ξύλινα χειροποίητα, βδελύγματα, and τὰ ὑψηλά With one exception (2 Chronicles 34:4, which is evidently corrupt), the Syriac has vaguely either "fears," i.e. objects of fear, or "idols." The Targum in all passages translates it by aYsnjsyngj; *chanisnesaya'*, "houses for star-worship" (Furst compares the Arab. *Chunnas*, the planet Mercury or Venus), a rendering which Rosenmuller supports. Gesenius preferred to consider these *chanisnesaya as* 'veils" or "shrines surrounded or shrouded with hangings" (Ezekiel 16:16; Targ. on Isaiah 3:19), and scouted the interpretation of Buxtorf — "status solares" — as a mere guess, though he somewhat paradoxically assented to Rosenmüller's opinion that they were "shrines dedicated to the worship of the stars." Kimchi, under the root ^mj, mentions a conjecture that they were trees like the *Asherim*, but (s.v. µmj) elsewhere expresses his own belief that the Nun is epenthetic, and that they were so called "because the sun-worshippers made them." Aben-Ezra (on Leviticus 26:30) says they were "houses made for worshipping the sun," which Bochart approves *(Canaan*, ii, 17), and Jarchi that they were a kind of idol placed on the roofs of houses. Vossius *(De Idol.* 2, 353), as Scaliger before him, connects the word with Amanus or Omanus, the sacred fire, the symbol of the Persian sun-god, and renders it *pyraea* (comp. Selden, ii, 8). Adelung *(Mithrid.* 1, 159, quoted by Gesenius on Isaiah 17:8) suggested the same, and compared it with the Sanscrit *homa.* But to such interpretations the passage in 2 Chronicles 34:4 is inimical (Vitringa on Isaiah 17:8). Gesenius's own opinion appears to have fluctuated considerably. In his notes on Isaiah *(I.* c.) he prefers the general rendering "columns" to the

more definite one of “sun-columns,” and is inclined to look to a Persian origin for the derivation of the word. But in his Thesaurus he mentions the occurrence of *Chainman* as a synonym of Baal in the Phoenician and Palmyrene inscriptions in the sense of “Dominus Solaris,” and it’s after application to the statues or columns erected for his worship. Spencer *(De Legg. Hebr.* 2, 25), and after him Michaelis *(Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* s.v.), maintained that it signified statues or lofty columns, like the pyramids or obelisks of Egypt. Movers *(Phon.* 1, 441) concludes with good reason that the sun-god Baal and the idol “Chamman” are not essentially different. In his discussion of *Chammanim* he says, “These images of the fire-god were placed on foreign or non-Israelitish altars, in conjunction with the symbols of the nature-goddess Asherah, or σύμβωμοι (<144803>2 Chronicles 14:3, 5; 34:4, 7; <230709>Isaiah 17:9; 27:9), as was otherwise usual with Baal and Asherah.” They are mentioned with the Asherim, and the latter are coupled with the statues of Baal (<111423>1 Kings 14:23; <122314>2 Kings 23:14). The *chammanim* and statues are used promiscuously (compare <122314>2 Kings 23:14, and <143404>2 Chronicles 34:4; <144803>2 Chronicles 14:3 and 5), but are never spoken of together. Such are the steps by which he arrives at his conclusion. He is supported by the Palmyrene inscription at Oxford, alluded to above, which has been thus rendered: “This column (anmj, *Chammaind)*, and this altar, the sons of Malchu, etc., have erected and dedicated to the sun.” The Veneto-Greek Version leaves the word untranslated in the strange form ἀκάβαντες. From the expressions in <260604>Ezekiel 6:4, 6, and <032630>Leviticus 26:30, it may be inferred that these columns, which perhaps represented a rising flame of fire and stood upon the altar of Baal (<143404>2 Chronicles 34:4), were of wood or stone. *SEE ASHERAH*.

15. tyKæmi, *maskith’*, occurs in <032601>Leviticus 26:1; <042152>Numbers 23:52; <260812>Ezekiel 8:12: “device,” most nearly suits all passages (compare <197307>Psalm 73:7; <201811>Proverbs 18:11; 25:11). This word has been the fruitful cause of as much dispute as the preceding. The general opinion appears to be that mˆba, signifies a stone with figures graven upon it. Ben-Zeb explains it as “a stone with figures or hieroglyphics carved upon it,’” and so Michaelis; and it is maintained by Movers *(Phon.* 1, 105) that the *baetylia*, or columns with painted figures, the “lapides effigiati” of Minucius Felix (c. 3), are these “stones of device,” and that the characters engraven on them are the ἱερὰ στποχεῖα, or characters sacred to the several deities. The invention of these characters, which is ascribed to

Taaut, he conjectures originated with the Seres. Gesenius explains it as a stone with the image of an idol, Baal or Astarte, and refers to his *Mon. Poaen.* p. 21-24, for others of a similar character. Rashi (on <03210>Leviticus 21:1) derives it from the root kc, to cover, "because they cover the floor with a pavement of stones." The Targum and Syriac, <03301>Leviticus 26:1, give 'stone of devotion," and the former, in <04352>Numbers 33:52, has "house of their devotion" where the Syriac only renders "their objects of devotion." For the former the Sept. has λίθος σκοπός, and for the latter τὰς σκοπιὰς αὐτῶν, connecting the word with the root hkc; "to look," a circumstance which has induced Saalschuitz *(Mos. Recht,* p. 382-385) to conjecture that *eben maskith* was originally a smooth elevated stone employed for the purpose of obtaining from it a freer prospect, and of offering prayer in prostration upon it to the deities of heaven. Hence, generally, he concludes it signifies a stone of prayer or devotion, and the "chambers of imagery" of <26807>Ezekiel 8:7 are "chambers of devotion." The renderings of the last mentioned passage in the Sept. and Targum are curious as pointing to a various reading, /tKcm] or, more probably, /bKvm] *SEE IMAGERY.*

16. µypæT] *teradphim'. SEE TERAPHIR*

(2.) The terms which follow have regard to the material and *workmanship* of the idol rather than to its character as an object of worship.

17. lsP; *pe'sel,* usually translated in the Authorized Version "graven or carved image." In two passages it is ambiguously rendered "quarries" (<07019>Judges 3:19, 26), after the Targum, but there seems to be no reason for departing from the ordinary signification. In the majority of instances the Sept. has γλυπτόν, once γλύμμα. The verb is employed to denote the finishing which the stone received at the hands of the masons after it had been rough-hewn from the quarries (<02404>Exodus 34:4; <11018>1 Kings 5:32). It is probably a later usage which has applied *pesel* to a figure cast in metal, as in <23019>Isaiah 40:19 44:10. (More probably still, *pesel* denotes by anticipation the molten image in a later stage, after it had been trimmed into shape by the caster.) These "sculptured" images were apparently of wood, iron, or stone, covered with gold or silver (<05725>Deuteronomy 7:25; <23022>Isaiah 30:22; <36219>Habakkuk 2:19), the more costly being of solid metal (<23019>Isaiah 40:19). They could be burned (<05705>Deuteronomy 7:5; <23650>Isaiah 45:20; <14304>2 Chronicles 34:4), or cut down (<05123>Deuteronomy 12:3) and

pounded (<14B407>2 Chronicles 34:7), or broken in pieces (<22B109>Isaiah 21:9), In making them, the skill of the wise iron-smith (<05D275>Deuteronomy 27:15; <23A410>Isaiah 40:20) or carpenter, and of the goldsmith, was employed (<07J703>Judges 17:3, 4; <23A407>Isaiah 41:7), the former supplying the rough mass of iron beaten into shape on his anvil (<23A412>Isaiah 44:12), while the latter overlaid it with plates of gold and silver, probably from Tarshish (<24B109>Jeremiah 10:9), and decorated it with silver chains. The image thus formed received the further adornment of embroidered robes (<26B618>Ezekiel 16:18), to which possibly allusion may be made in <23B319>Isaiah 3:19. Brass and clay were among the materials employed for the same purpose (<27D233>Daniel 2:33; 5:23). (Images of glazed pottery have been found in Egypt [Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg. 3,* 90: comp. Wisd. 15:8].) A description of the three great images of Babylon on the top of the temple of Belus will be found in Diod. Sic. 2, 9 (compare Layard, *Nin.* 2. 433). The several stages of the process by which the metal or wood became the "graven image" are so vividly described in <23A410>Isaiah 44:10-20, that it is only necessary to refer to that passage, and we are at once introduced to the mysteries of idol manufacture, which, as at Ephesus, "brought no small gain unto the craftsmen." *SEE SHRINE*.

18. Ësn]or Ësnen'*sek,* and hksme*massekah',* are evidently synonymous (<23A429>Isaiah 41:29; 48:5; <24A014>Jeremiah 10:14) in later Hebrew, and denote a "molten" image. *Massekah* is frequently used in distinction from *pesel* or *pesilim* (<05D275>Deuteronomy 27:15; <07J703>Judges 17:3, etc.). The golden calf, which Aaron made, was fashioned with "the graver" (frj, *cheret),* but it is not quite clear for what purpose the graver was used (<02E304>Exodus 32:4). The *cheret* (comp. χαράττω*)* appears to have been a sharp-pointed instrument, used like the *stylus* for a writing implement (<23B801>Isaiah 8:1). Whether then Aaron, by the help of the *cheret,* gave to the molten mass the shape of a calf, or whether he made use of the graver for the purpose of carving hieroglyphics upon it, has been thought doubtful. The Syr. has *tuipso (*τύπος*),* "the mould," for *cheret.* But the expression rxyw*vay-yatsar,* decides that it was by the *cheret,* in whatever manner employed, that the shape of a calf was given to the metal. *SEE MOLTEN*.

(3.) In the New Test. the Greek of idol is εἴδωλον, which exactly corresponds with it. In one passage εἰκών is the "image" or head of the emperor on the coinage (<40B220>Matthew 22:20). *SEE ALISGEMA*.

II. *Actual Forms of Idols.* — *Among* the earliest objects of worship, regarded as symbols of deity, were the meteoric stones which the ancients believed to have been the images of the gods sent down from heaven. *SEE DIANA*. From these they transferred their regard to rough unhewn blocks, to stone columns or pillars of wood, in which the divinity worshipped was supposed to dwell, and which were consecrated, like the sacred stone at Delphi, by being anointed with oil, and crowned with wool on solemn days (Pausan. *Phoc.* 24, § 6). Tavernier (quoted by Rosenmüller, *At. and Al Morgenland,* 1, § 89) mentions a black stone in the pagoda of Benares which was daily anointed with perfumed oil, and such are the "Lingams" in daily use in the Siva worship of India (compare Armobius, 1, 30; Min. Felix, c. 3). Such customs are remarkable illustrations of the solemn consecration by Jacob of the stone at Bethel, as showing the religious reverence with which these memorials were regarded. Not only were single stones thus honored, but heaps of stone were, in later times at least, considered as sacred to Hermes (Homer,. *Od. 16,* 471; comp. the Vulg. at <2D1608>Proverbs 26:8, "Sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii"), and to these each passing traveler contributed his offering (Crezer, *Symb.* 1, 24). The heap of stones which Laban erected to commemorate the solemn compact between himself and Jacob, and on which he invoked the gods of his fathers, is an instance of the intermediate stage in which such heaps were associated with religious observances before they became objects of worship. Jacob, for his part, dedicated a single stone as his memorial, and called Jehovah to witness, thus holding himself aloof from the rites employed by Laban, which may have partaken of his ancestral idolatry. *SEE JEGAR-SAIADUTHA*.

Of the forms assumed by the idolatrous images we have not many traces in the Bible. Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, was a human figure terminating in a fish *SEE DAGON*; and that the Syrian deities were represented in later times in a symbolical human shape we know for certainty. *SEE NISROCH*. The Hebrews imitated their neighbors in this respect as in others (<2A4413>Isaiah 44:13; Wisd. 13:13), and from various allusions we may infer that idols in human forms were not uncommon among them, though they were more anciently symbolized by animals (Wisd. 13:14), as by the calves of Aaron and Jeroboam, and the brazen serpent which was afterwards applied to idolatrous uses (<121804>2 Kings 18:4; <450123>Romans 1:23). — When the image came from the hands of the maker it was decorated richly with silver and gold, and sometimes crowned (Epist.

Jeremiah 9), clad in robes of blue and purple (<24009>Jeremiah 10:9), like the draped images of Pallas and Hera (Muller, *Hand. dl. Arch. d. Kunst,* § 69), and fastened in the niche appropriated to it by means of chains and nails (Wisd. 13:15), in order that the influence of the deity which it represented might be secured to the spot. So the Ephesians, when besieged by Croesus, connected the wall of their city by means of a rope to the temple of Aphrodite, with a view to insuring the aid of the goddess (Herod. 1, 26); and for a similar object the Tyrians chained the stone image of Apollo to the altar of Hercules (Curt. 4:3, § 15). Some images were painted red (Wisd. 13:14), like those of Dionysus and the Bacchantes, of Hermes, and the god Pan (Pausan. 2, 2, § 5; Muller, *u. and. d. Arch. d. Kunst,* § 69). This color was formerly considered sacred. Pliny relates, on the authority of Verrius, that it was customary on festival days to color with red lead the face of the image of Jupiter, and the bodies of those who celebrated a triumph (33:36). The figures of Priapus, the god of gardens, were decorated in the same manner *(*"*ruber* custos," Tibull. 1, 1, 18). Among the objects of worship enumerated by Arnobius (1, 39) are bones of elephants, pictures, and garlands suspended on trees, the "rami coronati" of Apuleius *(de Mag.* c. 56).

When the process of adorning the image was completed, it was placed in a temple or shrine appointed for it *(*οἰκία, Epist. Jeremiah 12,19; οἴκημα, Wisd. 13:15; εἰδωλεῖον, <46810>1 Corinthians 8:10; see Stanley's note on the latter passage). In Wisd. 13:15, οἴκημα is thought to be used contemptuously, as in Tibull. 1, 10, 19, 20, "Cum paupere cultu Stabat in *exigua* ligneus *cede* deus" (Fritsche and Grimm, *Handb.),* but the passage quoted is by no means a good illustration. From these temples the idols were sometimes carried in procession (Epist. Jeremiah 4, 26) on festival days. Their priests were maintained from the idol treasury, and feasted upon the meats which were appointed for the idols use (Bel and the Dragon, 3, 13). These sacrificial feasts formed an important part of the idolatrous ritual, and were a great stumbling block to the early Christian converts. They were to the heathen, as Prof. Stanley has well observed, what the observance of circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were to the Jewish converts, and it was for this reason that Paul especially directed his attention to the subject, and laid down the rules of conduct contained in his first letter to the Corinthians (8-10). *SEE IDOLATRY*.

is divine honor paid to any created object. It is thus a wider term than *image-worship* (q.v.). For many old monographs on the various forms of ancient idolatry, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 108 sq. *SEE GODS, FALSE*; *SEE BEAST-WORSHIP*.

We find the idea of idolatry expressed in the O.T. by bzK;(a *lie*, <19615>Psalm 45:5; <30104>Amos 2:4), or awJv;*(nullity)*, and still oftener by hb;[eT *(abomination)*. In after times the Jews designated it as h[;r;hdWb[; *(foreign worship)*. Thus we see that it had no name indicative of its nature, for the Biblical expressions are more a monotheistic qualification of divine worship than a definition of it; the last Hebrew expression, however, shows idolatry as not being of Jewish origin. The word εἰδωλολατρείαin the N.T. is entirely due to the Septuagint, which, wherever any of the heathen deities are mentioned, even though designated in the sacred text only as µyl¥ed Eæ*(nothings)*, translates by εἴδωλον, an *idol;* a practice generally followed by later versions. A special sort of idolatry, namely, the actual adoration of images *(Idololatria)* thus gave name to the whole species (<46014>1 Corinthians 10:14; <48520>Galatians 5:20; <60403>1 Peter 4:3). Subsequently the more comprehensive word εἰδολατρεία *(idolatria*, instead of *idololatria)* was adopted, which included the adoration and worship of other visible symbols of the deity (ε δος) besides those due to the statuary art. Herzog.

I. *Origin of Idolatry. — In* the primeval period man appears to have had not alone a revelation, but also an implanted natural law. Adam and some of his descendants, as late as the time of the Flood, certainly lived under a revealed system, now usually spoken of as the patriarchal dispensation, and Paul tells us that the nations were under a natural law (<45214>Romans 2:14,15). “Man in his natural state must always have had a knowledge of God sufficient for the condition in which he had been placed. Although God ‘in times past suffered all nations [or, rather, ‘all the Gentiles, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness’ (<44147>Acts 14:17). ‘For the invisible things of him, from the creation ‘of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, [even] his eternal power and godhead’ (<45120>Romans 1:20). But the people of whom we are

speaking' changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things,' and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever' (Romans 1:21-25). Thus arose that strange superstition which is known by the term *Fetishism* [or low nature-worship], consisting in the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones" (Poole, *Genesis of the Earth and of Man,* 2nd ed. p. 160, 161). Paul speaks of those who invented this idolatry as therefore forsaken of God and suffered to sink into the deepest moral corruption (Romans 1:28). It is remarkable that among highly-civilized nations the converse obtains; moral corruption being very frequently the cause of the abandoning of true religion for infidelity. — Kitto. That theory of human progress which supposes man to have gradually worked his way up from barbaric ignorance of God to a so-called natural religion is contradicted by the facts of Biblical history.

Nothing is distinctly stated in the Bible as to any antediluvian idolatry. It is, however, a reasonable sup-position that in the general corruption before the Flood idolatry was practiced. There is no undoubted trace of heathen divinities in the names of the antediluvians; but there are dim indications of ancestral worship in the postdiluvian worship of some of the antediluvian patriarchs. It has been supposed that the SET or SUTEKH of the Egyptian Pantheon is the Hebrew *Seth.* The Cainite Enoch was possibly commemorated as Annacus or Nannacus at Iconium, though, this name being identified with Enoch, the reference may be to Enoch of the line of Seth. It is reasonable to suppose that the worship of these antediluvians originated before the Flood, for it is unlikely that it would have been instituted after it. 'Some Jewish writers, grounding their theory on a forced interpretation of Genesis 4:26, assign to Enos, the son of Seth, the unenviable notoriety of having been the first to pay divine honors to the host of heaven, and to lead others into the like error (Maimon. *De Idol.* i, 1). R. Solomon Jarchi, on the other hand, while admitting the same verse to contain the first account of the origin of idolatry, understands it as implying the deification of men and plants. Arabic tradition, according to Sir W. Jones, connects the people of Yemen with the same apostasy. The third in descent from Joktan, and therefore a contemporary of Nahor, took the surname of *Abdu Shams,* or "servant of the sun," whom he and his family worshipped, while other tribes honored the planets and fixed stars (Hales, *Chronol.* 2, 59, 4to ed.). Nimrod, again, to whom is ascribed the

introduction of Zabianism, was after his death transferred to the constellation Orion, and on the slender foundation of the expression “Ur of the Chaldees” (<011131>Genesis 11:31) is built the fabulous history of Abraham and Nimrod, narrated in the legends of the Jews and Mussulmans (Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash, 1.* 23; Weil, *Bibl. Leg.* p. 47-74; Hyde, *Rel. Pers.* c. 2).

II. *Classification of Idolatry.* — All unmixed systems of idolatry may be classified under the following heads; all mixed systems may be resolved into two or more of them. We give in this connection general illustrations of these species of false worship as evinced by the nations associated with the Jewish people, reserving for the next head a more complete survey of the idolatrous systems of the most important of these nations separately.

1. Low nature-worship, or *fetishism,* the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones. The fetishism of the Negroes is thought to admit of a belief in a supreme intelligence: if this be true, such a belief is either a relic of a higher religion, or else is derived from the Muslim tribes of Africa. Fetishism is closely connected with magic, and the Nigritian priests are universally magicians.

Beast-worship was exemplified in the calves of Jeroboam and the dark hints, which seem to point to the goat of Mendes. There is no actual proof that the Israelites ever joined in the service of Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, though Ahaziah sent stealthily to Baalzebub, the fly-god of Ekron (2 Kings 1). Some have explained the allusion in <360109>Zephaniah 1:9 as referring to a practice connected with the worship of Dagon; comp. 1 Samuel 5, 5. The Syrians are stated by Xenophon *(Anab.* 1, 4, § 9) to have paid divine honors to fish. In later times the brazen serpent became the object of idolatrous homage (<121804>2 Kings 18:4). But whether the latter was regarded with superstitious reverence as a memorial of their early history, or whether incense was offered to it as a symbol of some power of nature, cannot now be exactly determined. The threatening in <032630>Leviticus 26:30, “I will put your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols,” may fairly be considered as directed against the tendency to regard animals, as in Egypt, as the symbols of deity. Tradition says that Nergal, the god of the men of Cuth, the idol of fire according to Leusden *(Philippians Hebr. Mixt.* diss. 43), was worshipped under the form of a cock; Ashima as a he-goat, the emblem of generative power; Nibhaz as a dog; Adrammelech as a mule or peacock; and Anammelech as a horse or pheasant.

The singular reverence with which trees have in all ages been honored is not without example in the history of the Hebrews. The terebinth at Mamre, beneath which Abraham built an altar (01207Genesis 12:7; 13:18), and the memorial grove planted by him at Beersheba (01233Genesis 21:33), were intimately connected with patriarchal worship though in after ages his descendants were forbidden to do that which he did with impunity, in order to avoid the contamination of idolatry. Jerome *(Onomasticon, s.v.* Drys) mentions an oak near Hebron which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestine abounds with sacred trees. They are found "all over the land covered with bits of rags from the garments of passing villagers, hung up as acknowledgments, or as deprecatory signals and charms; and we find beautiful clumps of oak-trees sacred to a kind of beings called Jacob's daughters" (Thomson, *The Land and the Book,* 2, 151). *SEE GROVE*.. As a symptom of the rapidly degenerating spirit, the oak of Shechem, which stood in the sanctuary of Jehovah (06246Joshua 24:26), and beneath which Joshua set up the stone of witness, perhaps appears in Judges (07037Judges 9:37) as "the oak (not 'plain,' as in the A.V.) of soothsayers" or "augurs." This, indeed, may be a relic of the ancient Canaanitish worship; an older name associated with idolatry, which the conquering Hebrews were commanded and endeavored to obliterate (05203Deuteronomy 12:3).

2. *Shamanism,* or the magical side of fetishism, the religion of the Mongolian tribes, and apparently the primitive religion of China.

3. High *nature-worship,* the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and of the supposed powers of nature. The old religion of the Shemitic races consisted, in the opinion of Movers *(Plin.* 1, c. 5), in the deification of the powers and laws of nature; these powers being considered either as distinct and independent, or as manifestations of one supreme and all-ruling being. In most instances the two ideas were co-existent. The deity, following human analogy, was conceived as male and female: the one representing the active, the other the passive principle of nature; the former the source of spiritual. the latter of physical life. The transference of the attributes of the one to the other resulted either in their mystical conjunction in the hermaphrodite, as the Persian Mithra and Phoenician Baal, or the two combined to form a third, which symbolized the essential unity of both. (This will explain the occurrence of the name of Baal with the masculine and feminine articles in the Sept.; comp. 28102Hosea 11:2; 24905Jeremiah 19:5;

(Romans 11:4. Philochorus, quoted by Macrobius *[Sat. 3,* 8], says that men and women sacrificed to Venus or the Moon, with the garments of the sexes interchanged, because she was regarded both as masculine and feminine [see Selden, *De Dis Syr.* 2, 2]. Hence *Lunus* and *Luna.)* With these two supreme beings all other beings are identical; so that in different nations the same nature-worship appears under different forms, representing the various aspects under which the idea of the power of nature is presented. The sun and moon were early selected as outward symbols of this all-pervading power, and the worship of the heavenly bodies was not only the most ancient, but the most prevalent system of idolatry. Taking its rise, according to a probable hypothesis, in the plains of Chaldsea. it spread through Egypt, Greece, Scythia, and even Mexico and Ceylon; and it is worthy of notice that even the religion of remote India presupposes a grand symbolic representation of the divine by the worship of these great physical powers (compare Lassen, *Ind. Alterth.* 1, 756 sq.; Roth, *Geschichte der Religionen). SEE HINDUISM*. It was regarded as an offence amenable to the civil authorities in the days of Job (Job 31:26-28), and one of the statutes of the Mosaic law was directed against its observance (Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3); the former referring to the star worship of Arabia, the latter to the concrete form in which it appeared among the Syrians and Phoenicians. It is probable that the Israelites learned their first lessons in sun worship from the Egyptians, in whose religious system that luminary, as Osiris, held a prominent place. The city of On (Bethshemesh or Heliopolis) took its name from his temple (Jeremiah 43:13), and the wife of Joseph was the daughter of his priest (Genesis 41:45). The Phoenicians worshipped him under the title of "Lord of heaven," μyaev; l [Bi, *Baal-shamayim (*βεελσάμην, acc. to Sanchoniatho in Philo Byblius), and Adon, the Greek Adonis, and the Tammuz of Ezekiel (8:14). *SEE TAMMUZ.* As Molech or Milcom, the sun was worshipped by the Ammonites, and as Chemosh by the Moabites. The Hadad of the Syrians is the same deity, whose name is traceable in Benhadad, Hadadezer, and Hadad or Adad, the Edomite. The Assyrian Bel or Belus is another form of Baal. According to Philo *(De Vit. Cont. §* 3), the Essenes were wont to pray to the sun at morning and evening (Joseph. *War,* 2, 8, 5). By the later kings of Judah, sacred horses and chariots were dedicated to the sun-god, as by the Persians (2 Kings 23:11; Bochart, *Hieroz.* pt. 1, bk. 2, c. 11; Selden, *De Dis Syr.* 2, 8), to march in procession and greet his rising (R. Solomon Jarchi on 2 Kings 23:11). The Massagetae offered horses in sacrifice to him (Strabo, 11, p. 513), on the principle

enunciated by Macrobius *(Sat. 7,* 7), “like rejoiceth in like” (“similibus similia gaudent;” compare Herod. 1, 216), and the custom was common to many nations.

The moon, worshipped by the Phoenicians under the name of Astarte (Lucian, *de Dea Syra,* c. 4), or Baaltis, the passive power of nature, as Baal was the active (Movers, 1, 149), and known to the Hebrews as Ashtaroth or Ashtoreth, the tutelary goddess of the Zidonians, appears early among the objects of Israelitish idolatry. But this Syro-Phoenician worship of the sun and moon was of a grosser character than the pure star worship of the Magi, which Movers distinguishes as Upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, and was equally removed from the Chaldean astrology and Zabianism of later times. The former of these systems tolerated no images or altars, and the contemplation of the heavenly bodies from elevated spots constituted the greater part of its ritual.

But, though we have no positive historical account of star-worship before the Assyrian period, we may infer that it was early practiced in a concrete form among the Israelites from the allusions in <3056>Amos 5:26 and <4042>Acts 7:42, 43. Even in the desert they are said to have been given up to worship the host of heaven, while Chiun and Remphan, or Rephan, have on various grounds been identified with the planet Saturn. It was to counteract idolatry of this nature that the stringent law of <0503>Deuteronomy 17:3 was enacted, and with a view to withdrawing the Israelites from undue contemplation of the material universe, Jehovah, the God of Israel, is constantly placed before them as Jehovah Sabaoth, Jehovah of Hosts, the king of heaven (<2705>Daniel 4:35, 37), to whom the heaven and heaven of heavens belong (<0514>Deuteronomy 10:14). However this may be, Movers *(Phon.* 1, 65, 66) contends that the later star-worship, introduced by Ahaz and followed by Manasseh, was purer and more spiritual in its nature than the Israelito-Phoenician worship of the heavenly bodies under symbolical forms, as Baal and Asherah; and that it was not idolatry in the same sense that the latter was, but of a simply contemplative character; He is supported, to some extent, by the fact that we find no mention of any images of the sun or moon or the host of heaven, but merely of vessels devoted to their service (<1204>2 Kings 23:4). But there is no reason to believe that the divine honors paid to the “Queen of Heaven” (<2418>Jeremiah 7:18; 49:19; or, as others render, “the frame” or “structure of the heavens”) were equally dissociated from image-worship. Mr. Layard (Nin. 2, 451) discovered a bas-relief at Nimrod which represented four idols

carried in procession by Assyrian warriors. One of these figures he identifies with Hera, the Assyrian Astarte, represented with a star on her head (Amos 5, 26), and with the "queen of heaven," who appears on the rocktablets of Pterium "standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower, or mural coronet," as in the Syrian temple of Hierapolis *(ib.* p. 456; Lucian, *de Dea Syra,* 81, 32). But, in his remarks upon a figure which resembles the Rhea of Diodorus, Layard adds, "The representation in a human form of the celestial bodies, themselves originally but a type, was a corruption which appears to have crept at a later period into the mythology of Assyria; for, in the more ancient bas-reliefs, figures with caps surmounted by stars do not occur, and the sun, moon, and planets stand alone" *(ib.* p. 457,458). The allusions in <18B38:31,32>Job 38:31, 32 are too obscure to allow any inference to be drawn as to the mysterious influences which were held by the old astrologers to be exercised by the stars over human destiny, nor is there sufficient evidence to connect them with anything more recondite than the astronomical knowledge of the period. The same may be said of the poetical figure in Deborah's chant of triumph, "the stars from their highways warred with Sisera" (<070520>Judges 5:20). In the later times of the monarchy, Mazzaloth, the planets, or the zodiacal signs, received, next to the sun and moon, their share of popular adoration (<122305>2 Kings 23:5); and the history of idolatry among the Hebrews shows at all times an intimate connection between the deification of the heavenly bodies and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the sidereal powers to the worship of Gad and Meni, Babylonian divinities, symbols of Venus or the moon, as the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect the moon was reverenced by the Egyptians (Macrob. *Sat.* 1, 19),; and the name Baal-Gad is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter, as the bringer of luck, was grafted on the old faith of the Phoenicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with Eastern astrology Adrammelech Movers regards as the sun-fire-the solar Mars, and Anammelech the solar Saturn *(Pho.* 1, 410, 411). The Vulg. rendering of <202608>Proverbs 26:8, "Sicut qui mittit lapidem in *acervum Mercurii,"* follows the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, *de Dis Syrzs,* 2, 15; Maim. *de Idol. 3,* 2; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. s.v.* µylwqrm*).*

4. Hero-worship, the worship of deceased ancestors or leaders of a nation. Of pure hero-worship among the Shemitic races we find no trace. Moses,

indeed, seems to have entertained some dim apprehension that his countrymen might, after his death, pay him more honors than were due to man, and the anticipation of this led him to review his own conduct in terms of strong reprobation (<05D421>Deuteronomy 4:21, 22). The expression in <19A628>Psalm 106:28, "The sacrifices of the *dead,"* is in all probability metaphorical, and Wisd. 14:15 refers to a later practice due to Greek influence. The Rabbinical commentators discover in <01481 6>Genesis 48:16 an allusion to the worshipping of angels (<51D218>Colossians 2:18), while they defend their ancestors from the charge of regarding them in any other light than mediators, or intercessors with God (Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* 5, 3). It is needless to add that their inference and apology are equally groundless. With like probability has been advanced the theory of the daemon-worship of the Hebrews, the only foundation for it being two highly poetical passages (<05321 7>Deuteronomy 32:17; <19A637>Psalm 106:37). It is possible that the Persian dualism is hinted at in <23451 7>Isaiah 45:7.

5. *Idealism,* the worship of abstractions or mental qualities, such as justice, a system never found unmixed. This constituted the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, as also of the Scandinavians. *SEE MYTHOLOGY*.

III. *Idolatry of certain ancient Heathen Nations in Detail. — All* idolatry is in its nature heathenish, and it has in all ages been a characteristic mark of heathendom, so that to the present day the vivid description of Romans 1 remains the most striking portraiture of heathen peoples. We have space in this article for a systematic view only of those early nations whose contact with the Hebrew race was the means of the *importation* of idolatry among the chosen people. *SEE POLYTHEISM*.

1. *Mesopotamian Mythology.-The* original idolatrous condition of the kindred of Abraham (q.v.) himself in the great plain of Aram is distinctly alluded to in Judges 24:2. According to Rawlinson (Essay in his *Herod.),* the Pantheons of Babylon and Nineveh, though originally dissimilar in the names of the divinities, cannot as yet be treated separately. The principal god of the Assyrians was Asshur, replaced in Babylonia by a god whose name is read II or Ra. The special attributes of Asshur were sovereignty and power, and he was regarded as the especial patron of the Assyrians and their kings. It is the Shemitic equivalent of the Hamitic or Scythic Ra, which suggests a connection with Egypt, although it is to be noticed that the same root may perhaps be traced in the probably Canaanitish Heres. Next to Asshur or Il was a triad, consisting of Anu, who appears to have

corresponded to Pluto, a divinity whose name is doubtful, corresponding to Jupiter, and Hea or Hoa, corresponding in position and partly in character to Neptune. The supreme goddess Mulita or Bilta (Mylitta cr Beltis) was the wife of the Babylonian Jupiter. This triad was followed by another, consisting of Ether (Il-a?), the sun, and the moon. Next in order are "the five minor gods, who, if not of astronomical origin, were at any rate identified with the five planets of the Chaldaean system." In addition, Sir H. Rawlinson enumerates several other divinities of less importance, and mentions that there are "a vast number of other names," adding this remarkable observation: "Every town and village, indeed, throughout Babylonia and Assyria appears to have had its own particular deity, many of these no doubt being the great gods of the Pantheon disguised under rustic names, but others being distinct local divinities." Sir H. Rawlinson contents himself with stating the facts discoverable from the inscriptions, and does not theorize upon the subject further than to point out the strong resemblances between this Oriental system and that of Greece and Rome, not indeed in the Aryan ground-work of the latter, but in its general superstructure. If we analyze the Babylonian and Assyrian system, we discover that in its present form it is mainly cosmic, or a system of high nature-worship. The supreme divinity appears to have been regarded as the ruler of the universe, the first triad was of powers of nature; the second triad and the remaining chief divinities were distinctly cosmic. But beneath this system were two others, evidently distinct in origin, and too deep-seated to be obliterated, the worship of ancestors and low nature-worship. Asshur, at the very head of the Pantheon, is the deified ancestor of the Assyrian race; and, notwithstanding a system of great gods, each city had its own special idolatry, either openly reverencing its primitive idol, or concealing a deviation from the fixed belief by making that idol another form of one of the national divinities. In this separation into its first elements of this ancient religion. we discover the superstitions of those races which, mixed, but never completely fused, formed the population of Babylonia and Assyria, three races whose three languages were yet distinct in the inscribed records as late as the time of Darius Hystaspis. These races were the primitive Chaldaeans, called Hamites by Sir H. Rawlinson, who undoubtedly had strong affinities with the ancient Egyptians, the Shemitic Assyrians, and the Aryan Persians. It is not difficult to assign to these races their respective shares in the composition of the mythology of the countries in which they successively ruled. The ancestral worship is here distinctly Shemitic: the name of Asshur proves this. It may be objected

that such worship never characterized any other Shemitic stock; that we find it among Turanians and Aryans: but we reply that the Shemites borrowed their idolatry, and a Turanian or Aryan influence may have given it this peculiar form. The low nature-worship must be due to the Turanians. It is never discerned except where there is a strong Turanian or Nigritian element, and when once established it seems always to have been very hard to remove. The high nature worship, as the last element, remains for the Aryan race. The primitive Aryan belief in its different forms was a reverence for the sun, moon, and stars, and the powers of nature, combined with a belief in one supreme being, a religion which, though varying at different times, and deeply influenced by ethnic causes, was never deprived of its essentially cosmic characteristics. *SEE ASSYRIA*.

2. *Egyptian.* — The strongest and most remarkable peculiarity of the Egyptian religion is the worship of animals (see Zickler, *De religione bestiarum ab Agyptiis consecratarum,* Lips. 1745; Schumacker, *De culiu animalium inter Egyptios et Judceos,* Wolfenb. 1773), trees, and like objects, which was universal in the country, and was even connected with the belief in the future state. No theory of the usefulness of certain animals can explain the worship of others that were utterly useless, nor can a theory of some strange anomaly find even as wide an application. The explanation is to be discovered in every town, every village, every hut of the Negroes, whose fetishism corresponds perfectly with this low nature-worship of the ancient Egyptians.

Connected with fetishism was the local character of the religion. Each home, city, town, and probably village, had its divinities, and the position of many gods in the Pantheon was due rather to the importance of their cities than any powers or qualities they were supposed to have. For a detailed account of the Egyptian deities, with illustrative cuts, see Kitto's *Pictorial Bible,* note on Deuteronomy 4:16; compare also EGYPT *SEE EGYPT* .

The Egyptian Pantheon shows three distinct elements. Certain of the gods are only personifications connected with low nature-worship. Others, the great gods, are of Shemitic origin, and are connected with high nature-worship, though showing traces of the worship of ancestors. In addition, there are certain personifications of abstract ideas. The first of these classes is evidently the result of an attempt to connect the old low nature-worship with some higher system. The second is no doubt the religion of the

Shemitic settlers. It is essentially the same in character as the Babylonian and Assyrian religion, and, as the belief of a dominant race, took the most important place in the intricate system of which it ultimately formed a part. The last class appears to be of later invention, and to have had its origin in an endeavor to construct a philosophical system.

In addition to these particulars of the Egyptian religion, it is important to notice that it comprised very remarkable doctrines. Man was held to be a responsible being, whose future after death depended upon his actions done while on earth. He was to be judged by Osiris, ruler of the West, or unseen world, and either rewarded with felicity or punished with torment. Whether these future states of happiness and misery were held to be of eternal duration is not certain, but there is little doubt that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul.

The religion of the Shepherds, or Hyksos, is not so distinctly known to us. It is, however, clear from the monuments that their chief god was SET, or SUTEKH, and we learn from a papyrus that one of the Shepherd-kings, APEPI, probably Manetho's "Apophis," established the worship of SET in his dominions, and reverenced' no other god, raising a great temple to him in Zoan, or Avaris. SET continued to be worshipped by the Egyptians until the time of the 22nd dynasty, when we lose all trace of him on the monuments. At this period, or afterwards, his figure was effaced in the inscriptions. The change took place long after the expulsion of the Shepherds, and was effected by the 22nd dynasty, which was probably of Assyrian or Babylonian origin; it is, therefore, rather to be considered as a result of the influence of the Median doctrine of Ormud and Ahriman than as due to the Egyptian hatred of the foreigners and all that concerned them. Besides SET, other foreign divinities were worshipped in Egypt-the god RENPU, the goddesses KEN, or KETESH, ANTA, and ASTARTA. All these divinities, except ASTARTA, as to whom we have no particular information, are treated by the Egyptians as powers of destruction and war, as SET was considered the personification of physical evil. SET was always identified by the Egyptians with Baal; we do not know whether he was worshipped in Egypt before the Shepherd-period, but it is probable that he was.

This foreign worship in Egypt was probably never reduced to a system. What we know of it shows no regularity, and it is not unlike the imitations of the Egyptian idols made by Phoenician artists, probably as

representations of Phoenician divinities. The gods of the Hyksos are foreign objects of worship in an Egyptian dress. *SEE HYKSOS.*

3. *Idolatry of Canaan and the adjoining Countries.* The center of the idolatry of the Palestinian races is to be sought for in the religion of the Rephaites and the Canaanites. We can distinctly connect the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth with the earliest kind of idolatry; and, having thus established a center, we can understand how, for instance, the same infernal rites were celebrated to the Ammonitish Molech and the Carthaginian Baal. The most important document for the idolatry of the Hittites is the treaty concluded between the branch of that people seated on the Orontes and Rameses II. From this we learn that SUTEKH (or SET) and ASTERAT were the chief divinities of these Hittites, and that they also worshipped the mountains and rivers and the winds. The SUTERKHS of several forts are also specified. *SEE HITTITES*. SET is known from the Egyptian inscriptions to have corresponded to Baal, so that in the two chief divinities we discover Baal and Ashtoreth, the only Canaanitish divinities known to be mentioned in Scripture. The local worship of different forms of Baal well agrees with the low nature-worship with which it is found to have prevailed. Both are equally mentioned in the Bible history. Thus the people of Shechem worshipped Baal-berith, and Mount Hermon itself seems to have been worshipped as Baal-Hermon, while the low nature-worship may be traced in the reverence for groves, and the connection of the Canaanitish religion with hills and trees. The worst feature of this system was the sacrifice of children by their parents-a feature that shows the origin of at least two of its offshoots.

The Bible does not give a very clear description of Canaanitish idolatry. As an abominable thing, to be rooted out and cast into oblivion, nothing is needlessly said of it. The appellation Baal, ruler, or possessor, implies supremacy, and connects the chief Canaanitish divinity with the Syrian Adonis. He was the god of the Canaanitish city Zidon, or Sidon, where "Ashtoreth, the abomination of the Zidonians," was also specially worshipped. In the Judge-period we read of Baalim and Ashteroth in the plural, probably indicating various local forms of these divinities, but perhaps merely the worship of many images. The worship of Baal was connected with that of the groves, which we take to have been representations of trees or other vegetable products. *SEE HIGH PLACE*. In Ahab's time a temple was built for Baal, where there was an image. His worshippers sacrificed in garments provided by the priests; and his

prophets, seeking to propitiate him, were wont to cry and cut themselves with swords and lances. Respecting Ashtoreth we know less from Scripture. Her name is not derivable from any Shemitic root. It is equivalent to the Ishtar of the cuneiform inscriptions, the name of the Assyrian or Babylonian Venus, the goddess of the planet. The identity of the Canaanitish and the Assyrian or Babylonian goddess is further shown by the connection of the former with star-worship. In the Iranian languages we find a close radical resemblance to Ashtoreth and Ishtar in the Persian, Zend *stara*, Sansk. *stra*, ἀστήρ, *stern*, all equivalent to our "star." This derivation confirms our opinion that the high nature-worship of the Babylonians and Assyrians was of Aryan origin. As no other Canaanitish divinities are noticed in Scripture, it seems probable that Baal and Ashtoreth were alone worshipped by the nations of Canaan. Among the neighboring tribes we find, besides these, other names of idols, and we have to inquire whether they apply to different idols or are merely different appellations.

Beginning with the Abrahamitic tribes, we find Molech, Malcham, or Milcom (Ëlˌmo µK;lˌ]mi µKod]m;), spoken of as the idol of the Ammonites. This name, in the first form, always has the article, and undoubtedly signifies the *king* (ËlˌMoh;, equivalent to ËlˌMoh), for it is indifferently used as a proper name and as an appellative with a suffix (comp. <24901>Jeremiah 49:1, 3, with <30101>Amos 1:15). Milcom is from Molech or its root, with µ formative, and Malcham is probably a dialectic variation, if the points are to be relied upon. Molech was regarded by the Ammonites as their king. When David captured Rabbah, we are told that "he took Malcham's crown from off his head, the weight whereof [was] a talent of gold with the precious stones: and it was [set] on David's head" (<10230>2 Samuel 12:30; comp. <13202>1 Chronicles 20:2). The prophets speak of this idol as ruler of the children of Ammon, and doomed to go into captivity with his priests and princes (<24901>Jeremiah 49:1, 3; <30101>Amos 1:15). The worship of Molech was performed at high places, and children were sacrificed to him by their parents, being cast into fires. This horrible practice prevailed at Carthage, where children were sacrificed to their chief divinity, Baal, called at Tyre "Melcarth, lord (Baal) of Tyre" rx l[b trql m (Inscr. Melit. Biling. ap. Gesen. *Lex.* s.v. lxb), the first of which words signifies *king of the city*, for trq,ËlˌM, There can therefore be no doubt that Molech was a local form of the chief idol of Canaan, and it is by no means certain that this

name was limited to the Ammonitish worship, as we shall see in speaking of the idolatry of the Israelites in the Desert.

We know for certain of but one Moabitish divinity, as of but one Ammonitish. Chemosh appears to have held the same place as Molech, although our information respecting him is less full. Moab was the "people of Chemosh" (<0212>Numbers 21:29; <2486>Jeremiah 48:46), and Chemosh was doomed to captivity with his priests and princes (<2487>Jeremiah 48:7). In one place Chemosh is spoken of as the god of the king of the children of Ammon, whom Jephthah conquered (<0712>Judges 11:24); but it is to be remarked that the cities held by this king, which Jephthah took, were not originally Ammonitish, and were apparently claimed as once held by the Moabites (2126; comp. <0212>Numbers 21:23-30); so that at this time Moab and Ammon were probably united, or the Ammonites ruled by a Moabitish chief. The etymology of Chemosh is doubtful, but it is clear that he was distinct from Molech. There is no positive trace of the cruel rites of the idol of the Ammonites, and it is unlikely that the settled Moabites should have had the same savage disposition as their wild brethren on the north. There is, however, a general resemblance in the regal character assigned to both idols and their solitary position. Chemosh, therefore, like Molech, was probably a form of Baal. Both tribes appear, to have had other idols, for we read of the worship, by the Israelites, of "the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon" (<0710>Judges 10:6); but, as there are other plurals in the passage, it is possible that this maybe a general expression. Yet, in saying this, we do not mean to suggest that there was any monotheistic form of Canaanitish idolatry. There is some difficulty in ascertaining whether Baal-Peor, or Peor, was a Moabitish idol. The Israelites, while encamped at Shittim, were seduced by the women of Moab and Midian, and joined them in the worship of Baal-Peor. There is no notice of any later instance of this idolatry. It seems, therefore, not to have been national to Moab, and, if so, it may have been borrowed, and Midianitish, or else local, and Canaanitish. The former idea is supported by the apparent connection of prostitution, even of women of rank, with the worship of Baal-Peor, which would not have been repugnant to the pagan Arabs; the latter finds some support in the name Shittim, *the acacias*, as though the place had its name from some acacias sacred to Baal, and, moreover, we have no certain instance of the application of the name of Baal to any non-Canaanitish divinity. Had such vile worship as was

probably that of Baal-Peor been national in Moab, it is most unlikely that David would have been on very friendly terms with a Moabitish king.

The Philistine idolatry is connected with that of Canaan, although it has peculiarities of its own, which are indeed so strong that it may be questioned whether it is entirely or even mainly derived from the Canaanitish source. At Ekron, Baal-zebub was worshipped, and had a temple, to which Ahaziah, the wicked son of Ahab, sent to inquire. This name means either *the lord of the fly*, or *Baal the fly*. It is generally held that he was worshipped as a driver-away of flies, but we think it more probable that some venomous fly was sacred to him. The use of the term Baal is indicative of a connection with the Canaanitish system. The national divinity of the Philistines seems, however, to have been Dagon, to whom there were temples at Gaza and at Ashdod, and the general character of whose worship is evident in such traces as we observe in the names Caphar-Dagon, near Jamnia, and Beth-Dagon, the latter applied to two places, one in Judah and the other in Asher. The derivation of the name Dagon, ˆ/gD; as that of a fish-god, is from gD; *a fish*. Gesenius considers it a diminutive," little fish," used by way of endearment and honor *(Thes.* s.v.), but this is surely hazardous. Dagon was represented as a man with the tail of a fish. There can be no doubt that he was connected with the Canaanitish system, as Derceto or Atargatis, the same as Ashtoreth, was worshipped under a like mixed shape at Ashkelon *(*αὕτη δὲ τὸμὲν πρόσωπον ἔχει γυναικός, τὸδ ἄλλο σῶμα πᾶν ἰχθύος, Diod. Sic. ii, 4). In form he is the same as the Assyrian god supposed to correspond to the planet Saturn. The house of Dagon at Gaza, which Samson overthrew, must have been very large, for about 3000 men and women then assembled on its roof. It had two principal, if not only, pillars in the midst, between which Samson was placed and was seen by the people on the roof. The inner portion of some of the ancient Egyptian temples consisted of a hypsethral hall, supported by two or more pillars, and inner chambers. The overthrow of these pillars would bring down the stone roof of the hall, and destroy all persons beneath or upon it, without necessarily overthrowing the sidewalls.

The idolatry of the Phoenicians is not spoken of in the Bible. From their inscriptions and the statements of profane authors we learn that this nation worshipped Baal and Ashtoreth. The details of their worship will be spoken of in the article PHOENICIA.

Syrian idols are mentioned in a few places in Scripture. Tammuz, whom the women of Israel lamented, is no doubt Adonis, whose worship implies that of Astarte or Ashtoreth. Rimmon, who appears to have been the chief divinity of the Syrian kings ruling at Damascus, may, if his name signifies *high* (from רמם), be a local form of Baal, who, as the sun-god, had a temple at the great Syrian city Heliopolis, now called Baalbek.

The book of Job, which, whatever its date, represents a primitive state of society, speaks of cosmic worship as though it was practiced in his country, Idumaea or northern Arabia. "If I beheld a sun when it shined, or a splendid moon progressing, and my heart were secretly enticed, and my hand touched my mouth, surely this [were] a depravity of judgment, for I should have denied God above" (31:26-28). See Poole, *Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2nd ed. p. 184. This evidence is important in connection with that of the ancient prevalence of cosmic worship in Arabia, and that of its practice by some of the later kings of Judah.-Kitto.

4. Much indirect evidence on this subject might be supplied by an investigation of *proper names. Mr.* Layard has remarked, "According to a custom existing from time immemorial in the East, the name of the supreme deity was introduced into the names of men. This custom prevailed from the banks of the Tigris to the Phoenician colonies beyond the Pillars of Hercules; and we recognize in the Sardanapalus of the Assyrians, and the Hannibal of the Carthaginians, the identity of the religious system of the two nations, as widely distinct in the time of their existence as in their geographical position" *(Nineveh,* 2, 450). The hint which he has given can be but briefly followed out here. Traces of the sun worship of the ancient Canaanites remain in the nomenclature of their country. Beth-Shemesh, "house of the sun;" En-Shemesh, "spring of the sun," and Ir-Shemesh, "city of the son," whether they be the original Canaanitish names or their Hebrew renderings, attest the reverence paid to the source of light and heat, the symbol of the fertilizing power of nature. Samson. the Hebrew national hero, took his name from the same luminary, and was born in a mountain village above the modern 'Ain Shems (En-Shemesh: Thomson, *The Land and the Book,* 2, 361). The name of Baal, the sun-god, is one of the most common occurrence in compound words, and is often associated with places consecrated to his worship, and of which, perhaps, he was the tutelary deity. Bamoth-Baal, "the high places of Baal;" Baal-Hermon, Beth-Baal-Meon, Baal-Gad, Baal-Hamon, in which the compound names of the sun god of Phoenicia and Egypt are

associated, Baal-Tamar, and many others, are instances of this. [That temples in Syria, dedicated to the several divinities, did transfer their names to the places where they stood, is evident from the testimony of Lucian, an Assyrian himself. His derivation of Hiera from the temple of the Assyrian Hera shows that he was familiar with the circumstance *(De Dea Syr.* c. 1). Baisampsa (=Bethshemesh), a town of Arabia, derived its name from the sun-worship (Vossius, *De Theol. Gent.* 2, c. 8), like Kir-Heres (<24831>Jeremiah 48:31) of Moab.] Nor was the practice confined to the names of places: proper names are found with the same element. Esh-baal, Ish-baal, etc., are examples. The Amorites, whom Joshua did not drive cut. dwelt on Mount Heres, in Aijalon, "the mountain of the sun." *SEE TIAINATH-HERES*. Here and there we find traces of the attempt made by the Hebrews, on their conquest of the country, to extirpate idolatry. Thus Baalah or Kirjath-Baal, "the town of Baal," became Kirjath-Jearim, "the town of forests" (<061560>Joshua 15:60). The Moon. Astarte or Ashtaroth, gave her name to a city of Bashan (<061312>Joshua 13:12, 31), and it is not improbable that the name Jericho may have been derived from being associated with the worship of this goddess. *SEE JERICHO*. Nebo, whether it be the name under which the Chaldaeans worshipped the Moon or the planet Mercury, enters into many compounds: Nebu-zaradan, Samgarnebo, and the like. Bel is found in Belshazzar, Belteshazzar, and others. Were Baladan of Shemitic origin, it would probably be derived from Baal-Adon, or Adonis, the Phoenician deity to whose worship <242218>Jeremiah 22:18 seems to refer; but it has more properly been traced to an Indo-Germanic root. Hadad, Hadadezer, Benhadad are derived from the tutelar deity of the Syrians, and in Nergalsharezer we recognize the god of the Cushites. Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab, appears in Carchemish, and Peor in Beth-Peor. Malcom, a name which occurs but once, and then of a Moabite by birth, may have been connected with Molech and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites. A glimpse of star-worship may be seen in the name of the city Chesil, the Shemitic Orion, and the month Chisleu, without recognizing in Rahab "the glittering fragments of the sea-snake trailing across the northern sky." It would, perhaps, be going too far to trace in Engedi, "spring of the kid," any connection with the goat-worship of Mendes, or any relics of the wars of the giants in Rapha and Rephaim. Furst, indeed, recognises in Gedi,Venus or Astarte, the goddess of fortune, and identical with Gad *(Handw. s.* t.). But there are fragments of ancient idolatry in other names in which it is not so palpable. Ishbosheth is identical with Eshbaal, and Jerubbesheth with Jerubbaal, and Mephibosheth and

Meribbaal are but two names for one person (comp. <241113>Jeremiah 11:13). The worship of the Syrian Rimmon appears in the names HadadRimmon, and Tabrimmon; and if, as some suppose, it be derived from ˆ/Mr,æ *Rimmon*, "a pomegranate-tree," we may connect it with the towns of the same name in Judah and Benjamin, with En-Rimmon and the prevailing tree-worship. It is impossible to pursue this investigation to any length: the hints which have been thrown out may prove suggestive. See each of these names in its place.

5. *Idolatrous Usages.* — Mountains and high places were chosen spots for offering sacrifice and incense to idols (<111107>1 Kings 11:7; 14:23), and the retirement of gardens and the thick shade of woods offered great attractions to their worshippers (<121604>2 Kings 16:4; <230129>Isaiah 1:29; <280413>Hosea 4:13). It was the ridge of Carmel which Elijah selected as the scene of his contest with the priests of Baal, fighting with them the battle of Jehovah as it were on their own ground. *SEE CARMEL*. Carmel was regarded by the Roman historians as a sacred mountain of the Jews (Tacit. *Hist.* 2, 78; Sueton. *Vesp.* 7). The host of heaven was worshipped on the housetop (<122312>2 Kings 23:12; <243918>Jeremiah 19:3; 32:29; <360105>Zephaniah 1:5). In describing the sun worship of the Nabataei, Strabo (16, 784) mentions two characteristics which strikingly illustrate the worship of Baal. They built their altars on the roofs of houses, and offered on them incense and libations daily. On the wall of his city, in the sight of the besieging armies of Israel and Edom, the king of Moab offered his eldest son as a burnt offering. The Persians, who worshipped the sun under the name of Mithra (Strabo, 15:732), sacrificed on an elevated spot, but built no altars or images. *SEE MOUNT*.

The priests of the false worship are sometimes designated Chemarim, a word of Syriac origin, to which different meanings have been assigned. It is applied to the non-Levitical priests who burnt incense on the high places (<122305>2 Kings 23:5) as well as to the priests of the calves (<280105>Hosea 10:5); and the corresponding word is used in the Peshito (<071830>Judges 18:30) of Jonathan and his descendants, priests to the tribe of Dan, and in the Targum of Onkelos (<014722>Genesis 47:22) of the priests of Egypt. The Rabbis, followed by Gesenius, have derived it from a root signifying "to be black," and without any authority assert that the name was given to idolatrous priests from the black vestments which they wore. But white was the distinctive color in the priestly garments of all nations from India to Gaul, and black was only worn when they sacrificed to the subterranean

gods (Bahr, *Symb.* 2, 87, etc.). That a special dress was adopted by the Baal-worshippers, as well as by the false prophets ‘(<38134>Zechariah 13:4), is evident from <12210>2 Kings 10:22 (where the rendering should be *“the* apparel”): the vestments were kept in an apartment of the idol temple, under the charge probably of one of the inferior priests. Micah’s Levite was provided with appropriate robes (<07171>Judges 17:11). The “foreign apparel” mentioned in <36108>Zephaniah 1:8, doubtless refers to a similar dress, adopted by the Israelites in defiance of the sumptuary law in <04157>Numbers 15:37-40. *SEE CHEMIARIM*.

In addition to the priests, there were other persons intimately connected with idolatrous rites, and the impurities from which they were inseparable. Both men and women consecrated themselves to the service of idols: the former as µyvdq] *kedeshim,* for which there is reason to believe the A.V. (<05237>Deuteronomy 23:17, etc.) has not given too harsh an equivalent; the latter as t/vdq]*kedeshoth,* who wove shrines for Astarte (<12307>2 Kings 23:7), and resembled the ἑταίραι of Corinth, of whom Strabo (8, 378) says there were more than a thousand attached to the temple of Aphrodite. Egyptian prostitutes consecrated themselves to Isis (Juvenal, 6:489; 9:22-24). The same class of women existed among the Phoenicians, Armenians, Lydians, and Babylonians (Herod. 1, 93, 199; Strabo, 11:p. 532; Epist. of Jerem. ver. 43). They are distinguished from the public prostitutes (<28414>Hosea 4:14), and associated with the performances of sacred rites, just as in Strabo (12, p. 559) we find the two classes co-existing at Comana, the Corinth of Pontus, much frequented by pilgrims to the shrine of Aphrodite. The wealth thus obtained flowed into the treasury of the idol temple, and against such a practice the injunction in <05218>Deuteronomy 23:18 is directed. Dr. Maitland, anxious to defend the moral character of Jewish women, has with much ingenuity attempted to show that a meaning foreign to their true sense has been attached to the words above mentioned; and that, though closely associated with idolatrous services, they do not indicate such foul corruption *(Essay on False Worship).* But if, as Movers, with great appearance of probability, has conjectured *(Phon.* 1, 679), the class of persons alluded to was composed of foreigners, the Jewish women in this respect need no such advocacy. That such customs existed among’ foreign nations there is abundant evidence to prove (Lucian, *De Syra Dea,* c. 5); and from the juxtaposition of prostitution and the idolatrous rites against which the laws in Leviticus 19 are aimed, it is probable that, next to its immorality, one main reason why it was visited

with such stringency was its connection with idolatry (compare 1 Corinthians 6:9). *SEE HARLOT*.

But besides these accessories there were the ordinary rites of worship which idolatrous systems had in common with the religion of the Hebrews. Offering burnt sacrifices to the idol gods (2 Kings 5:17), burning incense in their honor (1 Kings 11:8), and bowing down in worship before their images (1 Kings 19:18) were the chief parts of their ritual, and, from their very analogy with the ceremonies of true worship, were more seductive than the grosser forms. Nothing can be stronger or more positive than the language in which these ceremonies were denounced by Hebrew law. Every detail of idol-worship was made the subject of a separate enactment, and many of the laws, which in themselves seem trivial and almost absurd, receive from this point of view their true significance. We are told by Maimonides (Mror. *Veb.* c. 12) that the prohibitions against sowing a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments of mixed material, were directed against the practices of idolaters, who attributed a kind of magical influence to the mixture (Leviticus 19:19; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* 2, 18). Such, too, were the precepts which forbade that the garments of the sexes should be interchanged (Deuteronomy 23:5; Maimonides, *De Idol. 12,* 9). According to Macrobius *(Sat.* 3. 8), other Asiatics, when they sacrificed to their Venus, changed the dress of the sexes. The priests of Cybele appeared in women's clothes, and used to mutilate themselves (Creuzer, *Symbo* 2, 34,42): the same custom was observed "by the Ithyphalli in the rites of Bacchus, and by the Athenians in their Ascophoria" (Young, *Idol. Corinthians in Rel.* 1, 105; comp. Lucian, *De Dea Syra,* c. 15). To preserve the Israelites from contamination, they were prohibited for three years after their conquest of Canaan from eating of the fruit-trees of the land, whose cultivation had been attended with magical rites (Leviticus 19:23). They were forbidden to "round the corner of the head," and to "mar the corner of the beard" (Leviticus 19:27), as the Arabians did in honor of their gods (Herod. 3:8; 4:175). Hence the phrase hapeyxwtexq](literally), "shorn of the corner," is especially applied to idolaters (Jeremiah 9:26; 25:23). Spencer *(De Leg. Hebr.* 2, 9, § 2) explains the law forbidding the offering of honey (Leviticus 2, 11) as intended to oppose an idolatrous practice. Strabo describes the Magi as offering in all their sacrifices libations of oil mixed with honey and milk (15, p. 733) Offerings in which honey was an ingredient were made to the inferior deities and the dead (Homer, *Od. 10,* 519; Porph. *De Antr. Nymph.*

c. 17). So also the practice of eating the flesh of sacrifices “over the blood” (<19926>Leviticus 19:26; <26625>Ezekiel 33:25, 26) was, according to Maimonides, common among the Zabii. Spencer gives a double reason for the prohibition: that it was a rite of divination, and divination of the worst kind, a species of necromancy by which they attempted to raise the spirits of the dead (comp. Horace, *Sat.* 1, 8). There are supposed to be allusions to the practice of necromancy in <23504>Isaiah 65:4, or, at any rate, to superstitious rites in connection with the dead. The grafting of one tree upon another was forbidden, because among idolaters the process was accompanied by gross obscenity (Maimon. *Mor. Neb.* c. 12). Cutting the flesh for the dead (<19928>Leviticus 19:28; <11818>1 Kings 18:28), and making a baldness between the eyes (<05401>Deuteronomy 14:1), were associated with idolatrous rites, the latter being a custom among the Syrians (Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 2, 158 note). The thrice repeated and much vexed passage, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk” (<02319>Exodus 23:19; 34:26; <05421>Deuteronomy 14:21), interpreted by some as a precept of humanity, is explained by Cudworth in a very different manner. He quotes from a Karaite commentary which he had seen in MS.: “It was a custom of the ancient heathens, when they had gathered in all their fruit, to take a kid and boil it in the dam’s mill, and then in a magical way go about and besprinkle with it all the trees, and fields, and gardens, and orchards; thinking by this means they should make them fructify, and bring forth again more abundantly the following year” *(On the Lord’s Supper,* c. 2). Dr. Thomson mentions a favorite dish among the Arabs called *lebn immrs,* to which he conceives allusion is made *(The Land and the Book,* 1, 135). The law which regulated clean and unclean meats (<03223>Leviticus 20:23-26) may be considered both as a sanitary regulation and also as having a tendency to separate the Israelites from the surrounding idolatrous nations. It was with the same object, in the opinion of Michaelis, that while in the wilderness they were prohibited from killing any animal for food without first offering it to Jehovah *(Laws of Moses,* art. 203). The mouse, one of the unclean animals of Leviticus (11, 29), was sacrificed by the ancient Magi (<23667>Isaiah 66:17; Movers, *Phon.* 1, 219). It may have been some such reason as that assigned by Lewis *(Orig. Hebr.* 5, 1), that the dog was the symbol of an Egyptian deity, which gave rise to the prohibition in <05518>Deuteronomy 23:18. Movers says (1, 404) the dog was offered in sacrifice to Moloch, as swine to the moon and Dionysus by the Egyptians, who afterwards ate of the flesh (Herod. 3:47; <23504>Isaiah 65:4). Eating of the things offered was a necessary appendage to the

sacrifice (compare <12B12>Exodus 18:12; 32:6; 34:15; <04E12>Numbers 25:2, etc.). Among the Persians the victim was eaten by the worshippers, and the soul alone left for the god (Strabo, 15:732). “Hence it is that the idolatry of the Jews in worshipping other gods is so often described synecdochically under the notion of feasting. <23507>Isaiah 57:7, ‘Upon a high and lofty mountain thou hast *set thy bed*, and thither wentest thou up to offer sacrifice;’ for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie down on beds or couches. <26234>Ezekiel 23:41; Amos 2, 8, They laid themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge by every altar,’ i.e. laid themselves down to eat of the sacrifice that was offered on the altar; compare <26811>Ezekiel 8:11 (Cudworth, *ut supra*, c. 1; comp. <46810>1 Corinthians 8:10). The Israelites were forbidden “to print any mark upon them” (<31928>Leviticus 19:28), because it was a custom of idolaters to brand upon their flesh some symbol of the deity they worshipped, as the ivy-leaf of Bacchus (3 Macc. 2:29). According to Lucian *(De Dea Syra*, 59), all the Assyrians wore marks of this kind on their necks and wrists (comp. <23405>Isaiah 44:5; <48617>Galatians 6:17; <66401>Revelation 14:1, 11). Many other practices of false worship are alluded to, and made the subjects of rigorous prohibition, but none are more frequently or more severely denounced than those which peculiarly distinguished the worship, of Molech. It has been attempted to deny that the worship of this idol was polluted by the foul stain of human sacrifice, but the allusions are too plain and too pointed to admit of reasonable doubt (<05231>Deuteronomy 12:31; <12301>2 Kings 3:27; <24731>Jeremiah 7:31; <19A637>Psalm 106:37; <26239>Ezekiel 23:39). Nor was this practice confined to the rites of Molech; it extended to those of Baal (<24905>Jeremiah 19:5), and the king of Moab (<12301>2 Kings 3:27) offered his son as a burnt-offering to his god Chemosh. The Phoenicians, we are told by Porphyry *(De Abstin.* 2, c. 56), on occasions of great national calamity sacrificed to Kronos one of their dearest friends. Some allusions to this custom may be seen in <33607>Micah 6:7. Kissing the images of the gods (<11918>1 Kings 19:18; <28302>Hosea 13:2), hanging votive offerings in their temples (<09310>1 Samuel 31:10), and carrying them to battle (<10521>2 Samuel 5:21), as the Jews of Maccabseus’s army did with the things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites (2 Macc. 12:40), are usages connected with idolatry which are casually mentioned, though not made the objects of express legislation. But soothsaying, interpretation of dreams, necromancy, witchcraft, magic, and other forms of divination, are alike forbidden (<05809>Deuteronomy 18:9; <12002>2 Kings 1:2; <23504>Isaiah 65:4; <26221>Ezekiel 21:21). The history of other nations-and, indeed, the too common practice of the lower class of the population of Syria at the

present day-shows us that such a statute as that against bestiality (<03B23>Leviticus 18:23) was not unnecessary (comp. Herod. 2, 46; <45126>Romans 1:26). Purificatory rites in connection with idol-worship, and eating of forbidden food, were visited with severe retribution (<23667>Isaiah 66:17). It is evident, from the context of <26817>Ezekiel 8:17, that the rotaries of the sun, who worshipped with their faces to the east (ver. 16), and "put the branch to their nose," did so in observance of some idolatrous rite. Movers *(Phoen.* 1, 66) unhesitatingly affirms that the allusion is to the branch Barsom, the holy branch of the Magi (Strabo, 15:p. 733), while Havernick *(Comm. zu Ezech.* p. 117), with equal confidence, denies that the passage supports such an inference, and renders, having in view the lament of the women for Tammuz, "Sie entsenden den Trauergesang zu ihren Zorn." The waving of a myrtle branch, says Maimonides *(De Idol. 6:*2), accompanied the repetition of a magical formula in incantations. An illustration of the use of boughs in worship will be found in the Greek *ikrTropia* (Esch. *Eun.* 43; *Suppl.* 192; *Schol.* on Aristoph. *Plut.* 383; Porphyr. *De Ant. Nymph.* c. 33). For detailed accounts of idolatrous ceremonies, reference must be made to the articles upon the several idols. *SEE SACRIFICE*.

IV. *History of Idolatry among the Jews.*-

1. The first undoubted allusion to idolatry or idolatrous customs in the Bible is in the account of Rachel's stealing her father's teraphim (<01319>Genesis 31:19), a relic of the worship of other gods, whom the ancestors of the Israelites served "on the other side of the river, in old time" (<06402>Joshua 24:2). By these household deities Laban was guided, and these he consulted as oracles (yTæjinæ <01307>Genesis 30:27, A.V. "learned by experience"), though without entirely losing sight of the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, to whom he appealed when occasion offered (<01353>Genesis 31:53), while he was ready, in the presence of Jacob, to acknowledge the benefits conferred upon him by Jehovah (<01307>Genesis 30:27). Such, indeed, was the character of most of the idolatrous worship of the Israelites. Like the Cuthsan colonists in Samaria, who "feared Jehovah and served their own gods" (<12733>2 Kings 17:33), they blended in a strange manner a theoretical belief in the true God with the external reverence which, in different stages of their history, they were led to pay to the idols of the nations by whom they were surrounded. For this species of false worship they seem, at all events, to have had an incredible

propension. On their journey from Shechem to Bethel, the family of Jacob put away from among them “the gods of *the foreigner:”* not the teraphim of Laban, but the gods of the Canaanites through whose land they passed and the amulets and charms which were worn as the appendages of their worship (<01512>Genesis 35:2,4). *SEE JACOB.*

During their long residence in Egypt, the country of symbolism, they defiled themselves with the idols of the land, and it was long before the taint was removed (<06414>Joshua 24:14; <26107>Ezekiel 20:7). To these gods Moses, as the herald of Jehovah, flung down the gauntlet of defiance (Kurtz, *Gesch. d. Alt. B.* 2, 39), and the plagues of Egypt smote their symbols (<04304>Numbers 33:4). Yet, with the memory of their deliverance fresh in their minds, their leader absent, the Israelites clamored for some visible shape in which they might worship the God who had brought them up out of Egypt (Exodus 32). The Israelites, as dwellers in the most outlying and separate tract of the Shemitic part of Lower Egypt, are more likely to lave followed the corruptions of the Shepherd strangers than those of the Egyptians, more especially as, saving Joseph, Moses, and not improbably Aaron and Miriam, they seem to have almost universally preserved the manners of their former wandering life. There is scarcely a trace of Egyptian influence beyond that seen in the names of Moses and Miriam, and perhaps of Aaron also, for the only other name besides the former two that is certainly Egyptian, and may be reasonably referred to this period, that of Harnepher, evidently the Egyptian HAR-NEFRU, “Horus the good,” in the genealogies of Asher (<130736>1 Chronicles 7:36), probably marks an Egyptian taken by marriage into the tribe of Asher, whether a proselyte or not we cannot attempt to decide. There has been a difference of opinion as to the golden calf, some holding that it was made to represent God himself, others maintaining that it was only an imitation of an Egyptian idol. We first observe that this and Jeroboam’s golden calves are shown to have been identical in the intention with which they were made, by the circumstance that the Israelites addressed the former as the God who had brought them out of Egypt (<023204>Exodus 32:4,8), and that Jeroboam proclaimed the same of his idols (<111228>1 Kings 12:28). We next remark that Aaron called the calf not only god, but the LORD (<023205>Exodus 32:5); that in the Psalms it is said “they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth hay” (<19A620>Psalm 106:20); that no one of the calf-worshipping kings and princes of Israel bears any name connected with idolatry, while many have names compounded with the most sacred name

of God; and that in no place is any foreign divinity connected with calf-worship in the slightest degree. The adoption of such an image as the golden calf, however, shows the strength of Egyptian associations, else how would Aaron have fixed upon so ignoble a form as that of the God who had brought Israel out of Egypt? Only a mind thoroughly accustomed to the profound respect paid in Egypt to the sacred bulls, and especially to Apis and Minevis, could have hit upon so strange a representation; nor could any people who had not witnessed the Egyptian practices have found, as readily as did the Israelites, the fulfillment of their wishes in such an image. The feast that Aaron celebrated, when, after eating and drinking, the people arose, sang, and danced naked before the idol, is strikingly like the festival of the finding of Apis, which was celebrated with feasting and dancing, and also, apparently, though this custom does not seem to have been part of the public festivity, with indecent gestures. *SEE GOLDEN CALF*. The golden calf was not the only idol which the Israelites worshipped in the Desert. The prophet Amos speaks of others. In the Masoretic text the passage is as follows: “But ye bare the tent [or *tabernacle]* of your king and Chiun your images, the star of your gods [or YOUR God], which ye made for yourselves” (5, 26). The Sept. has Μολόχ for “your king,” as though their original Heb. had been µK;l]mi instead of µkK]l]mi, and ῾Ραιφάν for Chiun, besides a transposition.’ ‘In the Acts the reading is almost the same as that of the Sept., “Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them” 107:43). We cannot here discuss the probable causes of these differences except of the more important ones, the substitution of Moloch for “your king,” and Raiphan or Remphan for Chiun. It should be observed, that if the passage related to Ammonitish worship, nothing would be more likely than that Molech should have been spoken of by an appellative, in which case a strict rendering of the Masoretic text would read as does the A.V.; a freer could follow the Sept. and Acts; but, as there is no reference to the Ammonites or even Canaanites, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Sept. followed a text in which, as above suggested, the reading was µK;l]mi, Malcham, or “your king.” The likelihood of this being the true reading must depend upon the rest of the passage. Remphan and Chiun are at once recognized as two foreign divinities worshipped together in Egypt, RENPU, probably pronounced REIPU, and KEN the former a god represented as of the type of the Shemites, and apparently connected with war, the latter a goddess

represented naked standing upon a lion. They were worshipped with KHEM, the Egyptian god of productiveness, and the foreign war-goddess ANATA. Excluding KHEMI, who is probably associated with KEN from her being connected, as we shall see, with productiveness, these names, RENPU, KEN, and ANATA, are clearly not, except in orthography, Egyptian. We can suggest no origin for the name of RENPU The goddess KEN, as naked, would be connected with the Babylonian Mylitta, and as standing on a lion, with a goddess so represented in rock-sculptures at Maltheivyeh, near Nineveh. The former similarity connects her with generation; the latter, perhaps, does so likewise. If we adopt this supposition, the name KEN may be traced to a root connected with generation found in many varieties in the Iranian family, and not out of that family. It may be sufficient to cite the Greek γίν-ομαι, γυν-ή: she would thus be the goddess of productiveness. ANATA is the Persian Anaitis. We have shown earlier that the Babylonian high nature-worship seems to have been of Aryan origin. In the present case we trace an Aryan idolatry connected, from the mention of a star, with high nature-worship. If we accept this explanation, it becomes doubtful that Molech is mentioned in the passage, and we may rather suppose that some other idol, to whom a kingly character was attributed, is intended. Here we must leave this difficult point of OUT inquiry, only summing up that this false worship was evidently derived from the shepherds in Egypt, and may possibly indicate the Aryan origin of at least one of these tribes, almost certainly its own origin, directly or indirectly, from an Aryan source.

The next was a temporary apostasy. The charms of the daughters of Moab, as Balaam's bad genius foresaw, were potent for evil: the Israelites were "yoked to BaalPeor" in the trammels of his fair worshippers, and the character of their devotions is not obscurely hinted at (Numbers 25). The great and terrible retribution which followed left so deep an impress upon the hearts of the people that, after the conquest of the promised land, they looked with an eye of terror upon any indication of defection from the worship of Jehovah, and denounced as idolatrous a memorial so slight as the altar of the Reubenites at the passage of Jordan (⁰⁶Joshua 22:16).

2. It is probable that during the wanderings, and under the strong rule of Joshua, the idolatry learnt in Egypt was so destroyed as to be afterwards utterly forgotten by the people. But in entering Palestine they found themselves among the monuments and associations of another false religion, less attractive indeed to the reason than that of Egypt, which still

taught, notwithstanding the wretched fetishism that it supported, some great truths of man's present and future, but of a religion which, in its deification of nature, had a strong hold on the imagination. The genial sun, the refreshing moon, the stars, at whose risings or settings fell the longed-for rains, were naturally reverenced in that land of green hills and valleys, which were fed by the water of heaven. A nation thrown in the scene of such a religion and mixed with those who professed it, at that period of national life when impressions are most readily made, such a nation, albeit living while the recollection of the deliverance from Egypt and the wonders with which the Law was given was yet fresh, soon fell away into the practices that it was strictly enjoined to root out. In the first and second laws of the Decalogue, the Israelites were commanded to worship but one God, and not to make any image whatever to worship it, lest they and their children should fall under God's heavy displeasure. The commands were explicit enough. But not alone was idolatry thus clearly condemned: the Israelites were charged to destroy all objects connected with the religion of the inhabitants of Canaan. They were to destroy utterly all the heathen places of worship, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree." They were to "overthrow" the "altars" of the heathen, "break their pillars," "burn their groves, hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place" (Deuteronomy 12:2, 3), a passage we cite on account of the fullness of the enumeration. Had the conquered nations been utterly extirpated, their idolatry might have been annihilated at once. But soon after the lands had been apportioned, that separate life of the tribes began which was never interrupted, as far as history tells us, until the time of the kings. Divided, the tribes were unable to cope with the remnant of the Canaanites, and either dwelt with them on equal terms, reduced them to tribute, or became tributaries themselves. The Israelites were thus surrounded by the idolatry of Canaan; and since they were for the most part confined to the mountain and hilly districts, where its associations were strongest, they had but to learn from their neighbors how they had worshipped upon the high hills and under every green tree. From the use of plural forms, it is probable that the Baals and Ashtoreths of several towns or tribes were worshipped by the Israelites, as Baal-Peor had been, and Baalberith afterwards was. It does not seem, however that the people at once fell into heathen worship: the first step appears to have been adopting a corruption of the true religion.

During the lives of Joshua and the elders who outlived him, indeed, they kept true to their allegiance; but the generation following, who knew not Jehovah, nor the works he had done for Israel, swerved from the plain path of their fathers, and were caught in the toils of the foreigner (Judges 2). From this time forth their history becomes little more than a chronicle of the inevitable sequence of offence and punishment. “They provoked Jehovah to anger and the anger of Jehovah was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them” (⁰⁷⁰¹²Judges 2:12, 14). The narratives of the book of Judges, contemporaneous or successive, tell of the fierce struggle maintained against their hated foes, and how women forgot their tenderness and forsook their retirement to sing the song of victory over the oppressor. By turns, each conquering nation strove to establish the worship of its national god. During the rule of Midian, Joash, the father of Gideon, had an altar to Baal, and an Asherah (⁰⁷⁰⁶²Judges 6:25), though he proved but a lukewarm worshipper (ver. 31). Even Gideon himself gave occasion to idolatrous worship; yet the ephod which he made from the spoils of the Midianites was perhaps but a voice offering to the true God (⁰⁷⁰⁸⁷Judges 8:27). It is not improbable that the gold ornaments of which it was composed were in some way connected with idolatry (comp. ²³¹⁸Isaiah 3:18-24), and that, from their having been worn as amulets, some superstitious virtue was conceived to cling to them even in their new form. But, though in Gideon’s lifetime no overt act of idolatry was practiced, he was no sooner dead than the Israelites again returned to the service of the Baalim, and, as if in solemn mockery of the covenant made with Jehovah. chose from among them Baal-Berith, “Baal of the Covenant” (comp. Ζεὺς ὅρκιος), as the object of their special adoration (⁰⁷⁰⁸³Judges 8:33). Of this god we know only that his temple, probably of wood (⁰⁷⁰⁹⁹Judges 9:49), was a stronghold in time of need, and that his treasury was filled with the silver of the worshippers (9, 4). Nor were the calamities of foreign oppression confined to the land of Canaan. The tribes on the east of Jordan event astray after the idols of the land, and were delivered into the hands of the children of Ammon (⁰⁷¹⁰⁸Judges 10:8). But they put away from among them “the gods of the foreigner,” and with the baseborn Jephthah for their leader gained a signal victory over their oppressors. The exploits of Samson against the Philistines, though achieved within a narrower space and with less important results than those of his predecessors, fill a brilliant page in his country’s history. But the tale of his marvelous deeds is prefaced by that ever-recurring phrase, so mournfully familiar, “the children of Israel did evil again in the eyes of

Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines." Thus far idolatry is a national sin. The episode of Micah, in Judges 17, 18 sheds a lurid light on the secret practices of individuals, who, without formally renouncing Jehovah, though ceasing to recognize him as the theocratic king (<07706>Judges 17:6) linked with his worship the symbols of ancient idolatry. The house of God, or sanctuary, which Micah made in imitation of that at Shiloh, was decorated with an ephod and teraphim dedicated to God, and with a graven and molten image consecrated to some inferior deities (Selden, *De Dis Syris*, synt. 1, 2). It is a significant fact, showing how deeply rooted in the people was the tendency to idolatry, that a Levite, who, of all others, should have been most sedulous to maintain Jehovah's worship in its purity, was found to assume the office of priest to the images of Micah; and that this Levite, priest afterwards to the idols of Dan, was no other than Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. Tradition says that these idols were destroyed when the Philistines defeated the army of Israel and took from them the ark of the covenant of Jehovah (1 Samuel 4). The Danites are supposed to have carried them into the field, as the other tribes bore the ark, and the Philistines the images of their gods, when they went forth to battle (2 Samuel 5, 21; Lewis, *(Orig. Bebr.* 5, 9). But the *Seder Olnm Rabba* (c. 24) interprets "the captivity of the land" (<07730>Judges 18:30), of the captivity of Manasseh; and Benjamin of Tudela mistook the remains of later Gentile worship for traces of the altar or statue which Micah had dedicated, and which was worshipped by the tribe of Dan (Selden, *P, Dis Syr.* synt. 1, 2; Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 398). In later times the practice of secret idolatry was carried to greater lengths. Images were set up on the corn-floors, in the wine-vats, and behind the doors of private houses (<23708>Isaiah 57:8; <28901>Hosea 9:1, 2); and to check this tendency the statute in <05715>Deuteronomy 27:15 was originally promulgated. It is noticeable that they do not seem during this period to have generally adopted the religions of any but the Canaanites, although in one remarkable passage they are said, between the time of Jair and that of Jephthah, to have forsaken the Lord, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, Zidon, Moab, the children of Ammon, and the Philistines (<07106>Judges 10:6), as though there had then been an utter and profligate apostasy. The cause, no doubt, was that the Canaanitish worship was borrowed in a time of amity, and that but one Canaanitish oppressor is spoken of whereas the Abrahamites of the east of Palestine, and the Philistines, were almost always enemies of the Israelites. Each time of idolatry was punished by a servitude, each reformation followed by a deliverance. Speedily as the

nation returned to idolatry, its heart was fresher than that of the ten tribes which followed Jeroloam, and never seem to have had one thorough national repentance.

3. The notices of their great wars show that the enmity between the Philistines and the Israelites was toe great for any idolatry to be then borrowed from the former by the latter, though at an earlier time this was not the case. Under Samuel's administration a fast was held, and purificatory rites performed, to mark the public renunciation of idolatry (<1Sa 7:3-6>1 Samuel 7:3-6). Saul's family were, however, tainted, as it seems, with idolatry, for the names of Ishbosheth or Esh-baal, and Mephibosheth or Merib-baal, can scarcely have been given but in honor of Baal. From the circumstances of Michal's stratagem to save David, it seems not only that Saul's family kept teraphim, but, apparently, that they used them for purposes of divination, the Sept. having "liver" for 'pillow," as if the Hebr. had been dbK; instead of the present ryBK; *SEE PILLOW*. The circumstance of having teraphim, more especially if they were used for divination, lends especial force to Samuel's reproof of Saul (<1Sa 15:23>1 Samuel 15:23). During the reign of David idolatry in public is unmentioned, and no doubt was almost unknown. *SEE DAVID*.

The earlier days of Solomon were the happiest of the kingdom of Israel. The Temple worship was fully established, with the highest magnificence, and there was no excuse for that worship of God at high places which seems to have been before permitted on account of the constant distractions of the country. But the close of that reign was marked by an apostasy of which we read with wonder. Hitherto the people had been the sinners, their leaders reformers; this time the king, led astray by his many strange wives, perverted the people, and raised high places on the Mount of Corruption, opposite God's temple. He worshipped Ashtoreth, goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, building high places for the latter two, as well as for all the gods of his strange wives. Solomon, no doubt, was very tolerant, and would not prevent these women from following their native superstitions, even if they felt it a duty to burn their and his children before Molech. Foreign idolatry was openly imitated. Three of the summits of Olivet were crowned with the high places of Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Molech (<1Ki 11:7>1 Kings 11:7; <2Ki 23:13>2 Kings 23:13), and the fourth, in memory of his great apostasy, was branded with the opprobrious title of the "Mount of Corruption." Calamity speedily followed this great apostasy: the latter

years of Solomon were troubled by continual premonitions of those political reverses which were the inevitable penalty of this high treason against the theocracy. This is clearly brought out by the marked and frequent denunciations of the later prophets. *SEE SOLOMON*.

Rehoboam, the son of an Ammonitish mother, perpetuated the worst features of Solomon's idolatry (1 Kings 14:22-24); and in his reign was made the great schism in the national religion-when Jeroboam, fresh from his recollections of the Apis worship of Egypt, erected golden calves at Bethel and at Dan, and by this crafty state policy severed forever the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (1 Kings 12:26-33). To their use were temples consecrated and the service in their honor was studiously copied from the Mosaic ritual. High-priest himself, Jeroboam ordained priests from the lowest ranks (2 Chronicles 11:15); incense and sacrifices were offered, and a solemn festival appointed, closely resembling the feast of tabernacles (1 Kings 12:23, 33; comp. Amos 4:4, 5). *SEE JEROBOAM*. The worship of the calves, "the sin of Israel" (Hosea 10:8), which was apparently associated' with the goat-worship of Mendes (2 Chronicles 11:15; Herod. 2, 46) or of the ancient Zabii (Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* 5, 3), and the Asherim (1 Kings 14:15; A.V. "groves"), ultimately spread to the kingdom of Judah, and centered in Beersheba (Amos 5:5; 7:9). At what precise period it was introduced into the latter kingdom is not certain. The Chronicles tell us how Abijab taunted Jeroboam with his apostasy, while the less partial narrative in 1 Kings represents his own conduct as far from exemplary (1 Kings 15:3). Asa's sweeping reform spared not even the idol of his grandmother Maachah, and, with the exception of the high places, he removed all relics of idolatrous worship (1 Kings 15:12-14), with its accompanying impurities. His reformation wag completed by Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 17:6). See each king in alphabetical order. The successors of Jeroboam followed in his steps, till Ahab, who married a Zidonian princess, at her instigation (1 Kings 21:25) built a temple and altar to Baal, and revived all the abominations of the Amorites (1 Kings 21:26). For this he attained the bad pre-eminence of having done "more to provoke Jehovah, the God of Israel, to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him" (1 Kings 16:33). Compared with the worship of Baal, the worship of the calves was a venial offence, probably because it was morally less detestable, and also less anti-national (1 Kings 12:28; 2 Kings 10:28-31). *SEE ELIJAH*. Henceforth Baal-worship became so completely identified with the northern kingdom that it

is described as walking in the way or statutes of the kings of Israel (<12603>2 Kings 16:3; 17:8), as distinguished from the sin of Jeroboam, which ceased not till the Captivity (<12723>2 Kings 17:23), and the corruption of the ancient inhabitants of the land. The idolatrous priests became a numerous and important caste (<11819>1 Kings 18:19), living under the patronage of royalty, and fed at the royal table. The extirpation of Baal's priests by Elijah, and of his followers by Jehu (2 Kings 10), in which the royal family of Judah shared (<14207>2 Chronicles 22:7), was a death-blow to this form of idolatry in Israel, though other systems still remained (<12306>2 Kings 13:6). But, while Israel thus sinned and was punished, Judah was morally more guilty (<261651>Ezekiel 16:51). The alliance of Jehoshaphat with the family of Ahab transferred to the southern kingdom, during the reigns of his son and grandson, all the appurtenances of Baal-worship (<12818>2 Kings 8:18, 27). In less than ten years after the death of that king, in whose praise it is recorded that he "sought not the Baalim," nor walked "after the deed of Israel" (<14708>2 Chronicles 17:3, 4), a temple had been built for the idol, statues and altars erected, and priests appointed to minister in his service (2 Kings' 11:18). Jehoiada's vigorous measures checked the evil for a time, but his reform was incomplete, and the high places still remained, as in the days of Asa, a nucleus for any fresh system of idolatry (<12203>2 Kings 12:3). Much of this might be due to the influence of the king's mother, Zibiah of Beersheba, a place intimately connected with the idolatrous defection of Judah (<300814>Amos 8:14). After the death of Jehoiada, the princes prevailed upon Joash to restore at least some portion of his father's idolatry (<14218>2 Chronicles 24:18). The conquest of the Edomites by Amaziah introduced the worship of their gods, which had disappeared since the days of Solomon (<14514>2 Chronicles 25:14, 20). After this period, even the kings who did not lend themselves to the encouragement of false worship had to contend with the corruption which still lingered in the hearts of the people (<12535>2 Kings 15:35; <14702>2 Chronicles 27:2). Hitherto the temple had been kept pure. The statues of Baal and the other gods were worshipped in their own shrines; but Ahaz, who "sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him" (<14823>2 Chronicles 28:23), and built altars to them at every corner of Jerusalem, and high places in every city of Judah, replaced the brazen altar of burnt-offering by one made after the model of "*the* altar" of Damascus and desecrated it to his own uses (<12610>2 Kings 16:10-15).

The conquest of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser was for them the last scene of the drama of abominations which had been enacted uninterruptedly for

upwards of 250 years. In the northern kingdom no reformer arose to vary the long line of royal apostates; whatever was effected in the way of reformation was done by the hands of the people (<14310>2 Chronicles 31:1). But even in their captivity they helped to perpetuate the corruption. The colonists, whom the Assyrian conquerors placed in their stead in the cities of Samaria, brought with them their own gods, and were taught at Bethel, by a priest of the captive nation “the manner of the rod of the land, the lessons thus learnt resulting in a strange admixture of the calf-worship of Jeroboam with the homage paid to their national deities (<12724>2 Kings 17:24-41). Their descendants were ill consequence regarded with suspicion by the elders who returned from the captivity with Ezra, and their offers of assistance rejected (<15403>Ezra 4:3). *SEE SAMARITANS.*

The first act of Hezekiah on ascending the throne was the restoration and purification of the Temple, which had been dismantled and closed during the latter part of his father’s life (<14824>2 Chronicles 28:24; 29:3). The multitudes who flocked to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, so long in abeyance, removed the idolatrous altars of burnt-offering and incense erected by Ahaz (<14014>2 Chronicles 30:14). The iconoclastic spirit was not confined to Judah and Benjamin, but spread throughout Ephraim and Manasseh (<14310>2 Chronicles 31:1), and to all external appearance idolatry was extirpated. But the reform extended little below the surface (<232913>Isaiah 29:13). Among the leaders of the people there were many in high position who conformed to the necessities of the time (<232814>Isaiah 28:14), and under Manasseh’s patronage the false worship, which had been merely driven into obscurity, broke out with tenfold virulence. Idolatry of every form, and with all the accessories of enchantments, divination, and witchcraft, was again rife; no place was too sacred, no associations too hallowed, to be spared the contamination. If the conduct of Ahaz in erecting an altar in the temple court is open to a charitable construction, Manasseh’s was of no doubtful character. The two courts of the Temple were profaned by altars dedicated to the host of heaven, and the image of the Asherah polluted the holy place (<12107>2 Kings 21:7; <14307>2 Chronicles 33:7,15; comp. <243234>Jeremiah 32:34). Even in his late repentance he did not entirely destroy all traces of his former wrong. Tradition states that the remonstrances of the aged Isaiah (q.v.) only served to secure his own martyrdom (Gemara on *Yebamoth*, 4). The people still burned incense on the high places; but Jehovah was the ostensible object of their worship. The king’s son sacrificed to his father’s idols but was not associated with him in his

repentance, and in his short reign of two years restored all the altars of the Baalim and the images of the Asherah. With the death of Josiah ended the last effort to revive among the people a purer ritual, if not a purer faith. The lamp of David, which had long shed but a struggling ray, flickered for a while, and then went out in the darkness of Babylonian captivity. *SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF*.

It will be useful here to recapitulate the main varieties of the idolatry, which so greatly marred the religious character of this monarchical period of the Jewish state. It has been a question much debated whether the Israelites were ever so far given up to idolatry as to lose all knowledge of the true God. It would be hard to assert this of any nation, and still more difficult to prove. That there always remained among them a faithful few, who in the face of every danger adhered to the worship of Jehovah, may readily be believed, for even at a time when Baal-worship was most prevalent there were found seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed before his image (<111918>1 Kings 19:18). But there is still room for grave suspicion that among the masses of the people, though the idea of a supreme Being-of whom the images they worshipped were but the distorted representatives---was not entirely lost, it was so obscured as to be but dimly apprehended. And not only were the ignorant multitude thus led astray, but the priests, scribes, and prophets became leaders of the apostasy (Jeremiah 2-8). Warburton, indeed, maintained that they never formally renounced Jehovah, and that their defection consisted "in joining foreign worship and idolatrous ceremonies to the ritual of the true God" *(Die. Leg.* b. 5, § 3). But one passage in their history, though confessedly obscure, seems to point to a time when, under the rule of the judges, 'Israel for many days had no true God, and no teaching priest, and no law" (<140153>2 Chronicles 15:3). The correlative argument of Cudworth, who contends from the teaching of the Hebrew doctors and rabbis "that the pagan nations anciently, at least the intelligent amongst them, acknowledged one supreme God of the whole world, and that all other gods were but creatures and inferior ministers," is controverted by Mosheim *(Intell. Syst.* 1, 4, § 30, and notes). There can be no doubt that much of the idolatry of the Hebrews consisted in worshipping the true God under an image, such as the calves at Bethel and Dan (Josephus, *Ant. 8,* 8, 5; δαμάλεις ἐπωνύμους τῷ θεῷ*)*, and by associating his worship with idolatrous rites (<244105>Jeremiah 41:5) and places consecrated to idols (<121822>2 Kings 18:22). From the peculiarity of their position they were never

distinguished as the inventors of a new pantheon, nor did they adopt any one system of idolatry so exclusively as ever to become identified with it (so the Moabites with the worship of Chemosh (<042129>Numbers 21:29); but they no sooner came in contact with other nations than they readily adapted themselves to their practices, the old spirit of antagonism died rapidly away, and intermarriage was one step to idolatry.

a. Sun-worship, though mentioned with other kinds of high nature-worship, as in the enumeration of those suppressed by Josiah, seems to have been practiced alone as well as with the adoration of other heavenly bodies. In Ezekiel's remarkable vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem, he saw about four-and-twenty men between the porch and the altar of the Temple, with their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east, worshipping the sun (<260816>Ezekiel 8:16). Josiah had before this taken away 'the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord," and had "burned the chariots of the sun with fire" (<122311>2 Kings 23:11). The same part of the temple is perhaps here meant. There is nothing to show whether these were images or living horses. The horse was sacred to the sun among the Carthaginians, but the worship of the visible sun instead of an image looks rather like a Persian or an Arab custom. *SEE SUN*.

b. In the account of Josiah's reform we read of the abolition of the worship of Baal, the sun, the moon, Mazzaloth, also called Mazzaroth (<183832>Job 38:32), which we hold to be the mansions of the moon, *SEE ASTRONOMY*, and all the host of heaven (<122305>2 Kings 23:5). Manasseh is related to have served "all the host of heaven" (21:3). Jeremiah speaks of "the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah," as to be defiled, "because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods" (<241913>Jeremiah 19:13). In this prophet's time the people of Judah and Jerusalem, among other abominations, made cakes for "the queen of heaven," or "the worship of heaven:" a different form justifying the latter reading. The usual reading is Api, תכ,למ, which the Sept. once follows, the Vulg. always; some copies give תכאלמ, *worship,* that is, "a deity or goddess." The former reading seems preferable, and the context in two passages in Jeremiah shows that an abstract sense is not admissible (<244417>Jeremiah 44:17, 18, 19, 25). In Egypt, the remnant that fled after the murder of Gedaliah were warned by the prophet to abandon those

idolatrous practices for which their country and cities had been desolated. The men, conscious that their wives had burned incense to false gods in Egypt, declared that they would certainly burn incense and pour out drink-offerings to the queen of heaven, as they, their fathers, their kings, and their princes had done in a time of plenty, asserting that since they had left off these practices they had been consumed by the sword and by famine: for this a fresh doom was pronounced upon them (ch. 44). It is very difficult to conjecture what goddess can be here meant: Ashtoreth: would suit, but is never mentioned interchangeably; the moon must be rejected for the same reason. Here we certainly so a strong resemblance to Arab idolatry, which was wholly composed of cosmic worship and of fetishism, and in which the mansions of the moon were reverenced on account of their connection with seasons of rain. This system of cosmic worship may have been introduced from the Nabathaeans or Edomites of Petra, from the Sabians, or from other Arabs or Chaldmeans. *SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN*.

c. Two idols, *Gad,* dG; or Fortune, and *Meni,* ynem; or Fate, from hnm; *he* or *it divided, assigned, numbered,* are spoken of in a single passage in the later part of Isaiah (<236601>Isaiah 65:1). Gesenius, depending upon the theory of the post-Isaiah authorship of the later chapters of the prophet, makes these to be idols worshipped by the Jews in Babylonia, but it must be remarked that their names are not traceable in Babylonian and Assyrian mythology. Gesenius has, however, following Pococke *(Spec. Hist. Arabum,* p. 93), compared Meni with *Manah,* a goddess of the pagan Arabs, worshipped in the form of a stone between Mekkeh and El-Medineh by the tribes of Hudheyl and Khuzaah. But EI-Beydawi, though deriving the name of this idol from the root *mana,* "he cut," supposes it was thus called because victims were slain upon it *(Comment. in Coran.* ed. Fleischer, p. 293). This meaning certainly seems to disturb the idea that the two idols were identical, but the mention of the sword and slaughter as punishments of the idolaters who worshipped Gad and Meni is not to be forgotten. Gad may have been a Canaanitish form of Baal, if we are to judge from the geographical name Baal-gad of a place at the foot of Mount Hermon (<061117>Joshua 11:17; 12:7; 13:5). Perhaps the grammatical form of Meni may throw some light upon the origin of this idolatry. The worship of both idols resembles that of the cosmic divinities of the later kings of Judah. *SEE MEN*.

d. In Ezekiel's vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem he beheld a chamber of imagery in the Temple itself having "every form of creeping things, and

abominable beasts, and [or *even]* all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about," and seventy Israelitish elders offering incense (<26807>Ezekiel 8:7-12). This is so exact a description of an Egyptian sanctuary, with the idols depicted upon its walls, dimly lighted, and filled with incense-offering priests, that we cannot for a moment doubt that these Jews derived from Egypt their fetishism, for such this special worship appears mainly, if not wholly to have been. *SEE IMAGERY, CHAMBER OF*.

e. In the same vision the prophet saw women weeping for Tammuz (ver. 13, 14), known to be the same as Adonis, from whom the fourth month of the Syrian year was named. This worship was probably introduced by Ahaz from Syria. *SEE TAMMUZ*.

f. The *image of jealousy,* הקנאה צלם, spoken of in the same passage, which was placed in the Temple, has not been satisfactorily explained. The meaning may only that it was an image of-a false god, or there may be a play in the second part of the appellation upon the proper name. We cannot, however, suggest any name that might be thus intended. *SEE JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF*.

g. The brazen serpent, having become an object of idolatrous worship, was destroyed by Hezekiah (<121804>2 Kings 18:4). *SEE BRAZEN SERPENT*.

h. Moloch-worship was not only celebrated at the high place Solomon had made, but at Topheth, in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, where children were made to pass through the fire to the Ammonitish abomination.. This place, as well as Solomon's altars, Josiah defiled, and we read of no later worship of Moloch, Chemosh, and Ashtoroth. *SEE MOLOCH*.

i. For the supposed divinity גד of <23667>Isaiah 66:17 (compare Meier, *De uno deo Assyriorum,* Helmst. 1734), *SEE ACHR*).

The new population placed by the king of Assyria in the cities of Samaria adopted a strange mixture of religions. Terrified at the destruction by lions of some of their number, they petitioned the king of Assyria, and an Israelitish priest was sent to them. They then adopted the old worship at high places, and still served their own idols. The people of Babylon made Succothbenoth; the Cuthites, Nergal; the Hamathites, Ashima; the Avites, Nibhaz and Tartak; and the people of Sepharvaim burned their children to their native gods, Adrammelech and Anammelech. Nergal is a well known

Babylonian idol, and the occurrence of the element *Melech* (king) in the names of the Molechs of Sepharvaim is very remarkable (<12724>2 Kings 17:2441).

4. The Babylonian Exile was an effectual rebuke or the national sin. It is true that even during the captivity the devotees of false worship plied their craft as prophets and diviners (<24908>Jeremiah 29:8; Ezekiel 13), and the Jews who fled to Egypt carried with them recollections of the material prosperity which attended their idolatrous sacrifices in Judah, and to the neglect of which they attributed their exiled condition. (<24417>Jeremiah 44:17, 18). One of the first difficulties, indeed, with which Ezra had to contend, and which brought him well-nigh to despair, was the haste with which his countrymen took them foreign wives of the people of the land, and followed them in all their abominations (Ezra 9). The priests and rulers, to whom he looked for assistance in his great enterprise, were among the first to fall away (<15902>Ezra 9:2; 10:18; <16667>Nehemiah 6:17, 18; 13:23). Still, the post-exilian prophets speak of idolatry as an evil of the past, Zechariah before telling the time when the very names of the false gods would be forgotten (<38102>Zechariah 13:2). In. Malachi we see that a cold formalism was already the national sin, and such was ever after the case with the Jewish people. The Babylonian Exile, therefore, may be said to have purified the Jews from their idolatrous tendencies. How this great change was wrought does. not appear. Partly no doubt, it was due to the pious examples of Ezra and Nehemiah; partly, perhaps, to the Persian contempt for the lower ‘kinds of idolatry, which insured a respect for the Hebrew religion on the part of the government; partly to the sight of the fulfillment of God’s predicted judgments upon the idolatrous nations which the Jews had either sought as allies or feared as enemies. *SEE EXILE*.

5. Years passed by, and the names of the idols of Canaan had been forgotten, when the Hebrews were assailed by a new danger. Greek idolatry under Alexander and his successors was practiced throughout the civilized world. The conquests of Alexander in Asia caused Greek influence to be extensively felt, and Greek idolatry to be first tolerated, and then practiced by the, Jews (1 Macc. 1:43-50, 54). Some place-hunting Jews were base enough to adopt it. At first the Greek: princes who ruled Palestine wisely forbore to interfere with the Hebrew religion. The politic earlier Ptolemies even encouraged it; but when the country had fallen into the hands of the Seleucidae, Antiochus Epiphancs, reversing his father’s policy of toleration, seized. Jerusalem, set up an idol-altar to Jupiter in the

Temple itself, and forbade the observance of the law. Weakly supported by a miserable faction, he had to depend wholly upon his military power. The attempt of Artiochus to establish this form of worship was vigorously resisted by Mattathias (1 Macc. 2:23-26), who was joined in his rebellion by the Assideans (ver. 42), and destroyed the altars at which the king commanded them to sacrifice (1 Macc. 2:25, 45). The erection of. synagogues has been assigned as a reason for the comparative purity of the Jewish worship after the Captivity (Prideaux, *Conn.* 1, 374), while another cause has been discovered in the hatred for images acquired by the Jews in their intercourse with the Persians. The Maccabaean revolt, small in its beginning, had the national heart on its side, and, after a long and varied struggle, achieved more than the nation had ever before effected since the days of the Judges. Thenceforward idolatry was to the Jew the religion of his enemies, naturally made no perverts.

6. The early Christians were brought into contact with idolaters when the Gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and it became necessary to enact regulations for preventing scandal by their being involved in pagan practices, when joining in the private meals and festivities of the heathen (1 Corinthians 8). But the Gentile converts do not seem to have been in any danger of reverting to idolatry, and the cruel persecutions they underwent did not tend to lead them back to a religion which its more refined votaries despised. It is, however, not impossible that many who had been originally educated as idolaters did not, on professing Christianity, really abandon all their former superstitions, and that we may thus explain the very early outbreak of many customs and opinions not sanctioned in the N.T.

V. *Ethical Views respecting Idolatry.* — That this is a cardinal sin, and, indeed, the highest form, if not essential principle of all sin, as aiming a direct blow at the throne of God itself, is evident from its prohibition in the very fore-front of the Decalogue. Hence the tenacity with which the professors of all true religion in every age have opposed it under every disguise and at whatever cost. It has always and naturally been the associate of polytheism, and those corrupt forms of Christianity, such as the Roman and Greek Churches, which have endeavored to apologize for the adoration of pictures, images, etc., on the flimsy pretext that it is not the inanimate objects themselves which arc revered, but only the beings thus represented, arc but imitators in this of the sophistry of certain refined speculators among the grosser heathen e.g. of Egypt, Greece, etc., who put forth similar claims. *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*.

Three things are condemned in Scripture as idolatry:

1. The worshipping of a false God;

2. the worshipping of the true God through an image;

3. the indulgence of those passions which draw the soul away from God, e.g. covetousness, lust, etc. The Israelites were guilty of the first when they bowed the knee to Baal; of the second when they set up the golden calves; and both Israelites and Christians are often guilty of the third.

1. *Light in which Idolatry was regarded in the Mosaic Code, and the penalties with which it was visited of* one main object of the Hebrew polity was to teach the unity of God, the extermination of idolatry was but a subordinate end. Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, was the civil head of the state. He was the theocratic king of the people, who had delivered them from bondage, and to whom they had taken a willing oath of allegiance. They had entered into a solemn league and covenant with him as their chosen king (comp. <091007>1 Samuel 8:7), by whom obedience was requited with temporal blessings, and rebellion with temporal punishment. This original contract of the Hebrew government, as it has been termed, is contained in <022903>Exodus 19:3-8; 20:2-5; Deuteronomy 39, 10-30; the blessings promised to obedience are enumerated in <052801>Deuteronomy 28:1-14, and the withering curses on disobedience in verses 15-68. That this covenant was strictly insisted on it needs but slight acquaintance with Hebrew history to perceive. Often broken and often renewed on the part of the people (<070710>Judges 10:10; 2 Chronicles. 15:12, 13; <160938>Nehemiah 9:38), it was kept with unwavering constancy on the part of Jehovah. To their kings he stood in the relation, so to speak, of a feudal superior: they were his representatives upon earth, and with them, as with the people before, his covenant was made (<110314>1 Kings 3:14; 11:11). Idolatry, therefore, to an Israelite was a state offence (<091523>1 Samuel 15:23), a political crime of the gravest character, high treason against the majesty of his king. It was a transgression of the covenant (<051702>Deuteronomy 17:2), "*the* evil" pre-eminently in the eyes of Jehovah (<111225>1 Kings 21:25, opp. to. r vy̓hj ‘*the* right," <142702>2 Chronicles 27:2). But it was much more than all this. While the idolatry of foreign nations is stigmatized merely as an abomination in the sight of God, which called for his vengeance, the sin of the Israelites is regarded as of more glaring enormity, and greater moral guilt. In the

figurative language of the prophets, the relation between Jehovah and his people is represented as a marriage bond (<235405>Isaiah 54:5; <240314>Jeremiah 3:14), and the worship of false gods, with all its accompaniments (<032015>Leviticus 20:56), becomes then the greatest of social wrongs (Hosea 2; Jeremiah 3, etc.). This is beautifully brought out in <280216>Hosea 2:16, where the heathen name Baali, my master, which the apostate Israel has been accustomed to apply to her foreign possessor, is contrasted with Ishi, my man, my husband, the native word which she is to use when restored to her rightful husband, Jehovah. Much of the significance of this figure was unquestionably due to the impurities of idolaters, with whom such corruption was of no merely spiritual character (<023416>Exodus 34:16; <042501>Numbers 25:1, 2, etc.), but manifested itself in the grossest and most revolting forms (<450126>Romans 1:26-32).

Regarded in a moral aspect, false gods are called “stumbling-blocks” (<261403>Ezekiel 14:3), “lies” (<300204>Amos 2:4; <450125>Romans 1:25), “horrors” or “frights” (<111513>1 Kings 15:13; <245038>Jeremiah 50:38), “abominations” (<051707>Deuteronomy 29:17; 32:16; <111105>1 Kings 11:5; <122313>2 Kings 23:13), “guilt” (abstract for concrete, <300814>Amos 8:14, hmv;a; *ashmadh;* comp. <142918>2 Chronicles 29:18, perhaps with a play on *Ashima,* <121730>2 Kings 17:30); and with a profound sense of the degradation consequent upon their worship, they are characterized by the prophets, whose mission it was to warn the people against them (<244404>Jeremiah 44:4), as “shame” (<241113>Jeremiah 11:13; <280910>Hosea 9:10). As considered with reference to Jehovah, they are “other gods” (<062402>Joshua 24:2, 16), “strange gods” (<053216>Deuteronomy 32:16), “new gods” (<070508>Judges 5:8), “devils-not God” (<053217>Deuteronomy 32:17-<461020>1 Corinthians 10:20, 21); and, as denoting their foreign origin, “gods of the foreigner” (<062414>Joshua 24:14, 15). Their powerlessness is indicated by describing them as “gods that cannot save” (<234520>Isaiah 45:20),” that made not the heavens” (<241011>Jeremiah 10:11), “nothing” (<234124>Isaiah 41:24; <460804>1 Corinthians 8:4), “wind and emptiness” (<234129>Isaiah 41:29), “vanities of the heathen” (<241422>Jeremiah 14:22; <441415>Acts 14:15); and yet, while their deity is denied, their personal existence seems to have been acknowledged (Kurtz, *Gesch. d. A.B.* ii, 86, etc.), though not in the same manner in which the pretensions of local deities were reciprocally recognized by the heathen (<112023>1 Kings 20:23, 28; <121726>2 Kings 17:26). Other terms of contempt are employed with reference to idols, µyli l{a{, *elilim* (<032604>Leviticus 19:4), and µyli WLG, *gilluliem* (<051707>Deuteronomy 29:17), to which different meanings

have been assigned, and many which indicate ceremonial uncleanness. *SEE IDOL*.

Idolatry, therefore, being from one point of view a political offence, could be punished without infringement of civil rights. No penalties were attached to mere opinions. For aught we know, theological speculation may have been as rife among the Hebrews as in modern times, though such was not the tendency of the Shemitic mind. It was not, however, such speculations, heterodox though they might be, but overt acts of idolatry, which were made the subjects of legislation (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses, §* 245, 246). The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was devoted to destruction (<022220>Exodus 22:20); his nearest relatives were not only bound to denounce him and deliver him up to punishment (<051302>Deuteronomy 13:2-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (<051702>Deuteronomy 17:2-5). To attempt to seduce others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (<051306>Deuteronomy 13:6-10). An idolatrous nation shared a similar fate. No facts are more strongly declared in the Old Test. than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (<023415>Exodus 34:15, 16; Deuteronomy 7; 12:29-31; 20:17), and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (<240217>Jeremiah 2:17). A city guilty of idolatry was looked upon as a cancer of the state; it was considered to be in rebellion, and treated according to the laws of war. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were put to death. No spoil was taken, but everything it contained was burnt with itself; nor was it allowed to be rebuilt (<051313>Deuteronomy 13:13-18; <060626>Joshua 6:26). Saul lost his kingdom, Achan his life, and Hiel his family for transgressing this law (1 Samuel 15; Joshua 7; <111634>1 Kings 16:34). The silver and gold with which the idols were covered were accursed (<050725>Deuteronomy 7:25, 26). Not only were the Israelites forbidden to serve the gods of Canaan (<022324>Exodus 23:24), but even to mention their names, that is, to call upon them in prayer or any form of worship (<022313>Exodus 23:13; <060207>Joshua 23:7). On taking possession of the land they were to obliterate all traces of the existing idolatry; statues, altars, pillars, idol temples, every person and every thing connected with it, were to be swept away (<022324>Exodus 23:24, 32; 34:13; <050705>Deuteronomy 7:5, 25; 12:1-3; 20:17), and the name and worship of the idols blotted out. Such were the precautions taken by the framer of the Mosaic code to

preserve the worship of Jehovah the true God, in its purity. Of the manner in which his descendants have “put a fence” about “the law” with reference to idolatry, many instances will be found in Maimonides *(De Idol.).* They were prohibited from using vessels, scarlet garments, bracelets, or rings, marked with the sign of the sun, moon, or dragon *(ib.* <051710>Deuteronomy *7:*10); trees planted or stones erected for idol-worship were forbidden (<050805>Deuteronomy 8:5, 10); and, to guard against the possibility of contamination, if the image of an idol were found among other images intended for ornament, they were all to be cast into the Dead Sea (<051711>Deuteronomy 7:11). — Smith. *SEE ANATHENIA.*

2. *New-Test. Definitions on the Subject.-*

(1.) The name “idolater” is given not only to persons who worship heathen gods, but also such as worship idols of their own. <441716>Acts 17:16: “Now, while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry.” <461510>1 Corinthians 5:10, 11: Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an *idolater,* or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one no not to eat.” l Corinthians 6:9: “Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters.” <461007>1 Corinthians 10:7: “Neither be ye *idolaters,* as were some of them.” <662108>Revelation 21:8: “But the fearful ... and *idolaters* shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.”

(2.) The term idolatry is figuratively used to designate *covetousness,* which takes ‘Mammon’ for its god (<401624>Matthew 6:24; <421613>Luke 16:13). <510305>Colossians 3:5: “Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is *idolatry.”* Hence it is said (<490505>Ephesians 5:5), “For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an *idolater,* hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.” St. Paul further designates all evil concupiscence in general by the name of idolatry; *e.g.* <500319>Philippians 3:19: “Whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things;” comp. <451618>Romans 16:18, “For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words

and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." The same is said (⁵⁵⁰⁰⁴2 Timothy 3:4) of those who are "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." According to ⁴⁵⁰¹²Romans 1:21, idolatry takes its source in the impurity of the will, or in the heart, not in the mind; it is consequently a result of the abuse of human free agency. It is said, in the above-mentioned passage, "Because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." The not glorifying and the not praising' manifest the badness of the will or heart. In the Book of Wisdom (14:14) it is said that idolatry came into the world through the "idle vanity of man." Idolatry and sin have consequently the same origin, namely, the misuse of moral freedom. They therefore assist each other, yet, at the same time, present separately a difficult problem for reason to understand. To some extent idolatry may be considered as the theoretical, and sin as the practical effect of evil, which, in its complete manifestation, embraces both the mind and the heart, but takes its source exclusively in the latter; for all evil results from the will, by its own free action, separating itself from the divine will. — Krehl, *Handworterbuch des N.T.* p. 12.

3. *In the later Christian Church.* — The fathers generally define idolatry, from ⁴⁵⁰²³Romans 1:23, as a "taking away from God the glory which belongs to him" (Tertull. *De Idololatria,* c. 11), or "divine honor given to another" (Cyprian; Hilar. Diac.); sometimes, also, as a transferring of prayer from the Creator to the creature (Gregor. Naz.). Christian writers in general had no doubt on the subject (see Finnicus Maternus, *De errore proianarum religionum,* ed. Münter, c. 1-5). When Clement of Alexandria regards astonishment at the light emitted by the heavenly bodies, thankfulness towards the inventor of agriculture, consciousness of sin, a personification of effects, etc., as the origin of myths, he does not mean to consider them as the original source of idolatry, but only of its contemporary forms. From the primitive worship of the heavens as the abode of the invisible God, according to the oldest traditions, the worship of the different nations, as they became disseminated over the globe, and divided geographically and otherwise, turned to other symbols. Again, nations preserving the remembrance, and, so to speak, living under the influence of their founders and heroes, as 'soon as they forgot the true God, made these the objects of their veneration and worship. Thus they came to worship their progenitors (as in China) and their heroes, which latter worship is by some (Boss, for instance) considered as the only source

of mythology. How from thence they passed to the worship of symbolic animals, thence to anthropomorphism, and finally to the adoration of statues as images of the deity, has been best explained by Creuzer in his *Symbolik u. Hythologie d. alten Volker* (3rd edit. 1, 5 sq.). The fathers did not fail to perceive the influence which the original tradition of the true God had on the development of the symbolism and myths of the heathen religious systems. Lactantius *(Defalsa relig.* 1, 11) considers the *consensus gentium* in the belief in gods as a proof that they are touched by them. The early Protestant theologians had especially to contend against naturalism, which asserted that "the recognition of one supreme God is innate in man," and denied our knowledge of the unity of God being due either to revelation or to tradition, since it is found at the foundation of the learned polytheistic systems. They considered all further developments in these systems as resulting from intentional additions made in support of their hierarchy by an interested priesthood, or by rulers from motives of policy (see Herbert of Cherbury, *De relig. gentilium,* p. 6,168 sq.). These views were ably opposed by Gerhard Jo. Vossius *(De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana,* 1, 3 sq.), Van Dale *(De origine et progressu idololatrice,* 1, 2, 3), Selden *(De diis Syris* [Lips. 1662], p. 25 sq.). They however meant, as did also Farmer *(The general Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Heathen Nations* [Lond. 1783]), that the daemons, whether evil spirits or departed human souls, had very early become the objects of veneration on the part of the heathen. The Jews came gradually to the idea that the heathen deities were not nonentities, as the prophets had stated them to be, but really existing evil spirits, a view which was continued by the fathers, especially in relation to the so-called oracles. The earliest German theologians also admitted this doctrine of a worship of daemons. This, however, was gradually discarded after the researches of S. J. Baumgarten *(Gesch. d. Religionsparteien,* p. 176 sq.), and idolatry is now generally considered as the result of a' sophisticated tradition. Rationalism, based on Pelagian principles, either embraced the views of the naturalists, or else those of Heyne, J. H. Boss, etc., who maintain, the former that the myths and idolatry were either the natural consequences of historical events or the peculiar garb of philosophical ideas (historical and philosophical mythicism), while the latter derives idolatry partly from the universal wisdom whose higher thoughts assumed that form in order to be the more readily appreciated by the people, and partly from the interests of the priesthood; he considers, also, the tradition of real heroes as an abundant source. Others (like Lobeck,

etc.) see in the mythology of the heathen but a childish play of the imagination. But the opinion which most generally obtained is that behind the outward form of mythology is hidden a real philosophical or religious idea, and that personalities and historical facts are only erroneously introduced into it (Buttmann; G. Hermann). Finally, others considered idolatry in its full development as the result of the intentional maneuvers of the priesthood (so Fr. Creuzer, in the first editions of his *Symbolik),* or of a hierarchical system of nature, which amounts nearly to the same (K.O. Muller, *Prolegonz. zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie,* p. 316-344). The latter considers the very origin and nature of the gods and consequently of idolatry, as the result of an unconscious popular necessity, which from the first was connected or identified with illusion, instead of remaining a true and special idea. From this view-whose only defect is its too great disregard of the original religion-it is easy to come to those which govern the newer systems of religious philosophy, such as are upheld by Hegel *(Vorlesungen 2. Religions philosophie),* according to which religion has received a steady development from an earthly basis, so that idolatry was but one of its first forms, and not at all an estrangement from God, but a necessary part of the progress towards him. This view of it completely makes away with idolatry by the presumed connection of all religions arriving by successive developments at absolute religion. This view is supported by Hinrichs *(D. Religion im innern Verhaltnisse z. Wissenschaft* [Heidelb. 1821], p. 141 sq.) and Kraft *(D. Religionen aller Valker in philosophischer Darstellung* [Stuttg. 1848]). Feuerbach and other extreme Rationalists even consider religion itself as a sickly ideal phenomenon in human life.

We must rank under idolatry all adoration not addressed to the one invisible God of the Bible, or such adoration of him as is rendered in any manner not conforming to the revelations of the Bible. It results partly from additions and the influence of the world, partly from the original traditional command to seek God, which seeking, when unaided by him (in revelation), ends in error, so that, unconsciously, it is worldly existence that is apprehended instead and in the place of God. The mode of this apprehension varies in different nations, according to their geographical, historical, and intellectual circumstances, and may degenerate into the adoration of the most vain and arbitrary objects (fetishes), which priests or sorcerers may set up. Between the original symbolic and the most abject idolatry there are various-stages. While the majority of the heathen are

either on the brink or in the midst of fetishism, the more enlightened part look upon the idols only as symbols, sometimes of several deities, and sometimes of one God.

Idolatry was formerly considered as divided into two distinct classes, real and comparative; the former was absolute polytheism-the belief in the real divinity of the images-while the latter was either (Baumgarten) the worship of the several deities as subordinate to one, or (G.H. Vossius) the considering of the images worshipped as mere symbols of the invisible God. In <51305>Colossians 3:5 we find a metaphorical use made of the word idolatry to express undue attachment to earthly possessions and advantages. The same name has also been given, with good reason, to the use made of images in the Roman and Greek Churches. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. Abgotterei. On this last point, *SEE MARIOLATRY*; *SEE SAINT-WORSHIP*, etc.

Idu'el

*(*Ἰδουῆλος*)*, the second named of the leading Jews sent by Ezra to procure the aid of the priests in the return from exile (1 Esd. 8:43); evidently the ARIEL *SEE ARIEL* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (<15816>Ezra 8:16).

Idumae'a

Picture for Idumaea

*(*Ἰδουμαία*)*, the Gr. form of the Heb. name *Edom*, as found in the Sept., the N. Test., and Josephus. According to Josephus *(Ant.* 2, 1, 1), however, it is only a more agreeable mode of pronouncing what would otherwise be Ἀδῶμα (comp. Jerome on <26512>Ezekiel 25:12). In the Sept. we sometimes meet with Ἐδώμ, but more generally with Ἰδουμαία (the people being called Ἰδουμῖοι), which is the uniform orthography in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 4:15, 29, 61; 5, 3; 6:31; 2 Macc. 12:32), as well as in <41308>Mark 3:8, the only passage in the N.T. where it occurs. Our Auth Version has in three or four places (<23405>Isaiah 34:5, 6; <26515>Ezekiel 35:15; 36:5) substituted for Edom "Idumea," which is the name employed by the writers of Greece and Rome, though it is to be noted that they, as well as Josephus, include under that name the south of Palestine, and sometimes Palestine itself, because a large portion of that country came into possession of the Edomites of later times.

The Heb. µdea, Edom, as the name of the people, is *masculine* (<042220>Numbers 22:20); as the name of the country, *feminine* (<244917>Jeremiah 49:17). We often meet with the phrase µdea /ra, *Erets-Edom,* "the Land of Edom," and once with the poetic form µdea hde, *Sedeh-Edom,* "the Field of Edom" (<070504>Judges 5:4). The inhabitants are sometimes styled µdea ynB, *Beney-Edom,* "the Children of Edom," and poetically µdea tB, *Bath-Edom,* "the Daughter of Edom" (<250421>Lamentations 4:21, 22). A single person was called ymaea, *Adomi,* "an Edomite" (<052308>Deuteronomy 23:8), of which the feminine tymdea, *Adomith,* occurs in <111101>1 Kings 11:1.

1. *Origin of the Name. — The* name was derived from Isaac's son *Edom,* otherwise called Esau, the elder twin brother of Jacob. *SEE ESAU.* It signifies *red,* and seems first to have been suggested by his appearance at his birth, when "he came out all *red,"* i.e. covered with red hair (<012525>Genesis 25:25), and it was afterwards more formally and permanently imposed on him on account of his unworthy disposal of his birthright for a mess of red lentils (<012530>Genesis 25:30): "And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, from *the red, that red* (µdeah Amaz hiµdeah), for I am faint; therefore was his name called *Red"* (Edom; µdea). In the East it has always been usual for a chief either to give his name to the country which he conquers, or over which he rules, or to take a name from it. Esau, during the life of his father, seized the mountainous region occupied by the Horites. He had two names; but one of them was peculiarly applicable to the newly acquired territory. The mountains of Seir were remarkable for their *reddish* color; hence, doubtless, the name *Edom,* "red," was given to them. Esau is called "the father of Edom," giving to it his name and ruling over it (<013643>Genesis 36:43); and the country, in a very few cases, is also called "the mount of Esau" (<310108>Obadiah 1:8, 9, 19).

The original name of the country was *Mount Seir,* and it was probably so called from *Seir,* the progenitor of the Horites (<011406>Genesis 14:6; 36:20-22), though the signification of this name, *rugged,* may have been the cause of its adoption, as the mountains are singularly rough and rugged. And so says Josephus *(Ant.* 1, 20, 3): "Esau named the country Roughness from his own hairy roughness." Part of the region is still called *Esh-Sherah,* in which some find a trace of *Seir,* but the two words have no etymological relation. The name Seir continued to be applied to Edom after its occupation by the descendants of Esau, and even down to the close of the

O.T. history (see Joshua 11:17; 2 Chronicles 20:10: Ezekiel 25:8, etc.). The aborigines were called Horites (Sept. Χορῥαῖοι; Genesis 14:6); that is, *Troglodytes*, or "cave-dwellers," from the nature of their habitations. *SEE HORITE*. The mountains of Edom, as all travelers know, are filled with caves and grottoes hewn in the soft sandstone strata.

2. *Situation and Boundaries. — Edom* proper, or Idumaaa, is situated on the south-eastern border of Palestine, extending from it to the northern extremity of the Elanitic Gulf. It was bounded on the west by the great valley of the Arabal, on the south by a line drawn due east from the modern fortress of Akabah, on the east by the desert of Arabia, and on the north by the ancient kingdom of Moab. Its length from north to south was about 100 miles, and its breadth averaged 20. These boundaries are nowhere directly defined, but we can ascertain them from various incidental references in Scripture. When the Israelites encamped at Kadeshbarnea they were close to the border of Edom (Numbers 20), and Mount Hor is said to be within its border (Numbers 33:37). Hence, as Kadesh was situated in the valley of the Arabah, and as Mount Hor is only a few miles to the east of it, we conclude that the Arabah is the western boundary. The Israelites asked, but were refused, a passage through either Edom or Moab, so as to go direct from Kadesh to the east side of the Jordan (Numbers 20:14-20; Judges 11:17, 18). In consequence of this refusal, they were obliged to march south along the Arabah to Ezion-geber, and thence eastward by the wilderness round the territories of Edom and Moab (id. with Numbers 21:4). Hence we conclude that Edom and Moab occupied the whole region along the east side of the valley of the Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf. Edom was wholly a mountainous country, as may be inferred from the names given to it in the Bible and by ancient writers (Deuteronomy 1:2; 2:5; Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 1, 2; Eusebius, *Onomast.* s.v. Idumesa). The foot of the mountain range, therefore, may be regarded as marking its eastern border. On the north it appears to have been separated from Moab by the "brook Zered" (Deuteronomy 2:13, 14, 18; Numbers 21:12), which is probably identical with the modern wady el Ahsy. These views are corroborated by other and independent testimony. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the word *Gabla* is substituted for *Seir* in Deuteronomy 32:2; and Eusebius and Jerome state that Idumea was in their time called *Gebalene,* which is a Greek (Γεβαληνή) corruption of the Hebrew *Gebal,* "mountain" *(Ononast.* id. et s.v. Seir), and is retained to this day in the Arabic form

Jebal. The modern province of Jebal is bounded on the west by the Arabah, and on the north by wady el-Ahsy (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 151; Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 410). We may safely conclude from this that the ancient province had the same boundaries, as it had the same name. Thus Josephus writes *(Ant.* 5, 1, 22): "The lot of Simeon included that part of Idumrea which bordered upon Egypt and Arabia;" and, though this is true, it does not contradict the language of Scripture — "I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a foot breadth, because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession" (<5005>Deuteronomy 2:5). Not a foot breadth of Edom Proper, or Mount Seir, was ever given by divine sanction to the Jews.

Josephus divides Idumaea into two provinces, Gobolitis and Amalekitis *(Ant.* 2, 1, 2). The former embraced Idumaea Proper, being identical, as the name would indicate, with "*Mount* Seir;" the other embraced a portion of Southern Palestine, with the desert plain south of it, which was originally occupied by the Amalekites (<0413>Numbers 13:29), and subsequently, as we shall see, by the Edomites. Pliny places Idumaea to the south of Palestine, bordering upon Egypt *(Hist. Nat.* 5, 14). Strabo (16, 2, 36, p. 760) states that the Idumseans were originally Nabathaeans, but, being driven out thence, they joined themselves to the Jews. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.*

3. *History.* — *The* first mention of Mount Seir is in <0146>Genesis 14:6, where the confederate kings are said to have smitten the "Horites in their Mount Seir." B.C. cir. 2080. These Horites appear to have been a tribe of the gigantic aborigines of Western Asia, so called from dwelling in caves (<0136>Genesis 36:20-30). They were a pastoral people, divided into tribes like the modern Bedouin, having independent chiefs called Alltiph (ãWLaæ, ver. 29). Esau's marriage with the daughters of Canaan alienated him from his parents, and he then obtained a settlement among the Horites, where he acquired power and wealth as early as the time of Jacob's return from Padan-aram (<0276>Genesis 27:46). Probably his close alliance with Ishmael tended to increase his influence in his adopted country (<0289>Genesis 28:9; 32:3 sq.). — Though then established in Edom, Esau had still some part of his flocks in Western Palestine, in connection with those of his father; but on the return of Jacob he removed all his property from Canaan and dwelt in Mount Seir (<0366>Genesis 36:6-8). He gradually subdued and finally exterminated, or perhaps rather supplanted, the Horites (<5012>Deuteronomy 2:12, 22), and a distinct tribe of his descendants, the Amalekites, leaving

Edom, took possession of the desert plateaus south of Canaan (Genesis 36:12; Exodus 8:14 sq.). The earliest form of government among the Edomites was, like that of the Horites, by *chiefs* (in the A.V. rendered "dukes," but manifestly the same as the modern Arab *sheiks),* exercising independent authority over distinct tribes (Genesis 36:15-19). It appears, however, that the various tribes were, at least in times of general war, united under one leader, to whom the title of king (Ë l ¦m) was given. The names of eight of these kings (only one of whom is spoken of as related to any other, Anah, the son of Zibeon) are mentioned in Genesis 36:31-39, who are said to have reigned in Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," that is, apparently before the time of Moses (see Deuteronomy 33:5; Exodus 18:16-19). Most of the large nomad tribes of Arabia have now an acknowledged chief, who is styled *ezir,* and who takes the lead in any great emergency, while each division of the tribe enjoys independence under its own *sheik* on all ordinary occasions. Such would seem to have been the case with the Edomites, and this affords an easy solution of the apparent confusion in the account given by Moses, Genesis 36:31-43; and again in Exodus 15:15, where it is said "the *dukes* of Edom shall be amazed," and Judges 11:17, where Moses is represented as having sent "messengers from Kadesh into the *king* of Edom." The primitive and pastoral character of the people is incidentally brought out by the circumstance that this Anah, though a chieftain's son, was in the habit of tending his father's asses (Genesis 36:24). It was when thus employed that he found in the wilderness µymæhe¦ *ha-yenzim,* rendered in the Eng. Vers. by "the mules," but meaning more probably "the hot springs." There is in the country to the south-east of the Dead Sea (which formed part of the Seirite possessions) a place, *Callirhoe,* celebrated among the Greeks and Romans for its warm baths, which has been visited by modern travelers (Josephus, *War,* i, 33, 5; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 5, 5, 17; Legh's *Travels).*

Though the Israelites and Edomites were closely related, and though the former were commanded "not to abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother" (Deuteronomy 23:7), yet the bitterest enmity appears to have existed between them at every period of their history, as a perpetuation of the unbrotherly feud between their progenitors. When the Israelites asked permission to pass through the territory of Edom on their way to Canaan, they were rudely refused. B. C. 1619. The road by which it was sought to penetrate the country was termed "the *king's* highway" (ver. 17), supposed

by Dr. Robinson *(Researches,* 2, 556; but see a different explanation in De Saulcy's *Narrative,* 1, 392; comp. 273, 276) to be wady el-Ghuweir, for it is almost the only valley that affords direct and easy passage through those mountains. From a comparison of these incidents it may be inferred that the change the form of government took place during the wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert, unless we suppose, with Rosenmüller, that it was only this north-eastern part of Edom which was now subject to a monarch, the rest of the country remaining under the sway of its former chieftains. But whether the regal power at this period embraced the whole territory or not, perhaps it did not supplant the ancient constitution, but was rather grafted on it, like the authority of the Judges in Israel, and of Saul, the first king, which did not materially interfere with the government that previously existed. It further appears, from the list of Idumeman kings, that the monarchy was not hereditary, but elective (for no one is spoken of as the son or relative of his predecessor); or probably that chieftain was acknowledged as sovereign who was best able to vindicate his claim by force of arms. Every successive king appears to have selected his own seat of government: the places mentioned as having 'enjoyed that distinction are Dinhabah, Avith, Pagu or Pai. Even foreigners were not excluded from the throne, for the successor of Samlah of Masrekah was Saul, or Shaul, "of Rechoboth, on the river." The word *Rechoboth* means, literally, *streets,* and was a not uncommon name given to towns; but the emphatic addition of "the river" points evidently to the Euphrates, and between Rakkah and Anah, on that river, there are still the remains of a place called by the Arabs Rachabath Malik Ibn-Tauk. In the age of Solomon we read of one Hadad, who "was of the king's seed in Edom" (<111114>1 Kings 11:14); from which some have conjectured that by that period there was a royal dynasty of one particular family; but all that the expression may imply is that he was a blood relation of the last king of the country. Hadad was the name of one of the early sovereigns "who smote Midian in the field of Moab" (<010635>Genesis 36:35).

The country was attacked by Saul with partial success (<091447>1 Samuel 14:47). A few years later David overthrew the Edomites in the "valley of Salt," at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 109), and put garrisons in their cities (<100814>2 Samuel 8:14; <131811>1 Chronicles 18:11-13; <111115>1 Kings 11:15. Comp. the inscription of Psalm 60, and 5:8, 9; 118:9, 10, where "the strong city" may denote Selah or Petra). Then were fulfilled the. prophecies in <012523>Genesis 25:23, and 27:40, that the "elder

should serve the younger;" and also the prediction of Balaam (<0242418>Numbers 24:18), that Edom and Seir should be for possessions to Israel. Solomon created a naval station at Ezion-geber, on the Elanitic Gulf, from whence his ships went to India and Eastern Africa (<111026>1 Kings 9:26; <142818>2 Chronicles 8:18). Towards the close of his reign an attempt was made to restore the independence of the country by one Hadad, an Idumaean prince, who, when a child, had been carried into Egypt at the time of David's invasion, and had there married the sister of Tahpanhes the queen (<111114>1 Kings 11:14-23). *SEE HADAD*. If Edom then succeeded in shaking off the yoke, it was only for a season, since in the days of Jehoshaphat, the fourth Jewish monarch from Solomon, it is said "there was no king in Edom; a deputy was king;" i.e. he acted as viceroy for the king of Judah. For that the latter was still master of the country is evident from the fact of his having fitted out, like Solomon, a fleet at Ezion-geber (<112247>1 Kings 22:47, 48; <142036>2 Chronicles 20:36, 37). It was, no doubt, his deputy (called *king)* who joined the confederates of Judah and Israel in their attack upon Moab (<120301>2 Kings 3:9, 12, 26). Yet there seems to have been a partial revolt of the Edomites, or at least of the mountaineers of Seir, even in the reign of Jehoshaphat (<142022>2 Chronicles 20:22); and under his successor, Jehoram, they wholly rebelled, and "made a king over themselves" (<120820>2 Kings 8:20, 22; <142108>2 Chronicles 21:8, 10). From its being added that, notwithstanding the temporary suppression of the rebellion, "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day," it is probable that the Jewish dominion was never completely re- stored. Amaziah, indeed, invaded the country, and having taken the chief city, Selah or Petra, he, in memorial of the conquest, changed its name to Joktheel (q. d. subdued of God); and his successor, Uzziah, retained possession of Elath (<121407>2 Kings 14:7; <142511>2 Chronicles 25:1114; 26:3). But in the reign of Ahaz, hordes of Edomites made incursions into Judah, and carried away captives (<142817>2 Chronicles 28:17). About the same period, Rezin, king of Syria, expelled the Jews from Elath, which was thenceforth occupied by the Edomites (<121606>2 Kings 16:6, where for *Syrians,* µymwra, we ought to read *Edomites,* µymwda, De Rossi, *Varice Lectiones,* 2, 247). Now was fulfilled the other part of Isaac's prediction, viz., that in course of time Esau "should take his brother's yoke from off his neck" (<012740>Genesis 27:40). It appears from various incidental expressions in the later prophets that the Edomites employed their recovered power in the enlargement of their territory in all directions. They spread as far south as Dedan in Arabia, and northward to Bozrah in the Hauran; though it is doubtful if the Bozrah of Scripture may

not have been a place in Idumaea Proper (<23406>Isaiah 34:6; 63:1; <24907>Jeremiah 49:7,8-20; <26513>Ezekiel 25:13; <30101>Amos 1:12). During the decline of the Jewish power, and wars of Judah and Israel, the Edomites gradually enlarged their possessions. When Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, the Edomites joined him and took an active part in the plunder and slaughter which followed. Their cruelty at that time is specially referred to in Psalm 137, and was the chief cause of those dreadful prophetic curses which have since been executed upon their country (<24917>Jeremiah 49:17; <25421>Lamentations 4:21; <26513>Ezekiel 25:13,14; <31010>Obadiah 1:10-21). From the language of Malachi (<39102>Malachi 1:2, 3), and also from the accounts preserved by Josephus *(Ant. 10,* 9, 7), it would seem that the Edomites did not wholly escape the Chaldaean scourge; but instead of being carried captive, like the Jews, they not only retained possession of their own territory, but became masters of the south of Judah, as far as Hebron (1 Macc. 5:65, comp. with <26510>Ezekiel 35:10; 36:5). Probably as a reward for the assistance afforded by them to the Chaldeeans, the Edomites were permitted to settle in Southern Palestine, and in the country lying between it and the borders of Egypt. The name Idumea was now given to the whole country, from the valley of the Arabah to the Mediterranean (Joseph. *Ant.* 5, 1, 22; Strabo, 16:2), and from Eleutheropolis to Elath (Jerome, *Comment. in Obad.).* Hence arose the mistakes of Roman writers, who sometimes give the name Idumaea to all Palestine, and even call the Jews Idumaeans (Virgil, *Georg. 3,* 12; Juvenal, 8:160).

While the Edomites thus extended their conquests westward, they were driven out of their own country by the Nabatheeans (q.v.), who, leaving the nomad habits of their ancestors, settled down amid the mountains of Edom, engaged in commerce, and founded the little kingdom of *Arabia Petraee.* Some of their monarchs took the name Aretas (2 Macc. 5, 8; Joseph. *Ant. 15,* 1, 2), and some Obodas (Joseph. *Ant. 13,* 5, 1). One of them was that Aretas whose daughter Herod Antipas married (<40143>Matthew 14:3, 4); and it was the same king of Arabia who captured Damascus, and held it at the time of Paul's conversion (<44925>Acts 9:25; <47132>2 Corinthians 11:32). Idumaea was taken by the Romans in A.D. 105, and under their paternal government the enterprising inhabitants increased greatly in wealth and power. A lucrative transport trade between India, Persia, and the Levant was in their hands. Roads were constructed across the desert of Arabia, through the defiles of Edom, and westward and northward to the

Mediterranean and Palestine. Traces of them still remain, with ruinous military stations at intervals, and fallen milestones of the times of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius *(Peutinger Tables;* Laborde's *Voyage;* Burckhardt's *Syria,* p. 374, 419; Irby and Mangles's *Travels,* p. 371, 377, 1st ed.). The magnificent rock-temples, palaces, and tombs of Petra were then constructed, which still continue to be the wonder and admiration of Eastern travelers. They are not the works of the Edomites, but of the descendants of *Nebaioth,* Ishmael's oldest son and Esau's brother-in-law (0125DGenesis 25:13; 36:3; Joseph. *Ant.* 1, 12, 4; Diod. Sic. 19.)

On the revival of Jewish power under the Asmonseans, that part of Southern Palestine to which the name Idumnea had been given by classic writers was seized, and about B.C. 125 they were finally subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled them to submit to circumcision and other Jewish rites, with a view to incorporate them with the nation (1 Macc. 5, 3, 65; 2 Macc. 10, 16; 12, 32; Joseph. *Ant. 13,* 9, 1; 15, 4). The amalgamation, however, of the two races seems never to have been perfected. The country was governed by Jewish prefects, and one of these, an Idumaean by birth, became procurator of Judaea, and his son was Herod the Great, "king of the Jews" (Joseph. *Ant. 12,* 8, 6; 13, 9, 2 14,1, 3 and 8; 15, 7, 9; 17, 11, 4). Not long before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, 20,000 Idumseans were called in to the defense of the city by the Zealots, but both parties gave themselves up to rapine and murder (Joseph. *War, 4,* 4, 5; 5, 1; 7, 8, 1). This is the last mention made of the Edomites in history. The author of a work on Job, once ascribed to Origen, says that their name and language had perished, and that, like the Ammonites and Moabites, they had all become Arabs. In the second century Ptolemy limits the name Idumsea to the country west of the Jordan.

In the first centuries of the Christian sera Edom was included in the province of *Palcestina Tertia,* of which Petra was metropolis (S. Paulo, *Geogr. Sac.* p. 307; Reland, *Palcest.* p. 218). After the Mohammedan conquest its commercial importance declined, its flourishing port and inland cities fell to ruin. The Mohammedans were the instruments by which the fearful predictions of the Scripture were finally fulfilled. The Crusaders made several expeditions to Edom, penetrating it as far as to Petra, to which they gave the name "Valley of Moses" *(Gesta Dei per François,* p. 518, 555, etc.), a name still existing in the Arabic form *Wady Maisa.* On a commanding hill some twelve miles north of Petra they built a fortress, and called it *Mons Regalis;* its modern name is Shobek *(ib.* p. 611). The

Crusaders occupied and fortified Kerak, the ancient Kir Moab, and raised it to the dignity of an Episcopal see, under the impression that it was Petra *(ib.* p. 812, 885, 1119). From the age of the Crusaders until the present century nothing was known of Idumaea. No traveler had passed through it, and as a country it had disappeared from history. Volney heard some vague reports of its wonders from Arabs. Seetzen also heard much of it in the year 1806, but he was unable to enter it. Burckhardt was the first to traverse the country. In 1812 he traveled from Kerak south by Shobek to Petra *(Trav. in Syr.* p. 377 sq.; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 165). In 1828, Laborde, proceeding northward from Akabah through the defiles of Edom, also visited Petra, and brought away a portfolio of splendid drawings, which proved that the descriptions of Burckhardt had not been exaggerated. Many have since followed the footsteps of the first explorers, and a trip to Petra now forms a necessary part of the Eastern traveler's grand tour.

4. *Physical Geography.* — Idumaea embraces a section of a broad mountain range, extending in breadth from the valley of the Arabah to the desert plateau of Arabia. "Along the base of the range on the side of the Arabah, are low calcareous hills. To these succeed lofty masses of igneous rock, chiefly porphyry; over which lies the red and variegated sandstone in irregular ridges and abrupt cliffs, broken by deep and wild ravines. The latter strata give the mountains their most striking features" (Porter, *Handb. for S. and Pal.* 1, 44). "The first thing that struck me," says Stanley, "in turning out of the Arabah up the defiles that lead to Petra was, that we had suddenly left the desert. Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sinaitic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass, sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprouting corn; and this continues through the whole descent to Petra, and in Petra itself. The next peculiarity was when, after having left the summit of the pass, or after descending from Mount Hor, we found ourselves insensibly encircled with rocks of deepening and deepening red. Red, indeed, even from a distance, the mountains of 'red' Edom appear, but not more so than the granite of Sinai; and it is not till one is actually in the midst of them that this red becomes crimson, and that the wonder of the Petra colors fully displays itself *(Sin. and Pal.* p. 88). The ravines which intersect these sandstone mountains are very remarkable. Take them as a whole, there is nothing like them in the world, especially those near Petra. "You descend from wide downs and before you opens a deep cleft between

rocks of red sandstone rising perpendicularly to the height of one, two, or three hundred feet. This is the *Sikl*.... Follow me, then, down this magnificent gorge-the most magnificent, beyond all doubt, which I have ever beheld. The rocks are almost precipitous, or rather they would be if they did not, like their brethren in all this region, overlap, and crumble, and crack, as if they would crash over you" *(ib.* p. 90). Such are the ravines of Idumaea, and the dark openings of the numerous tombs and grottoes which dot their sides; and the sculptured façades here and there hewn out in their gorgeously colored cliffs add vastly to their picturesque grandeur. The average elevation of the sandstone range is about 2000 feet. Immediately on its eastern side, and indeed so close to it as to make up part of one great range, is a parallel ridge of limestone, attaining a somewhat higher elevation, and extending unbroken far to the north and south. The latter sinks with a gentle slope into the desert of Arabia. The deep valleys and the little terraces along the mountainsides, and the broad downs upon their summits, are covered with rich soil, in which trees, shrubs, and flowers grow luxuriantly. While Edom is thus wild, rugged, and almost inaccessible, the deep glens and flat terraces along the mountainsides are covered with rich soil, from which trees, shrubs, and flowers now spring up luxuriantly. No contrast could be greater than that between the bare, parched plains on the east and west, and the ruddy cliffs, and verdant, flower-spangled; glens and terraces of Edom. This illustrates Bible topography, and reconciles seemingly discordant statements in the sacred volume. While the posterity of Esau dwelt amid rocky fastnesses and on mountain heights, making their houses like the eyries of eagles, and living by their sword (<24916>Jeremiah 49:16; <01740>Genesis 27:40), yet Isaac, in his prophetic blessing, promised his disappointed son that his dwelling should be "of the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above" (<01739>Genesis 27:39). But many critics are of opinion (e.g. Vater, De Wette, Geddes,Von Bohlen) that ynemi[mi should there be rendered *from*, i.e. "far away from, or destitute of," the fatness of the earth, etc.; and it is immediately added, "for thou shalt live by thy sword "and it does not appear that Idumaea was ever particularly noted for its fertility. Some other passages of Scripture are also illustrated by a glance at the towering precipices and peaks of Edom. The border of the Amorites was from "the ascent of scorpions *(Akrabbim),* from the rock" that is, from the rocky boundary of Edom (<07036>Judges 1:36). We read that Amaziah, after the conquest of Seir, took ten thousand of the captives to the "top of the cliff,"

and thence cast them down, dashing them all to pieces (<14511>2 Chronicles 25:11, 12).

5. *Present State of the Country. — Idumaea,* once so rich in its flocks, so strong in its fortresses and rock-hewn cities, so extensive in its commercial relations, so renowned for the architectural splendor of its temples and palaces-is now a deserted and desolate wilderness. Its whole population is contained in some three or four miserable villages; no merchant would now dare to enter its borders; its highways are untrodden, its cities are all in ruins. The predictions of God's Word have been fulfilled to the very letter (see Estlander, *Vaticinia Jesaice in dumnceos. Aboae,* 1825). "Thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof… When the whole earth rejoiceth I will make thee desolate.... Thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumaea, even all of it… Edom shall be a desolation; every one that goeth by it shall be astonished" (<23413>Isaiah 34:13; <26514>Ezekiel 35:14; <24917>Jeremiah 49:17). Idumaea is now divided into two districts, *Jebal,* including the northern section as far as wady el-Ghuweir, and *Esh Shercah,* embracing the southern part (Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria,* p. 410; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 154). Burckhardt mentions a *third* district, *Jebal Hesma;* but Robinson says that though there is a sandy tract, el-Hismah, with mountains around it, on the east of Akabah, it does not constitute a separate division. The site of the ancient capital Bozrah is now marked by the small village of Busaireh, and Petra, the Nabathaean capital, is well known as wady Musa.

The whole of this region is at present occupied by various tribes of Bedouin Arabs. The chief tribe in the *Jebal* is the Hejaya, with a branch of the Kaabineh, while in *esh-Sherah* they are all of the numerous and powerful tribe of the Haweitat, with a few independent allies. The Bedouins in Idumaea have of late--years been partially subject to the pacha of Egypt, paying an annual tribute, which, in the case of the Beni Sukhr, is one camel for two tents. The fellahin, or peasants, are half Bedouin, inhabiting the few villages, but dwelling also in tents; they too pay tribute to the Egyptian government, and furnish supplies of grain.

6. The character of the Edomites was drawn by Isaac in his prophetic blessing to Esau — "By thy sword shalt thou live" (<01740>Genesis 27:40). War and rapine were the only professions of the Edomites. By the sword they got Mount Seir-by the sword they exterminated the Horites-by the sword they long battled with their brethren of Israel, and finally broke off

their yoke-by the sword they won Southern Palestine-and by the sword they performed the last act in their long historic drama, massacred the guards in the Temple, and pillaged the city of Jerusalem.

Little is known of their religion, but that little shows them to have been idolatrous. It is probable that Esau's marriage with the "daughters of Cancan," who "were a grief of mind" to his father and mother (Genesis 26:34, 35), induced him to embrace their religion; and when Esau and his followers took possession of Mount Seir, they seem to have followed the practice common among ancient nations of adopting the country's gods, for we read that Amaziah, king of Judah, after his conquest of the Edomites, "brought the gods of the children of Seir, and set them up to be his gods" (2 Chronicles 25:14, 15, 20). Josephus also refers both to the idols (one of which he named *Koze)* and priests of the Idumaens *(Ant. 15,* 17, 9).

7. *Literature. — With* respect to the striking fulfilment of the prophetic denunciations upon Edom, we need only refer the reader to the well-known work of Keith, who frequently errs, however, in straining the sense of prophecy beyond its legitimate import, as well as in seeking out too literally minute an accomplishment. On Idumaea generally, see C. B. Michaelis, *Dis. De Antiquiss, Idumaea. Hist.* in Pott and Ruperti's *Sylloge Comment. Theologic.* part 6, p. 121; J. D. Michaelis, *Comment. de Troglodytis Seiritis,* in the *Syntagma Comment.,* part 1, p. 194. For the ancient geography, Reland's *Palcestina;* Forster's *Geography of Arabia;* Ritter's *Palastina und Syrien.* For the history and commerce, Nolde, *Hist. Idumaea,* Frank. 1726: Vincent's *Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients,* vol. 2. For modern geography, the travels of Burckhardt, Laborde, Wilson, Stanley, and Porter's *Handb. for Syria and Pal.;* but especially, *Sketches of Idumaea and its present Inhabitants,* by Dr. E. Robinson, in the *Amer. Rib. Repository* for April 1833, p. 247, and his *Bib. Researches,* 2, 551. *SEE EDOMITE*, etc.

Idumae'an

(Ἰδουμαῖος), an inhabitant of the land of Idumaea (q.v.) (2 Macc. 10:15,16).

I'gal

(Heb. *Yigal',* יִגְאָל *avenger),* the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ἰγάλ, Vulg. *Igal*, Eng. Vers. "Igal.") Son of Joseph, and commissioner on the part of Issachar to explore the land of Canaan (Numbers 13:7). He of course perished with his nine false-hearted companions on their return (Numbers 14:37). B.C. 1657.

2. (Sept. Ἰγαάλ, Vulg. *Igaal*, A.V. "Igal.") Son of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (2 Samuel 23:36). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list of 1 Chronicles the name is given as "*Joel* the brother of Nathan" (11:38, Ἰωήλ). Kennicott, after a minute examination of the passage, both in the original and in the ancient versions, decides in favor of the latter as most likely to be the genuine text *(Dissertion*, p. 212-214).

3. (Sept. Ἰωήλ, Vulg. *Jegaal*, A.V. "Igeal.") One of the sons of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3:22). The number "six" there given is that of the grandchildren of Shechaniah (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. ante 406.

Igdali'ah

(Heb. *Yigdalyah'*, but only in the prolonged form, *Yigdalya'hu*, Why;lDgy;æ whom *Jehovah will make great;* Sept. Γοδολίας, Vulg. *Jegedalia),* the father of Hanan, into the chamber of which latter Jeremiah brought the Rechabites to propose the test of their temperance (Jeremiah 35:4). B.C. ante 606.

Ig'eil

(1 Chronicles 3:22). *SEE IGAL* 3.

Ignatian Epistles

SEE IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

Ignatius of Antioch

one of the apostolical fathers (q.v.), called also *Theoyhorus (*ὁ θεοφόρος*),* a title which he explained to the emperor Trajan as meaning "one who has Christ in his heart." We have no trustworthy accounts of the life and ministry of Ignatius. The chief authority is the *Martyrium Ignatii* (see below), but even those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated. There are several unsupported stories in the fathers, e.g. that Ignatius was the child whom Christ took into his arms

(Mark 9:36), that he had seen Christ, etc. Abulpharagius *(Dynasc. 7,* 75, ed. Pococke, 1663) was understood to assert that Ignatius was born at Nura in Sardinia or Cappadocia, but Mr. Cureton (see below) shows that the words used have no such reference. The *Martyrium* (c. 3) asserts that he was, along with Polycarp, a hearer of St. John; Chrysostom says that he was nominal bishop of Antioch by the laying on of the hands of the apostles themselves but Eusebius fixes the date of his ordination at A.D. 69, when several of the apostles were dead. According to the same historian, he was the second successor of St. Paul, Evodius having been the first. The Apostolic Constitutions, on the other hand, say that Ignatius and Evodius held the office together, Evodius by appointment from Peter, Ignatius from Paul. So say, also, Baronius and Natalis Alexander, making, however, Evodius bishop of the Jews, and Ignatius of the Gentiles. "Of the episcopate of Ignatius we know little. He appears to have been over-earnest in insisting upon the prerogatives of the clergy, especially the bishops. The *Miartyrium Ignatii* represents him as anxious for the steadfastness of his flock during the persecution said to have taken place in Domitian's reign, and incessant in watching and prayer and in instructing his people, fearing lest the more ignorant and timid among them should fall away. On the cessation of the persecution he rejoiced at the little injury the church at Antioch had sustained. When the emperor Trajan, elated with his victories over the Dacians and other nations on the Danubian frontier, began to persecute the Church, the anxiety of Ignatius was renewed, and, eager to avert the violence of persecution from his flock, and to obtain the crown of martyrdom, he offered himself as a victim, and was brought before the emperor, then at Antioch on his way to the eastern frontier to attack the Armenians and Parthians. The conference between Trajan and the bishop is given in the *Martyriuen Ignatii;* it ended in an order of the emperor that Ignatius should be taken to Rome, and there thrown to the wild beasts. He was led thither by a long and tedious route, but was allowed to have communication with his fellow-Christians at the places at which he stopped. He was thrown to the wild beasts in the Roman amphitheatre, at the feast distinguished as ἡ τρισκαιδεκάτη, 'the feast of the thirteenth' (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Saturnalia). Such parts of him as remained were collected by his sorrowing friends, and taken back to Antioch, where in Jerome's time they were resting in the cemetery outside the gate toward Daphne. From thence they were removed by the emperor Theodosius II to the Church of Ignatius (previously known as the Tycheum, or Temple of Fortune), in the city of Antioch (Evang. *Hist. Eccl.*

1, 16). Their subsequent removals are uncertain. The martyrdom of St. Ignatius is commemorated by the Roman Church on the 1st of February; by the Greek 'Church on the 20th of December, the correct anniversary of his martyrdom." The year of Ignatius's death has been much disputed. Many of the best writers (following the *Martyriume Ignatii)* place it in A.D. 107; but, as it is now generally conceded that Trajan did not visit the East till 114, and as he probably spent the winter 114-115 at Antioch, the best critics agree on A.D. 115 as the most probable date.

Epistles of Igynatius. — On his way from Antioch to Rome, Ignatius is said to have written seven epistles. These are enumerated both by Eusebius *(Hist. Eccl. 3*, 36) and Jerome *(De Viris Illustr. c.* 16). At present, however, there are fifteen epistles extant, all ascribed to Ignatius. Seven of these are considered by many to be genuine, namely,

1. Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, *Ad Ephesios;*
2. Μαγνησιεῦσιν, *Ad Magnesianos;*
3. Τραλλιανοῖς, *Ad Tralliancs;*
4. Πρὸς ῾Ρωμαίους, *Ad Romanios;*
5. Φιλαδελφεῦσιν, *Ad Philadelphenos;*
6. Σμυρναίοις, *Ad Smyrnceos;* and,
7. Πρὸς Πολύκαρπον*Ad Polycarpumn.*

The titles of these epistles agree with the enumeration of Eusebus and Jerome. There are found two recensions of them — a longer, now regarded as an interpolated one, first published by Pacaeus (1557), and a shorter form, which is considered as tolerably uncorrupted. Many doubt the genuineness of either (see below). Two ancient Latin versions are extant, corresponding in a great degree to the two forms or recensions of the Greek text: the larger, known as the common *(vulyata)* version, the other first discovered and published by archbishop Usher (1644) (see below). The epistles to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp were published, with a translation, in a still shorter Syriac version, by Cureton (1845). Many of the interpolations found in the larger form are of passages from the N.T.

Five other epistles, though extant in Greek, are regarded by nearly all classes of critics as spurious, namely,

8. Πρὸς Μαρίαν εἰς Νεάπολιν τὴν πρὸς τῷ Ζαρθῷ, or Πρὸς Μαρίαν Κασταθολίτην, or ἐκ Κασοθήλων, or Κασταθαλῖτιν, or ἐκ

Καστα̣θάλων *Ad Macrinam, Neapo liem, quce est ad Zarbumn,* or *Ad Mariam Cassobolitam* variously written *Castabalitam,* or *Castabalensem,* or *ex Cossobelis,* or *Chassaobolorum,* or *Chasabolorum,* or *Castabolorm;*

9. Πρός τοὺς ἐν Ταρσῷ, *Ad Tarsenses;*

10. Πρὸς Ἀντιοχεῖς, *Ad Antiochenos;*

11. Πρὸς Ἥρωνα, διάκονον Ἀντιοχείας, *Ad Heronem Diaconum Antiochice;*

12. Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους, *Ad Philippenses.* Some copies add to the title of this last epistle the words περὶ Βαπτίσματος, *De Baptismate,* an addition which by no means describes the contents. Of four of these spurious epistles two ancient Latin versions are extant, the common version, and that published by Usher. Of that to the Philippians there is but one version, namely, the common. The epistle to Polycarp in the common Latin version is defective, containing only about one third of what is in the Greek text. There is also extant, both in the Greek and in the two Latin versions, an epistle of Mary of Cassobele (called also Προσήλυτος, *Proselta)* to Ignatius, to which his letter professes to be an answer.

The remaining three epistles ascribed to Ignatius are found only in Latin. They are very short, and have long been given up as spurious. They are,

13. *S. Joanni Evangelist;*
14. *Al Eundem;* and,
15. *Beatac Virginia.*

With these is found a letter of the Virgin to Ignatius, *Beata Virgo Ignatio,* professing to be an answer to his letter. This also is given up as spurious.

The controversy respecting the genuineness of these writings began at an early period. In A.D. 1495 the three Latin epistles and the letter of the Virgin were printed at Paris, subjoined to the *Vita et Processus S. Tholsm Cantuarensis Martyris super Libertate Ecclesiastica.* In A.D. 1498, three years after the appearance of these letters, another collection, edited by J. Faber, of Staples (Stapulensis), was printed at Paris in folio, containing the common Latin version of eleven letters, that of Mary of Cassobelae not being among them. They were published with some of the works ascribed to Dionysius Areopagita and an epistle of Polycarp. These eleven epistles were reprinted at Ven. 1502; Paris, 1515; Basel, 1520; and Strasburg,

1527. In 1516 the preceding fourteen epistles, with the addition of the letter to Mary of Cassobelae, were edited by Symphorianus Champerius of Lyons, and published at Paris in 4to, with seven letters of St. Antony, commonly called the Great. In A.D. 1557, the twelve epistles of Ignatius, in Greek, were published by Valentinus Paceus, or Paceus, in 8vo, at Dillingen, in Suabia on the Danube, from an Augsburg MS. They were reprinted at Paris, 1558, with critical emendations. The same twelve Greek epistles, from another MS. from the library of Gaspar a Nydpryck, were published by Andreas Gesner, with a Latin version by Joannes Brunner, Ziurich, 1559, folio. In these editions the Greek text of the seven epistles was given in the larger form, the shorter form, both in Greek and Latin, being as yet undiscovered. The genuineness of these remains was now called in question. The authors of the *Centuries Magdeburgenses* were the first to express their doubts, though with caution and moderation. Calvin, in his *Institutiones* (1, 3), declared that "nothing could be more silly than the stuff *(naeenice)* which had been brought out under the name of Ignatius, and rendered the impudence of those persons more insufferable who had set themselves to deceive people by such phantoms *(larvce)."* The controversy grew warm, the Roman writers and the Episcopalians commonly contending for the genuineness of at least a part of the epistles, and the Presbyterians denying it. The three epistles not extant in Greek were the first given up, but the rest were stoutly contended for. Several, however, distinguished between the seven enumerated by Eusebius and the rest, and some contended that even those which were genuine were interpolated. While the controversy was in this state, Vedelius, a professor at Geneva, published an edition *(S. Ignatii quae extant Omnia,* Geneva, 1623, 4to) in which the seven genuine were arranged apart from the other five epistles; he marked, also, in the genuine epistles, the parts which he regarded as interpolations. In 1644 archbishop Usher's (4to, Oxford) edition of the epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius appeared. It contained,

1. *Polycarpiana Epistolarum Ignatianarum Sylloge* (Polycarp's Collection of the Epistles of Ignatius), containing Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians and six of the supposed genuine epistles of Ignatius;

2. *Epistolce B. Ignatio adscriptae a Medice Etatis Graecis Sex* (Six Epistles ascribed to St. Ignatius by the Greeks of the Middle Age). The epistle of Polycarp was included in this class, with the five spurious epistles extant in Greek. The common Latin version was also printed with these in

parallel columns, and the three epistles which are extant only in Latin were subjoined;

3. A Latin version of eleven epistles (that to the Philippians being omitted) from the two MSS. obtained by Usher, and now first printed. This corresponds, in the main, to the shorter text of the so-called genuine epistles, The work of Usher contains also a valuable introduction and notes to the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Canons ascribed to Clement of Rome. In 1646 the epistles of Ignatius were published by Isaac Vossius (4to, Amst.), from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence. The MS., which is not accurately written, and is mutilated at the end, is valuable as the only one containing the shorter recension of the genuine epistles; it wants, however, that to the Romans, which was given by Vossius in the longer form, as in the former editions. The five spurious epistles, and that of Mary of Cassobelae to Ignatius, from the Medicean MS., the text of which differs materially from that previously published; the three Latin epistles; Usher's Latin version of the eleven Greek epistles; and the common version of that to the Philippians, were all given by Vossius. In 1647 Usher published his *Appendix Ignatiina*, containing the Greek text of the seven epistles, and two Latin versions of the *Martyriun Ignatii*. He gave the Medicean text of six of the epistles; that to the Romans was the common text, with the interpolations expunged, as determined by a collation, of the epistle contained in the *Martyriun*, both in the Greek of Symeon Metaphrastes and the Latin version published by Usher. After the controversy had been carried on for some time, and great progress had been made towards the settlement of the text, the most formidable attack on the genuineness of the epistles was made by Daille (Dallaus), one of the most eminent of the French Protestants, in his work *De Scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagite et Ignatii Antiocheni circumfrentur Libri duo* (Genesis 1666, 4to). The works of Ignatius form the subject of the second book. This attack of Daille called forth the *Vindiciae Ignatianae* of bishop Pearson (Cambridge, 1672, 4to), which was long supposed to have settled the controversy. But it has recently been reopened with fresh vigor and interest. Archbishop Usher, in his edition of the Ignatian Epistles published at Oxford in 1644, declared that he could not venture to promise that the genuine Ignatius could be recovered without the aid of another Greek text, which he hoped to obtain from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence, or at least without the aid of a Syriac copy, which he did not despair of procuring from Rome. The

Medicean MS. was published, but the difficulties remained the same. The Syriac version, which was then looked to as affording the only probable clew to the solution, eluded the most diligent and anxious search for a period of 200 years. It was reserved for the Rev. William Cureton, a canon of Westminster, to supply this clew. Mr. Cureton discovered, among a most important collection of Syriac MSS., procured for the British Museum by archdeacon Tattam, in the year 1843, from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara of the Syrians, in the Desert of Nitria, three entire epistles, which he published in the year 1845. This publication naturally excited great attention on the part of those who felt an interest in the subject, and called forth severe strictures from some who seemed to consider that to remove any part of the seven epistles of Ignatius was to take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy. The form Which the controversy now took led to the publication, in 1849, by Mr. Cureton, of the *Corpus Ignatianum,* in which the editor brought together *a complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles — genuine, interpolated, and spurious; together with numerous Extracts from them, as quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers down to the Tenth Century,* and accompanied by a full history of the controversy from its commencement. Mr. Cureton's conclusion was that the three epistles which he published were the only genuine productions of Ignatius in the series bearing his name. If this did not "take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy," it is because the supposed testimony of a most venerable apostolic father is not one of its foundations, for certainly the three letters are as bare of prelatic allusion as any of Paul's. But the matter did not rest here. Several critical reviews of this position appeared, the most important of which was by Uhlhorn, in the 21st volume of the *Zeitschriff d. Hist. Theol.,* in which a long and learned examination of the question, under the title *Das Verhiltniss d. syrischen Recension cd. ignatianischen Briefe zu d. kürzern griechischen… Authentie d. Briefe uberhaupt* (translated into English, in a somewhat condensed form, by the Rev. Henry Browne, in the *Theol. Critic* [1852]), is entered into, which finally asserts that "the seven letters, according to the shorter Greek recension, are the genuine productions of Ignatius of Antioch." Another *Translation of the Epistles of Ignatius (together with Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and the Apologies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian),* with notes, and an account of the present state of the question respecting the epistles of Ignatius, by the Rev. Temple Chevallier, B.D. (8vo), appeared in 1852. In 1859 the question was again opened, and again in the *Zeitschfeiu hist. Theol.,* by Dr. R. A. Lipsius, who, in a paper

entitled *Ueber die Aechtheit der syrischen Recension der ignatianischen Briefe*, goes over the ground again with all the learning of his predecessors in the same field, but more at length, examining in detail, and with great critical acumen, the arguments which have been adduced by both sides in this discussion. Dr. Lipsius adopts all the reasoning of the learned editor of the *Corpus Ignatianum*, and arrives at the same conclusion, namely, that the three letters to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans, in the form in which they appear in the Syriac recension, are the genuine letters of Ignatius, but that the present recession of the seven letters are from a later hand, in which the three genuine letters have been remodeled, and to these three four new ones added. It is a circumstance not to be overlooked that this full adoption of Mr. Cureton's views has appeared in the same journal which gave to the world Uhlhorn's lucubrations, and speaks highly for the honest desire of its conductors to promote the cause of truth, and that only. Bunsen also adopted the views of Cureton in his *Die dreiechten und vier unechten Briefe des Ignatius* (Hamburg, 1847, 8vo), and his conclusions have been admitted by some eminent Presbyterian authorities (see *Bibl. Repos.* July, 1849); but Dr. Killen, the Irish Presbyterian, in his *Ancient Church* (Belfast and N. Y. 1859, 8vo), condemns all the epistles as worthless and spurious. He remarks that "it is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin that upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate in pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the Word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. Had Pearson enjoyed the same clear views of Gospel truth as the reformer of Geneva, he would not have wasted so many precious years in writing a learned vindication of the nonsense attributed to Ignatius. Calvin knew that an apostolic man must have been acquainted with apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the production of an age when the pure light of Christianity was greatly obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it, "There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of

Ignatius." Dr. Killen's positive arguments against the genuineness of *all* the epistles are,

1. The style is suspicious;

2. The epistles ignore God's Word, which is never done by any of the genuine writings of the early fathers;

3. They contain chronological blunders;

4. They use words in meanings which they did not acquire till long after the time of Ignatius;

5. They abound in puerilities, vaporing, and mysticism;

6. They manifest an unhallowed and insane desire for martyrdom. Baur and Hilgenfeld also hold them all not to be genuine, but think that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after A.D. 150, and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek.

With Uhlhorn agree also many able and sound critics of the Romanists and Protestants, as Mohler, Hefele, and Gieseler.

The most complete edition of Ignatius is that contained in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius, the second edition of which, by Le Clerc (Almst; 1724, 2 vols. folio), contains all the genuine and spurious epistles (Greek and Latin), with the epistles of Mary of Cassobelse and of the Virgin, the two ancient Latin versions (the common one and Usher's), the *Martyriumn Ignatii*, the *Dissertationes* (i.e. the Introduction) of Usher, the *Vindiciae* of Pearson, a *Dissertatio de Ignatianis Epistolis* by Le Clerc, and variorum notes. A useful edition of the genuine epistles, with those of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and the *Martyria* of Ignatius and Polycarp, was published by Jacobson (Oxford, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo). There are versions in several languages of modern Europe, including two English translations, an old one by archbishop Wake *(Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers,* Lond. 1693, 8vo), and a modern one by Clementson (1827. 8vo). Wake's translation has been repeatedly published.

The *Martyrium Ignatii*, which is our chief authority for the circumstances of Ignatius's death, professes to be written by eye-witnesses, the companions of his voyage to Rome, supposed to be Philo, a deacon of Tarsus or some other church in Cilicia, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian,

who are mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius *(Ad Philarlelph.c.* 11; *Ad Smyrneos, c.* 13). Usher adds to them a third person, Gaius, but on what authority we know not, and Gallandius adds Crocus, mentioned by Ignatius *(Ad Romanus,* c. 10). The account, with many interpolations, is incorporated in the work of Symeon Metaphrastes (Dec. A.D. 20), and a Latin translation from him is given by Surius, *De Probatis Sanctor. Vitis,* and in the *Acta Sanctorum,* under the date of the 1st of February. The *Martyrium* was first printed in Latin by archbishop Usher, who gave two distinct versions from different MSS. The Greek text was first printed by Ruinart, in his *Aeta Martyrium Sincera* (Par. 1689, 4to), from a MS. in the Colbertine library, and in a revised edition in Le Clerc's Cotelerius. It is given by Jacobson and by most of the later editors of the epistles. Its genuineness is generally recognized, but it is thought to be interpolated. See the remarks of Grabe, quoted by Jacobson at the end of the *Martyrium.* A considerable fragment of an ancient Syriac version of the *Martyrium* of Ignatius has been published by Mr. Cureton.

See Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* anno 117; Lardner, *Credibility of Gospel History; Edinburgh Review,* July, 1849; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* p. 197-200; Bohringer; *Kirchengesch. in Biog. 1,* 7 sq.; Milman. *Lat. Christ.* 1, 53 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 269, 295, 631; Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Milton, *Prose Works,* 1, 78 sq.; *NX Y. Review,* 1, 367; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* April, 1850; *New Englander,* Nov. 1849; *Quarterly Review,* Dec. 1850; Lipsius, in *Zeitsch. f. history Theol.* 1856, Heft 1; Uhlhorn, in *Herzog's Real Encyklop. 6,* 623 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev. 33,* 640 sq.; *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1867, p. 137 sq.; *Princet. Rep.* 1849, p. 378 sq.; *Amer. Quart. Church Review,* Jan. 1870, p. 563 sq. *SEE EPISTLES.*

Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople

flourished about the beginning of the 9th century. The schism of the Greek and Roman churches, which began under Photius (q.v.), who persecuted Ignatius and usurped his see, gives importance to his life. The following account of him is (necessarily) chiefly from Roman sources, and must be taken with allowance. He was born in 799, and was the son of the emperor Michael Curopalates; his mother, Procopia, was the daughter of the emperor Nicephorus. On the revolt of Leo the Armenian, Michael surrendered to him the throne, which he had occupied for the short period of a year and nine months only, and embraced monastic life. His sons

followed the example of their father, and the youngest, Nicetas, then aged fourteen, changed his name to Ignatius. The new emperor, in order not to be disturbed in the possession of power, separated the several members of the family of Michael, and caused his two sons, Eustratius and Nicetas, to be made eunuchs. During the reign of the three emperors, Leo, Michael II, and Theophilus. the young men were allowed to enjoy in tranquility the monastic life to which they had devoted themselves. Ignatius was admitted into the order of priesthood by Basil, bishop of Paros, in the Hellespont, a prelate who had suffered great persecution in opposing the Iconoclasts, and to whom Ignatius was much attached. On the death of Theophilus, the empress Theodora was declared regent in the name of her son, Michael III. Being opposed to the Iconoclasts, she banished John, the patriarch of Constantinople, and caused Methodius to; be elected in his place. Four years after, on the death of Methodius, the patriarchal dignity was bestowed upon, Ignatius. But he did not long enjoy this honor. Bardas, the brother of the empress, whom he had excommunicated on account of his scandalous excesses, having obtained considerable influence on the mind of the young emperor Michael, whose vices he flattered and encouraged, induced him to take the reins of government, and to compel his mother to withdraw to a convent, and to accept the vows. Ignatius, when summoned to lend his authority to this unfilial act, did not: content himself with remonstrating against it, but gave' a stern refusal. He was, in consequence, banished to the isle of Terebinthos, and deprived of his see, which he had held for eleven years. Photius, a eunuch related to Bardas, and a person of considerable learning, who favored the Iconoclasts, was by the will of the emperor, but without the consent of the Church, appointed to the patriarchate of Constantinople. For the controversy of Photius with the Church of Rome and its issue, *SEE PHOTIUS*. All means employed to induce Bardas to resign remaining ineffective, his death was finally determined upon, and he was murdered in 866. Basil the Macedonian now became possessed of the supreme power. One of the first acts of his reign was to banish Photius and recall Ignatius, who was triumphantly reinstated in his patriarchal dignity Nov. 3, 867. At his suggestion a council was assembled at Constantinople, which ranks in the Roman Church as the eighth ecumenical. It was presided over by the legate of pope Adrian II, and in it Photius and his partisans were excommunicated, and their opinions condemned. From this time Ignatius was allowed to rule the Greek Church without opposition. He died Oct. 23, 878, on which day the Greek and Roman churches still celebrate his memory. He was buried in

the church of St. Sophia, but his remains were afterwards transferred to that of St. Michael, near the Bosphorus. The details of his life are principally drawn from Nicetas David, who had known him personally. Ignatius wrote Βίος Ταρασίου τοῦ πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, the Greek text of which remains unpublished, but a Latin translation of it is to be found in Surius, *De probatis Sanctorum Vitis*, and in the *Aeta Sanctorum* (Feb. 25), 3:576: Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Νικηφόρου, πατριάρχου Κωνστ, the Greek text of which is contained in the *Acta Sanctorunm* (March 12). ii, 704, Append. He also wrote other works, among them an abridgment of fifty-three fables from Babrius in Iambic verses, each fable containing only four verses. These were published at first under the name of Gabrias, Gabrius, or Babrius, in the Aldine *Esop* (Venice, 1505), and afterwards under the author's real name (Ignatius Magister), in Ritterhusius's *Phedrus*, and Nevelet's *Mythologia Esopica*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé, 25*, 795; *English Cyclopedia;* Smith, *Dict. of Biography;* Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 52, 96; Neander, *Ch. Hist. 3*, 558 sq.; Hardwicke, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 195 sq.

Ignatius Loyola

SEE LOYOLA.

Ignis Purgatorius

SEE PURGATORY.

Ignorance

the want of knowledge or instruction. It is often used to denote illiteracy. Mr. Locke observes that the causes of ignorance are chiefly three:

1, want of ideas;

2, want of a discoverable connection between the ideas we have;

3, want of tracing and examining our ideas.

As respects religion, ignorance has been distinguished into three sorts:

1. An *invincible* ignorance, in which the will has no part. It is an insult upon justice to suppose it will punish men because they were ignorant of things which they were physically incapable of knowing.

2. There is a *willful* and *obstinate* ignorance; such an ignorance, far from exculpating, aggravates a man's crimes.

3. A sort of voluntary ignorance, which is neither entirely willful nor entirely invincible, as when a man has the means of knowledge, and does not use them. — Locke, On *the Understanding.* 2, 178; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, 2, 26, 29, 64; Watts, *On the Mind;* Henderson's Buck, *Theolog. Dict.* s.v. *SEE KNOWLEDGE*.

Ignorantines

(Latin, *Fratres Ignorantice;* French, *Freres Ignorantines),* also known as the *Congregation of Christians Instruction and Christian Schools*, is the name of a Jesuitical foundation for the gratuitous instruction of poor children in sacred as well as secular learning, which was founded in France in the early part of the 18th century (1724) by the abbé de la Salle. 'As the object is to confine the instruction to such branches as do not conflict with, but even favor, the religious views of the Roman Catholics, virtually preparing the young, by the exclusion of all books by Protestants, to remain true to the church of their fathers, they have gradually been introduced into every Catholic country of Europe. In France this society shared at the Revolution the fate of all the other religious bodies; but, under the name of *Brothers of the Christian Schools,* they were recalled, and re-established under Napoleon in 1806. They are now exceedingly numerous in France, Italy, and in some parts of Bohemia and Germany. Many branches exist also in England and Ireland. In the latter country they have large educational establishments, with a series of schoolbooks specially designed for Roman Catholics. The Ignorantines wear a dress very similar to that of the Jesuits. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 517; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 632.

Igumen or Hegumen

is the title of an abbey in the male monasteries of the Greek Church, more especially in Russia.

Ihre, Johann von

a Swedish philologian, was born March 3, 1707, at Lund, and educated at the universities of Upsala, Greifswald, Jena, and Halle. At the last-named high school he afterwards lectured for a time on the Oriental languages,

then traveled extensively in Germany, Holland, England, and France, and on his return to his native country was appointed librarian at Upsala University. In 1737 he was appointed professor of poetry, and the year following professor of rhetoric, which he remained for forty years. He died Nov. 26, 1780. He distinguished himself greatly by his thorough investigations into the philological merits of his mother tongue, and by his labors on the Gothic version of Ulfilas, the results of which are left us in *Scripta versionem Ulphilanam et lieng. Maeso-gothicam illustrentia,* which were collected and edited by A. F. Büsching (Berl. 1773, 4to). This collection (which is very rare, as only 131 copies were printed) contains,

1. *Ulphilas illustratus,* a series of critical observations on the readings of the *Codex Argenteus,* with a preface, in which he attempts to prove 'that the letters of the Codex were produced by an encaustic process, the surface of the parchment having been covered with wax, on which silver-leaf was laid, and the form of the letter stamped thereon with a hot iron;"

2. *Fragmenta vers. Ulph.,* containing the portions of the Epistle to the Romans published by Knittel, with annotations;

"**3.** *Dissertatio de originibuss Ling. Lat. et Gr. inter Mesogothos reperiundis;*

4. *De verbis Moesogoth; Analecta Ulphil., i, de Cod. Argent. et litt. Goth.,* 2, *de nominibus subst. et adject. Maesogoth.;*

5. *De Ling. Cod. Arg.;*

6. *Specimen Gloss. Ulphil., cume praejationibus.* An Appendix to the work contains tracts by other writers. He wrote also *De usu LXX interpretum in N.T.* (Upsal. *1730): — De usu accentuum Hebraeorum* (ibid. 1733). See Kitto, *Cyclopaedia Bib. Lit.* 2, 377; Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.,* Adelung's *Add.* 2, 2270 sq.

I. H. S.

is an inscription or monogram which has probably been used by the Christian Church from an early date among the sacred symbols on church furniture, and in painted windows of the house of God, but its use has by no means been confined to ecclesiastical buildings. On tombs, roofs, and walls of houses, on books, and on other possessions of Christians, this monogram has been, and is even now, frequently impressed, especially

among the adherents of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican churches. The interpretations which have been given of this mystic title are threefold. One is that they are the initials of the words *"In Hoc Signo,"* borrowed from the luminous cross which it is said was miraculously displayed in the sky before Constantine and his army. Others make them the initials of the words *"Jesus Hominusm Salvator,"* especially the Jesuits, who use it for their badge and motto in the form **I.H.S**; and still another, that they are the first three letters of the Greek ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, Jesus. This last opinion has been espoused by the late "Cambridge Camden Society" in a work which they published on this subject: *Argument for the Greek Origin of the Monogram L H. S.* (London, 1841). The earliest Christian emblems found also seem to confirm this opinion, as they are in every case written in the Greek language, and "the celebrated monogram inscribed by Constantine's order on the *labarum,* or standard of the cross, was undoubtedly Greek." Eusebius *(Eccles. Hist.),* in describing the famous standard, says, "A long spear, overlaid with gold, formed the figure of the cross by means of a piece laid transversely over it. On the top of the whole was fixed a crown, formed by the intertexture of gold and precious stones; and on this two letters indicating the name of Christ symbolized the Savior's title by means of its first characters, the letter P being intersected by a X exactly in its center; and these letters the emperor was in the habit of Wearing on his helmet at a later period." In regard to the shape of the letter S being Roman, and not (reek, *The Church,* a paper of the Church of England in Canada, says, "It might easily have become corrupted (i.e. the Greek Σ into a Latin S) —it would not, indeed, have been intelligible except to a few of the best scholars unless it were corrupted-and so could scarcely have escaped transmutation when the knowledge of the Greek tongue, which we are certified was the case, perished, or very nearly so, during the Middle Ages in the Western Church." — Staunton, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 382; Blunt, *Eccles. Dict.* 1, 375. *SEE LABARUM*.

I'im

(Heb. *Iyism',* µyYÀ[ê*iins,* as in <240618>Jeremiah 26:18, etc.), the name of two places.

1. (Sept. Aἰείμ, Vulg. *Iim.)* A city in the extreme south of Judah, mentioned between Baalah and Azem (<061529>Joshua 15:29), and therefore doubtless included within the territory set off to Simeon, as the associated places were (<061903>Joshua 19:3), which afford the only means for a

conjectural position nearly midway from the Dead Sea towards the Mediterranean.

2. (Sept. Τα , Vulg. *Ijeabarim),* both reading the same as in the preceding verse.). One of the stations of the Israelites not long before reaching the Jordan (<0336>Numbers 33:45); usually called fully IJE-ABARIM (ver. 44).

Ijar

SEE IYAR.

Ij'e-ab'arim

(Hebrew *lyeh' ha-Abarim',* yYeêaeayrAbæ[}h;, *ruins of the Abarim.,* or regions beyond; Sept. Åχαγαί, but in <0334>Numbers 33:44 simply read; Vulg. *Jeabarin* and *Ijeabarim),* the forty-seventh station of the Israelites on approaching Canaan, described as being between Oboth and Dibon-gad, "in the border of Moab" (<0334>Numbers 33:44), or between Oboth and the brook Zered, "in the wilderness which is before (i.e. *east* of) Moab, towards the sun-rising" (<0211>Numbers 21:11), and therefore not far from *Aineh,* a little south of wady el-Ahry, which forms the southern boundary of the Moabitish territory, and lies near the southern end of the range of Abarim, that give this compound form to the name (simply IIM in <0334>Numbers 33:44), to distinguish it from the lim of Judah (<0615>Joshua 15:29). *SEE ABARIM.*

I'jon

(iebo. *yon',* ˆ/Y[æ, place of *ruins;* Sept. Åἴν, Αἰών, Αιων), a frontier city of the kingdom of Israel, mentioned as being captured, along. with Abel-BethMeholah and other places in Naphtali, first by Benhadad of Syria (<1115>1 Kings 15:20; <1416>2 Chronicles 16:4), and afterwards by Tiglath-pileser of Assyria (<1215>2 Kings 15:29). The associated names and circumstances render the supposition of Dr. Robinson *(Researches, 3,* 346) very probable, that this locality corresponds to a large ruin-covered hill called *Tell Debbin* (Thomson, *Land and Book,* 1, 335), in the present Merj Ayun (meadow *of fountains),* a fine meadow tract between wady et-Teim and the Litany, north of Lake Huleh (comp. *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1846, p. 204, 214; new edition of *Researches, 3,* 375; Schwarz, *Palestine,* p. 36).

Iken, Konrad

a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, born at Bremen Dec. 25, 1689, was professor of theology at the gymnasium of that city, and pastor of one of the Reformed churches. He died June 30, 1753. Iken wrote, *Antiquitates Hebraicae* (Brem. 1730, 4to, 5th ed., annotated by J. H. Schacht, 1810, 8vo) *Thesaurus Nov. Theolog. — Philol. Dissertationum, exegeticarum ex Musceo Th. Ifascei et Conrad. Ikenii* (Levden, 1732, 2 vols. fol.): — De *tempore celebratce ultinmae Caenae paschalis Christi* (Bremen, 173.5 and 1739, 8vo); this work and the following are directed against G. F. Gude *(q.v.):--Dissertatio quae contra Gudium demonstratur Coenam Christi* σταυρώσιμον *vere paschalem fuisse* (Bremen, 1742, *8vo): — Tractatus Talmudicus de cultu quotidiano Templi, quem versione Latina donatum et notis illustratume eruditorun examini subjicit Conrad. Ikenius* (Bremen, 1736, 4to): — *Symbolce litterarice ad incrementum scientiarum omnis yeneris, a variis amicis collatcer* Bremen, 1744-49, 3 vols. *8vo):--Harmonia historiceper-pessionum J. Christi* (Bremen, 1743, 4to; 2nd ed. Utrecht, ,758.4to) —*Dissertationes philol. — theolog. in diversa sac. cod. utriusque instrunentalia loca* (Leyden, 1749, 4to; 2nd ed. augmented, pub. by J. H. Shacht, Utrecht, 1770, 4to): — *De Institutis et Caerimoniis Legis allosaicce ante Mosen* (Bremen, 1752, 2 parts, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gin. 25*, 8 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* 2, 377. (J.N.P.)

Ik’kesh

(Heb. *Ikkesh’*, vQ¢æ *perverse*, as in <19A104>Psalm 101:4, etc.; Sept. Ἐκκὶς, Ἐκκής, Ἐκκῆς), the father of Ira the Tekoite, which latter was one of David’s famous warriors (<102326>2 Samuel 23:26; <131128>1 Chronicles 11:28), and captain of the sixth regiment of his troops (<132709>1 Chronicles 27:9). B.C. ante 1046.

Ikonobortsi

is the name of a small sect of Russian dissenters who are opposed to paintings, both in churches and in private houses. *SEE RUSSIA*.

Ikriti, Shemarja ben-Ellah

a Jewish philosopher and commentator, originally from Rome, flourished at Negroponte towards the close of the 13th and the opening of the 14th century. His father Eliah was a distinguished scholar of the island of Crete,

whence he derived his name. Shemarja devoted his early years to the study of philosophical writings, but later he gave his time almost exclusively to the study of exegesis, as the result of which he translated and wrote commentaries on all the books of the 0. T., with the exception of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. His edition of *Genesis,* to which, according to his own statement, he devoted no less than twenty-five years, he dedicated, with other works of his, to king Robert of Naples (in 1328). The main object of writing these commentaries, which have never yet been published, was to reconcile the Rabbanites and Karaites. Himself a Rabbanite, he held that the Karaites were in the wrong to set aside altogether the Talmudical traditions; and the Rabbanites, he asserted, missed the mark also by not only assigning the first place to the Talmud, but by disregarding the Bible (comp. *Ozar Nechmald,Vien.* 1857, ii, 93). But, whatever his success may have been with the Rabbanites, he certainly failed to convince the Karaites, who read his works extensively, that the Talmudical Hagada contained a deep meaning unrevealed to the superficial student, or to persuade them that the Bible and Talmud both deserved a philosophical interpretation. Another aim which Shemarja is said to have had in writing his commentaries was the union of the followers of Maimonides (q.v.) with the old orthodox school. He also wrote a Logic, after the Greek style, and a Hebrew Grammar. See Grirtz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 7,* 318 sq.; Carmol.y in Jost's *Annalen* (1839), p. 69, 155; Dukes, *Shir Shelomo* (Hannov. 1858), 2, 4; Kitto, *Cyclopaedia Bibl. Liter.* 2, 377; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud. 3,* 27 sq. *(J.* H.W.)

I'lai

(Heb. *Ilay',* yl iy [æ. q. Chald. yLi[æ *supreme;* Sept. Ἠλί), an Ahohite, and one of David's chief heroes (1 Chronicles 11:29); called ZALBION in the parallel list (2 Samuel 23:28). B.C. 1046.

Ildefonsus, St.

archbishop of Toledo, was born in that city in 607. He studied under Isidore of Seville, became monk, then abbot of the convent, of Agli, near Toledo, and was finally made archbishop of his native city in 658. According to Julian of Toledo, Ildefonsus composed a large number of works, most of which, however, were left unfinished. The only writings supposed to be authentic that we now possess under his name are, *De illibata b. Visginis virginitate* (in the *Biblioth. Patr.,* Lugd., 7): — two

books, *De cognitione baptismi et de itinere deserti quo pergitur post baptismum,* a rule of faith and conduct for converts: — a continuation of Isidorus's *De viris illustribus,* beginning with Gregory the Great, and containing notices of thirteen other writers, mostly Spanish bishops (in Fabricius, *Bibl. eccles.* p. 60 sq.). One of his successors in the see of Toledo, St. Julian (680-690), added to this a *Vita Ildefonsi Toletani,* from which almost all our information concerning Ildefonsus is derived. Two letters of his, with answers by Quirinus bishop of Barcelona, are found in D'Achery, *Spicil.* The Adoptianists (q.v.), in the 8th century, quoted the writings of *Eugenius, Ildejbnsus, Julianus, Toletance sedis antistites,* as favoring their peculiar views (see Alcuin, *Opp.* 2, 568). See the Bollandists, Jan. 23rd; Gregorio Mavlns, *Vida de S. Ildelfonso* (Valentia, 1727, 12mo); Baronius, *Annales,* 667, No. 5, 6; Baillet, *Vies des Saints,* Jan. 23rd. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 633; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 25,* 811 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist. 3,* 581.

Ilgen, Karl David

an eminent German theologian, was born February 26, 1763, at the village of Sehna, in Prussian Saxony. When fourteen years old he was able to enter the second class in' the gymnasium of Naumburg; but his parents being unable to give him any further help, he was from that time obliged to depend on his own exertions alone. His struggle for subsistence strengthened his mind, and in 1783, with a good elementary education, he entered the University of Leipzig. Here were written his first essays, which are to be found in the collection of his works entitled *Opuscula philologica* (Erford, 1797, 2 vols.). He applied himself with particular zeal to the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1789 he was called to the rectorship of the Academy of Naumburg, and so distinguished himself as an instructor that five years afterwards he was called as professor of Oriental languages to Jena, and there he was finally transferred to the chair of theology. In spite of his eminent attainments, his bluntness and dryness of manner prevented his being as efficient in his new sphere of action as he might otherwise have been. His learning was better displayed in his writings than in his lectures. He began to write a work on the "Historical Documents of the Temple of Jerusalem," for which he intended to make a thorough investigation of all the Jewish sayings, traditions, and fables, and to compare them with what historical knowledge we possess on the same points, so as to secure a history of the Jews, their political institutions, their mode of divine worship, their moral, religious, and intellectual state, such

as would truly have deserved the name of a *critically correct* history," but, through the agency of G. Hermann, this work was interrupted by a call as rector to Pforte (in Prussian Saxony) (1802). He held this position for twenty-nine years, and fulfilled its duties with distinguished ability. In 1816 he was appointed counselor of the Consistory. In 1831 he was compelled to ask for his discharge, and retired to Berlin, where he died September 17, 1834. All that he has left us of any value, besides the *De Jobi antiquissimi cafminis Hebr. natura atque virtute* (Leips. 1789), is a few philosophical treatises which he wrote during his rectorship at Pforte. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 633 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* 2, 378.

Ilive, Jacob

an English infidel, born in 1710, was both a printer and a type-founder by trade. In 1733 he published a discourse to prove the plurality of worlds. He maintained that earth is a hell, and that the souls of men are fallen angels. Before and after this publication he lectured publicly on the same topic. In the same year, 1733, he published another work, entitled *A Dialogue between a Doctor of the Church of England and Mr. Jacob Ilive upon the subject of the Oration.* In 1751 he published what claimed to be a translation of *The Book of Jasher,* which he attributed to a certain Alcuin of Brittany, although he was himself the real author (see Horne's *Bibl. Bib.).* Another pamphlet, entitled *Modest Remarks on Bishop Sherlock's Sermons,* caused him to be condemned to two years' imprisonment. During his forced residence at Clerkenwell Bridewell, he wrote *Reasons offered for the Reformation of the House of Correction in Clerkenwell.* Ilive however, did some real service to Biblical statistics in publishing a second edition of Calasio, *Concordantice Sacrorum Bibliorum* (Lond. 1747,4 vols. fol.). See Gough, *Brit. Topography;* Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenting Churches;* Chalmers, *Genesis Biog. Dict.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio*$_{r}$*. Generale, 25:*814; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog. 2,* 1605. (J. N. P.)

Illatio

is a term used in old rituals of the Mass for *praefatio.*

Illescas, Jacob de

(çaqçylyd byq[y), a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished in the 14th century at Illecas, not far from Madrid, whence his family derived their name. He wrote a *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (contained

in Frankfurter's great *Rabbinic Bible)* in an allegorical, cabalistic sense, with many valuable grammatical explanations of difficult passages. He also paid particular attention to obscure passages of Rashi and Aben-Ezra's expositions on this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and freely quotes other celebrated Jewish literati, as Lekach Tob, Joseph, Tam, Bechor Shor, Jehudah the Pious, Isaac of Vienna, Moses de Coney, Aaron, Eljakim, the Tosafoth, etc. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Liter.* 2, 378; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 91.

Illgen, Christian Friedrich

a German theologian, was born at Chemnitz, in Saxony, Sept. 16,1786, studied at the University of Leipzig, where he first lectured, and then became extraordinary professor of philology in 1818, of theology in 1823, ordinary professor of theology in 1825, and finally canon. He was particularly distinguished for his knowledge of theological history. He died Aug. 4, 1844. His principal works are, *Lalius Socinus, Leben* (Lpz. 1814 and 1826, 2 parts,. *4to):* — *Memoria utriusque catechismi Lutheri* (Leipzig, 1829-30): — *Historia collegi iphilobiblici* (1836-40): — *Abhandlung i. den Wlerth der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (1817); and a collection *of Predigten: die Veirlarung d. irdischen Lebens durch d. Evangelium* (1823). He founded the Historical Theological Society, and from 1825 to the time of his death he edited the *Zeitschriffiur hist. Theol.* See S. Bruno Lindner, *Erinnerungen an Dr. Illgen* in the *Zeitschrift.f. d. historische Theologie* (1845), p. 3; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25,* 814; Herzog, *Real Encyklopadie, 6,* 635.

Illuminated

*(*φωτιζόμενοι*)* was a term used in the early Christian Church for the baptized. *SEE BAPTISM*. The apostle Paul writes in two places (Hebrews 6:4; 10:32) of those who were ἅπαξ φωτισθέντες*;* and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 372), in its third canon, calls the newly baptized προσφάτως φωτισθέντας. Justin Martyr, in his second *Apology,* explains the name to refer to the *spiritual* knowledge acquired by those who were baptized, and there was probably an association between the term and the ritual use of lights in the baptismal service. — Blunt, *Cyclop. of Theol.* 1, 323. By some, however, the title "illuminated" is supposed to have been given to those newly baptized in the early Church, because a lighted taper

was put into their hands as a symbol of their enlightenment. *SEE LIGHTS*. (J. H.W.)

Illuminati

a name assumed at different periods by sects of Mystics or Enthusiasts and Theosophs, who claim a greater degree of illumination or perfection than other men.

1. The first sect known under this name was a party of mystic enthusiasts who made their appearance in Spain about 1575, and who also bore the name of *Alumbrados* or *Alombrados*. They considered prayer as such an efficacious means of union with God that the soul of man could by it become entirely identified with the nature of God, so that its actions would therefore be really the actions of God himself; and they further held that for such persons good works, the sacraments, etc., are superfluous as a means of sanctification. (We invite here to a comparison of the doctrines of this sect with the Jesuits, when first instituted by Ignatius Loyola. See Ranke, *History of the Popes*, transl. by Mrs. Austin, 1, 190.) They were persecuted by the Inquisition, and then disappeared from Spain; but in 1623 they reappeared in France, under the name of *Guerinets*, a sect very similar to the Alombrados of Spain, a sort of Illuminati, but who, in addition to the mystic belief of the Alombrados, believed in a special revelation of perfectibility, made to one of their number, a friar, whose name was Bouquet. But they also soon became extinct, and were no longer known in France in 1605.

Another very similar sect arose in Belgium.

2. But the name of "Illuminati" was really first given to an association of Deists and Republicans which was founded May 1, 1776, by Adam Weishaupt, professor of canon law at the University of Ingolstadt. This "order," which, by its founder, was first called the *Order of the Perfectibilists*, was established on a masonic foundation like that of the organization of the Jesuits. They announced as their aim to elevate mankind to the highest possible degree of moral purity, and to lay the foundation for the reformation of the world by organizing an association of the best men to oppose the progress of moral evil. Practically, however, the "order" soon evinced tendencies dangerous alike to Church and State. In their opposition to religious and political Jesuitism, Which at that time, in Roman Catholic Germany, imposed unbearable restraints on the human

mind, they aimed at nothing less than revolutionizing religion, abolishing Christianity in order to substitute reason in its place, deposing all civil powers, and establishing a nominal republican government. Weishaupt himself, however, was a very honorable man, actuated by the purest motives, and zealous for the religious and political improvement of mankind. The most active disciple, through whose influence the society increased with extraordinary rapidity, was the baron Adolph von Knigge, who joined the Illuminati in 1780. The baron maintained that Christianity was not so much a popular religion as a system exclusively applicable to the elect, and that, introduced by the Mystics; it had found its form of highest development in Freemasonry. Only a small number of the elect were allowed an insight into the ultimate object of the new organization, but the whole system was made profusely attractive to a certain class of minds by mysterious ceremonies and forms. The order aimed steadfastly at obtaining the control of the higher offices in Church and State; and, although liberty and equality were proclaimed as its fundamental principles, it sought absolute supremacy. With a view to reach that end, Weishaupt, who had himself been a Jesuit, finally made use of the same means by which the Jesuits had been so successful. Thus he sought to win over to his side all persons of any influence; to surround rilers with members of the order; to make proselytes of men weak in mind but strong of purse, while at the same time he excluded such as, on account of their pride or their strength of character, would be unlikely to prove pliant subjects, or whose want of discretion might injure the order. Strict, unquestioning, and blind obedience was made the first duty of every member; every one was under the direct control of his immediate superiors, and knew in fact no other members of the order. Aside from this, each member was subject to a private supervision, which extended to the head of the society; “and the Illuminati were soon involved in a system of mutual espionage, confession, and the like, essentially inconsistent with true freedom, but calculated to place the threads all in one hand, by which the holy legion was to be led on, as it was imagined, to the benefaction of mankind.” Only such persons as were distinguished for prudence, wisdom, complete abnegation for self, and zeal for the interest of the society, were admitted to the higher degrees, wherein the mysteries of the higher order were revealed to them, while those of the lower degrees hardly suspected their existence. These mysteries related to religion, on which subject they were of the character of naturalism and freethinking; and to politics, in regard to which the aim was to replace monarchy by republicanism and socialism. An active

correspondence was kept up between the chiefs and the members of the order in the different districts where lodges were established. It was carried on by means of a cipher, generally of the usual figures; but the higher orders also made use of other signs. The months were designated by particular names; thus January became *Dineh,* February *Benmeh;* and Germany was called the *Orient,* Bavaria *Achaia,* Munich *Athens.* The order was represented by (symbol O) a lodge by (symbol) The letters addressed to a superior were marked Q. L., i.e. *Qzuibus licet,* to open the letter; if the letter was addressed to one of the higher chiefs, it was marked *Soli;* and if to one still superior, *Prinzo.* Each one of the Illuminati was, besides, known in the order by some particular name. Thus the founder went by the ominous appellation of Spartacus; Knigge by that of Philo, etc. The attractions which the order presented by its mysterious secret forms, and the extraordinary energy and Jesuitical acumen which the leaders brought to bear on their undertaking, soon swelled its numbers, and, during its most prosperous period, the association consisted of over 2000 members, among them some of the most prominent names of Germany, and even princes, who, however, could only be initiated into the lower orders, as the higher mysteries of the order inculcated republicanism. The headquarters of the order were in Bavaria, which, with Suabia and Franconia, formed the first province of the association in Germany, and it was not only established in all the principal cities of Germany, but also gained a foothold in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and Italy.

As regards its interior organization, the order was established on the basis of the Society of Jesus, of which, as we have already observed, Weishaupt had once been a member. In 1777 he had joined the freemasons. From the first it had been his aim to connect his new society with freemasonry, for the purpose of giving it a firmer foundation, and with the ultimate object of finally absorbing the latter in the former. Knigge’s activity and enterprise finally succeeded in bringing the Illuminati to be considered as freemasons by the craft, bat this step made new enemies for the Illuminati, and ultimately caused their overthrow. Knigge modeled the material organization of the society after that of freemasonry, dividing the members into three classes, each of which was again composed of several degrees. The first, a preparatory class, was composed of novices, Minervites, and *Illuninati minores.* Any man eighteen years of age could become a novice, and on his conduct depended his promotion to the next degree, which

could be effected after one, two, or three years. The second class, or that of freemasons, embraced apprentices, masons, and master-masons, besides the two higher grades of *Illuminatus major* and of *Illuminatus dirigens,* of Scottish knights. These latter had the control of the Minervite lodges. The third class, or that of the "Mysteries," was divided into higher and lesser mysteries; the latter embraced the priests and the regents, or members to whom had been imparted the mysterious aims of the society in regard to religion and politics. The initiation to the degree of regent was conducted with great solemnity, and was very impressive. The adepts of the higher mysteries were also of two degrees, the *Magneus* and the *Rex,* to whom the principles of naturalism, republicanism, and socialism were further developed. These were the Areopagites of the order, and had no superiors but the secret council, presided over by the general of the order (Weishaupt), which composed the highest court of appeal for all members of the order.

A jealous feeling and contention for leadership, which sprang up between Weishaupt and Knigge, and a difference of opinion of the two greatest heads of the society on many points of organization and discipline, hastened the decline of the order, especially after Knigge had left it (July 1, 1784). As soon as the State and Church disturbing tendency, which for a time had remained hidden, became known, the order was vehemently denounced. June 22, 1784, the elector of Bavaria issued an edict for its suppression. But the society continued to exist in secret. When, however, the authorities had succeeded in obtaining further evidences of the dangerous tendency of the order by securing some of the papers of the association (which they published), they punished the members by fine, imprisonment, and exile. Many quit the country, among them Weishaupt (Feb. 16, 1785), on whose head a price had been set. He fled to Gotha (some say Halle), and resided there until his death, Nov. 18,1830. Edicts were again published by the elector of Bavaria, March 2 and August 16, 1785, which, by the severe punishment which it threatened to members, caused the rapid decline of the order, and they disappeared altogether towards the close of the last century (eighteenth). "Great importance was at one time attached to the order of the Illuminati, whose secret influence was regarded as. a principal cause of many of the political events of the time of the French Revolution, and the works of Abbe Barruel and of Professor Kobison of Edinburgh upon this subject were eagerly read, but the highly exaggerated character of their views is now generally

acknowledged." See Herzog, *Real- Encyklop. 6,* 636; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 519; *Grosse Absichten d. Ordens d. Illuminaten,* etc., *von vier ehemaligen Mitgliedern* (Munich, 1786); *Nachtrag z. d. grossen Absichten* (Mun. 1786); *Grundsatze, Verfassung u. Schicksale d. Illuminatenordens in Bayern* (1786); Weishaupt, *Apologie d. Illuminaten* (Frank. 1786); same, *Einleitung z. meiner Apologie* (Frank. 1787); same, *Das verbesserte System d. illominaten,* etc. (Frank. 1787); Philo's (Knigge's) *Endliche Erklarung und Antwort,* etc. (Hannov. 1788).; *Die neuen Arbeiten d. Spartacus u. Philo in d. Illuminatenorden,* etc. (1794); Voss, *Ueber d. Illuminatenorden* (1799); *Einige Originalschrijfen d. IIluminatenordens,* etc., *auf hochsten Bejehl z. Druck befordert* (Munich. 1787); *Natchtragv. weiteren Originalschriften, und der Illusminatensekte überhaupt,* etc. (Munch. 1787); Henke, *Kirchengesch. 7,* 206 sq.; *Zeitschriftf hist. Theol. 6,* art. 2; Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemo. Encyklop.* sect. 2, 16:206 sq.; Kahnis, *Germans Protestantisms, p.* 59 sq. *SEE MYSTICS.* (J. H. W.)

Illuminatio

(sacramentun illuminationis). SEE ILLUMINATED.

Illumination, Art of

The art of illuminating manuscripts with gold and color seems to prevail in countries where the art of printing is unknown. It has been erroneously supposed to have been originated by Christianity; it is certain, however, that under its sway it was brought to its known perfection. The time when the Christians first adapted the art of illumination it is impossible to determine definitely, but it most probably dates from the time when the ancient fashion of rolled manuscripts (comp. the article THOIAH), which the Jews still preserve, was changed for the present book form. The earliest specimens extant are from the first half of the 2nd century; and we find St. Jerome, no later than the 4th century, complaining of the abuse of filling up books with ornamental capital letters of an enormous size. In the 5th century many of the MSS. were illuminated, especially copies of the Gospels and other Scriptures. They were written on a blue ground in silver, with the name of God in gold. By the influence of Byzantine luxury there were even produced some copies on a *gilded* ground in letters of black. One of the best specimens of the perfection to which the art had been brought in that century is the *Codex Argenteus,* or copy of the Gothic (Ulphilas's) version of the N.T. in letters of silver, with the initials in gold,

now preserved in the royal library at Upsala. It is also supposed that at that time the various schools of illumination originated. “Rome had succumbed to barbarian violence, and her arts, though decaying, still exerted an influence in this new style of painting, then in its infancy. That influence was naturally stronger in Italy, and therefore the early illuminations of the Italian school bear traces of the old Roman style. In France the same influence was manifest, mixed up with national peculiarities, and this school was consequently called the Franco-Roman.” But, remarkable as it may appear, it is now found that Ireland was far in advance of other nations in the knowledge of this art, as she was generally in advance of them in the scale of civilization. “Her fame had extended over Europe, her monasteries were adorned with men of great piety and learning, who were the trainers of the leading spirits of the age. She was the first to break through the dense darkness of the times, and, as she gave Christianity to Scotland, so she also imparted to the Saxons the art of illumination.” The first illuminator seems to have been Dagaus, abbot of Iniskeltra, who flourished in the second half of the 6th century. Of English illumination, the finest specimen extant is from the 10th century, the celebrated “Benedictional” by St. Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, written and painted between 963 and 984. In the 13th century, and even down to its decline three centuries later, the art was greatly furthered by Bonaventura’s series of meditations on the life of Christ, which gave minute descriptions of the several scenes of which it treated, and thus formed a sort of ideal. During the Byzantine period it was mainly the Scriptures, the works of the fathers, and books for Church service generally that were illuminated. Later, volumes for private devotion were also thus enriched, until, at the close of the 15th century, the art of illumination was generally applied not only to books, but to MSS. of almost any sort. The invention of printing seemed to sound its death-knell, and it is not to be wondered at that the monks, who, being cut off from secular business, and having found employment by the application of this art, then made a strong resistance to the introduction of an art that would deprive them, sooner or later, of their own employment. But the popular mind had become so accustomed to the illumination of works that its extinction was much more gradual than had been anticipated, and the earliest printed books were not only illuminated, but the printers even attempted, by a process of their art, to supersede manual labor. Perhaps the latest effort of this kind was an edition of the Liturgy, brought out in 1717 by John Short, entirely engraved on copper plates. “The pages were surrounded by borders, and embellished with

pictures and decorated initial letters." See Hill, *English Monasticism,* ch. 12 where may also be found the details of the work as it was carried on for centuries in the various monasteries of Europe. Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art,* 2, 193 sq.

Illuminism

SEE ILLUMINATI; *SEE RATIONALISM*.

Illyes, Andreas

a Hungarian prelate was born at Szont-Gyoergy, in Transylvania, in the first half of the 17th century, and educated at Rome. On his return to his native country he filled several positions of trust, then went to Posen as canon, and later became bishop of Weissenburg. On account of the political disturbances in Transylvania he removed to Vienna. The time of his death is not generally known. He published *Verbun adverbiarum,* 74 sermons in Hungarian (Vienna, 1693, 4to): — *Vitce sanctorum* (ibid. 1693), in Hungarian (Tyrnan, 1705, and often), etc. — Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. 2, 2276.

Illyrica, Council of

(Conciliums Illyricum), held in the year 375, according to Ceillier and Hefele, by order of the emperor alentinian. It was attended by a large number of bishops, who met to consider the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the three divine persons, as it had been set forth at Nicaea. They issued a synodal letter to the churches of Asia, etc., confirming the doctrine with great emphasis, and they further decreed that the homousiastical trinity doctrine should be everywhere taught, and all those who should reject it be punished by anathema. See Hefele, *Conciliengesch. 1,* 716 sq.; Landon, *Man. of Councils,* p. 266 sq. *SEE ARIANISM*.

Illyr'icum

(Ἰλλυρικόν, lit. *Illyrian,* but the word is of unknown though prob. native etymology), or *Illyria,* a country lying to the northwest of Macedonia, and answering nearly to that which is at present called *Dalmatia;* by which name, indeed, the southern part of Illyricum itself was known, and whither St. Paul informs Timothy that Titus had gone (2 Timothy 4:10). The apostle Paul, in his third great missionary journey, after traversing Asia

Minor and Macedonia, tells the Church of Rome that "round about unto Illyricum *(*Κυκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ*)* I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ" (<45159>Romans 15:19). The exact meaning of the passage is somewhat doubtful. The κύκλος may be joined with Jerusalem, and signify its *neighborhood* (as Alford, ad loc.); or it may be joined with the μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, and denote the *circuit* of the apostle's journey "as far as Illyricum" (an expression warranted by the indefinite phrase of Luke, "those parts," <44202>Acts 20:2). Through the southern part of Illyria proper ran the great road called *Via E'nnutia,* which connected Italy and the East, beginning at Apollonia and Dyrrhachium, passing through Thessalonica and Philippi, and terminating at the Hellespont *(Antonini Itinzerarium,* ed. Wessel., p. 317) Along this road Paul may have traveled on his third journey till he reached that region on the shore of the Adriatic which was called Illyricum. From Dyrrhachium he may have turned north into that district of Illyricum then called Dalmatia, and may have founded the churches subsequently visited by Titus (<550410>2 Timothy 4:10). Afterwards he may have gone southwards by Nicopolis to Corinth. (But see Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul,* 1, 389; 1. 128, 1st ed.) Illyricum is a wild and bare mountainous region. A ridge of rugged limestone mountains runs through it from north to south, affording a fitting home for a number of wild tribes, who now, as in ancient times, inhabit the country. The coastline is deeply indented, and possesses some excellent harbors (Grote, *History of Greece,* vol. iv; Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro).* Its boundaries were not very distinct: Pliny (3, 28) and Strabo (7, 313) placing it east of the Adriatic Gulf, while Ptolemy (2, 17) divides it into Liburnia, Iapodia, and Dalmatia (compare Mannert, 7:306). The earliest notices state that certain tribes called Ἰλλύριοι inhabited the mountainous region along the coast between Epirus and Liburnlia (Scylax, ch. 19 sq.). On the invasion of the country by the Goths, these tribes were scattered eastward and northward, and gave their name to a wider region; and this was probably the geographical import of the name as used by Paul. At a later period, Illyricum became one of the four great divisions of the Roman empire, and embraced the whole country lying between the Adriatic, the Danube, the Black Sea, and Macedonia (Gibbon's *Roman Empire,* chap. 1). The best ancient description of it is that of Appian *(Bell. Illyr.),* and among moderns that of Cramer *(Ancient Greece,* i, 29 sq.). *SEE DALMATIA.* (For its history, see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s.v.) — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog. s.*v.

Illyricus

SEE FLACIUS (MATTHIAS).

Image

(prop. μlx, *tse'lem;* εἰκών*;* but also designated by various other Hebrew. terms; often rendered "graven image," "molten image," etc.). *SEE IDOL*. For the interpretation of the colossal statue of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (<2023>Daniel 2:31), *SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF*.

Image-breakers

SEE ICONOCLASTS.

Image of God

The notion of the "image of God in man" is one of the fundamental conceptions of Christian theology. It takes its root in the Mosaic account of creation, where we find God saying (<010126>Genesis 1:26), "Let us make man, Wnmelx]B]and Wn2a tWmnD]K,ain our image, after our likeness." This first expression is again used in the next verse, where the act of creation is recorded, and subsequently also, <010906>Genesis 9:6, after sin had entered the world. There is consequently no further difference between μlx,and tWmD]than that the one is the concrete, the other the abstract expression of the same idea. This is also seen in comparing 5, 3 and <010906>Genesis 9:6. The two synonyms are in fact used for the sake of emphasis, *q.* d. *in exact resemblance of us.*

"No one doubts that the phrase 'image of God' denotes in general a *likeness of God;* but the opinions of theologians have always been different respecting the particular points of resemblance which Moses intended to express by the phrase. Nor is this strange, since Moses does not explain what he means by it, and it is used in very different significations in- the Bible, a fact that has not been sufficiently noticed. The common opinion is, that this phrase denotes certain excellences which man originally possessed, but which he lost, in part at least, by the fall. The principal texts cited in behalf of this opinion are <010126>Genesis 1:26; compare <010215>Genesis 2:15 sq.; and from the N.T., <510309>Colossians 3:19; compare <490424>Ephesians 4:24, where a *renewal* after the image of God is mentioned, which is understood to mean a *restoration* of this image, implying that man must have lost it; also

<47103>2 Corinthians 11:3. Against this common opinion it may be objected that the image of God is described in many passages as existing after the fall, and as still discoverable in men; as <01906>Genesis 9:6; <59009>James 3:9; <46106>1 Corinthians 11:6, 7, and especially <01501>Genesis 5:1-3, from which it appears that Seth, being made in the likeness of Adam, must have had the same image of God, whatever it was, which Adam possessed" (Knapp, *Christian Theology,* bk. 1, art. 6 sec. 53, p. 168).

In the works of the fathers we find great diversity of opinion concerning this image of God (Gregor. Nyss. *De homin. opif* c. 4:5, or 16). Some of the early Latin fathers also maintained a bodily likeness to God (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5,6). The Audaeans (q.v.) admitted only the physical resemblance (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles. 4,* 9), while Augustine and the Church of Alexandria rejected it altogether (Clemens, *Strom.* 2, 19). They also agreed in making the divine image, in a moral point of view, to consist in uprightness before God, and in the harmony between the higher and the lower faculties of the soul; as also physically in the immortality of the body, and the mastership over all other creatures. Others admit a confirmation and strengthening of the image of God in man by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which they consider not only as a gift of free grace, but also as necessary to the completeness of man (Cyr. Alex. *Thes.* 34. *dial.* 6). These different parties make great use of the distinction between the two expressions *imago* and *similitudo;* the scholastics maintaining that by the *inmago* (which, though weakened by the fall. was still extant) is to be understood the essence of the innate, natural attributes of the spirit, especially reason and liberty; and by the *similitudo* (which was obliterated by the fall) the moral nature of man, which was agreeable to God, or, in other words, the thorough unison with the divine will originating in the divine grace (HugoVict. *De Sacram.* 1. 1, p. 6, c. 2; Petr. Lomb. *Sent.* 1. 2, dist. 16, D.). The creed of Trent makes no positive mention concerning the image of God, but the *Catechisimus Ramanus* considers it as consisting in the peculiar inherent dispositions of the human soul, for after its definitions concerning Adam's body it says, "Quod autem ad animam pertinet, eum (hominem) ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit liberumque ei arbitrium tribuit," which, however, does not satisfactorily explain in what relation this *liberun arbitrium* (free will) stands with regard to the *imago dei* (image of God) in the soul. It also leaves undecided the question whether the consequent submission of the desires to the dictates of reason is also to be considered as forming part of this image of God. From the

word *addidit* we can only infer that the *originalis justitice admirable donum* is something independent, not inherent *(Cat. Rom.* 1, 2,19). The Romish theologians still endeavor to maintain the distinctions made by the scholastics between *imago* and *similitudo.* "The 'original justice' is further considered as a supernatural gift, which man possesses by a special grace, so that it is made to counterbalance the natural division between the higher and the lower forces (the spirit and the flesh reason and sensuality), thus directing the forces towards God, and introducing the *similitudo* in the *imago* (Bellarmine, *De Grat. Prinm Ilonsini:* 5, 5). Thus the Roman Catholic Church starts in its theory from the present state of man, as resulting from the fall, in regard to which state communion with God is something *superadded.* Some Romanist theologians distinguish between original *justice* and original *holiness* (communion with God), maintaining the former to be the attribute of pure nature as it came from the hand of the Creator, and holding the latter to be exclusively the gift of superadded and supernatural grace. The evangelical Church, on the contrary, by considering the image of God as belonging to Adam's true nature, as he came from the hands of his Creator, obtains a doctrine at once more clear, more simple, and more true *(Apol.* 1, 17; comp. *Form. Concord. sol. decl.* 1 10). It considers habitual communion with God as a state natural to man, and belonging to his normal organization before the fall, not as a special particular gift. It maintains, further, that this original image of God was lost by the fall of man.

"But in the papal anthropology, man, as he comes from God, is imperfect. He is not created sinful indeed, but neither is he created holy. To use the papal phrase, he is created *in puris natusulibus;* without positive righteousness and without positive unrighteousness. The body is full of natural carnal propensities, and tends downwards. The soul, as rational and immortal, tends upwards. But there is no harmony between the two *by creation.* An act subsequent to that of creation, and additional to it, is necessary to bring this harmony about; and this is that act by which the gift of original righteousness is *superadded* to the gifts of creation. In and by this act the higher part is strengthened to acquire and maintain dominion over the lower, and a positive perfection is imparted to human nature that was previously lacking in it. Original righteousness is thus, in reference to the created and natural characteristics of man, a *supernatural* gift.

"The second peculiarity in the papal anthropology consists in the tenet that *apostasy, involves the loss of a supernatural, but not of a natural gift.* By

the act of transgression, human nature lapses back into that condition of conflict between the flesh and the spirit in which it was created. In losing its original righteousness, therefore, it loses nothing with which it was endowed by the *creative* act, but only that superadded gift which was bestowed subsequently to this. The supremacy of the higher over the lower part is lost by the Adamic transgression, and the two parts of man, the flesh and the spirit, fall into their *primitive* and *natural* antagonism again. Original righteousness being a supernatural gift, original sin is the loss of it, and, in reality, the restoration of man to the state in which he was created" (Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* 2, 146).

The "image," or likeness of God, in which man was made, has, by some, been assigned exclusively to the body; by others simply to the soul; others, again, have found its essence in the circumstance of his having *"dominion"* over the other creatures. As to the body, it is not necessary to take up any large space to prove that in no instance can that literally bear the image of God, that is, be "like" God. Descant ever so much or ever so poetically upon man's upright and noble form, this has no more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one: God is incorporeal, and has no bodily shape to be the antitype of anything material. Not more tenable is the notion that the image of God in man consisted in the "dominion" which was granted to him over this lower world. Limited dominion may, it is true, be an image of large and absolute dominion; but man is not said to have been made in the image of God's dominion, which is accident merely, for, before any creatures existed, God himself could have no dominion but in the image and likeness of God himself, of something which constitutes *his nature.* Still further, man, according to the history was evidently made in the image of God, *in order* to his having dominion, as the Hebrew connective particle ("and") imports. He who was to have dominion must necessarily be made before he could be invested with it, and therefore dominion was consequent to his existing in the "image" and "likeness" of God, and could not be that image itself.

The attempts which have been made to fix upon some *one* essential quality in which to place that "image" of God in which man was created, are not only uncalled for by any scriptural requirement, but are even contradicted by various parts of Scripture, from which alone we must derive our information on this subject. It is in vain to say that this "image" must be something essential to human nature, something only which cannot be lost. We shall, it is true, find that revelation places it in what is essential to

human nature; but that it should comprehend nothing else, or one quality only, has no proof or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is not essential to human nature, and what may be lost and be regained. As to both, the evidence of Scripture is explicit.

(1.) When God is called "the, Father of spirits" a likeness is certainly intimated between man and God in the *spirituality* of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of Paul with the Athenians: "Forasmuch, then, as we are the *offspring* of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art, and man's device;" plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument against human representations of the Deity; but it imports, as Howe well expresses it, that. "we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure; as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind' or thinking power?" In spirituality, and consequently immateriality, this image of God in man, then, in the first particular, consists.

(2.) The sentiment expressed in Wisdom 2, 23, is evidence that, in the opinion of the ancient Jews, the image of God in man comprised *immortality* also: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity;" and though other creatures, and even the body of man, were made capable of immortality, and at least the material human frame, whatever we may think of the case of animals, would have escaped death, had not sin entered the world, yet, without running into the absurdity of the "natural immortality" of the human soul, that essence must have been constituted immortal in a high and peculiar sense, which has ever retained its prerogative of eternal duration amidst the universal death, not only of animals, but of the bodies of all human beings. *SEE IMMORTALITY*.

(3.) To these correspondences we are to add that of *intellectual powers*, and we have what divines have called, in perfect accordance with the Scriptures, the *natural* image of God in his creature, which is essential and ineffaceable. He was made capable of *knowledge*, and he was endowed with liberty of *will.*

(4.) This natural image of God, in which man was created, was the foundation of that *moral image* by which also he was distinguished. Unless he had been a spiritual, knowing, and willing being, he would have been wholly incapable of moral qualities. That he had such qualities eminently, and that in them consisted the image of God, as well as in the natural attributes just stated, we have also the express testimony of Scripture. “Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.” There is also an express allusion to the moral image of God, in which man was first created, in <510310>Colossians 3:10, “And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him;” and in <490424>Ephesians 4:24, “Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing the works of his hands “as very good.” This is pronounced with reference to each individually as well as to the whole: “And God saw *everything* that he had made, and behold, it was very good” But as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. Without them he would have been imperfect as *man;* and, had they existed in him, in their first exercises, perverted and sinful, he must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced “very good.” — Watson, *Institutes*, 2, 9-13.

From this point of view we may arrive at a correct apprehension of the idea of the divine image. God, as an absolute spirit, whose essential element of life is love, cannot but manifest himself in an eternal object of this love, of the same essence with himself. This is the Son, the eternal, absolute, immanent image of God. But as God, by virtue of his unfathomable, overflowing love, calls also forth (or creates) other beings, to whom he wills to impart his blissful life by the establishing of his kingdom, he, the type of all perfection, cannot create them but after his own image, as he sees it from all eternity in the Son. This *created* image of God is man in his primitive condition. Man was the real object of God’s creative activity, as is seen in God’s special decision with regard to his creation (<010126>Genesis 1:26; comp. Psalm 8), and mankind are called to be the real population of his kingdom. The whole universe (and even in some sense the angels, <581014>Hebrews 1:14) was only created for man, which is the reason why he was not created till all other things were ready for him. The faculties which other creatures present only in a limited, disconnected manner, were in him (as the μικρόκοσμος*)* united into a harmonious whole; moreover, in him

alone (as the μικρόθεος), of all creatures, was the personal spiritual life of God mirrored; and by direct inspiration of the divine breath of life, the spirit was infused, by which he became a spiritual, self-conscious, free, and individual soul. Man was created God's image in his individualism. As God is not an abstract, but a real spirit, full of the living powers which created the world, so the image of God in man embraced his whole nature. It extended also to the body as the outward image, the dwelling and organ of the soul. Man was created the image of God in the totality of his being. But, while man was thus made the image of God to himself, he was also made the image of God to the world before which he stands as the representative of God, a relation by which the mastery over the outer world ascribed to him in Scripture (Genesis 1:28-30) is shown to have an inner foundation. Thus far the image of God was innate in man and inalienable. This innate state, however, bespoke a corresponding *habitual* state. Inasmuch as God the Spirit is love, man was destined to a life of love, and was at once brought into it by communion with God. From the heart, however, as the center of individual life, the power of love manifests itself in the direction of knowledge as truth and wisdom (objective and subjective directions), and in the direction of the will, as freedom and sanctity (formal and material directions), yet so that these spiritual conditions in their original working produced a state partly of untried innocence and partly of unfolding development. To the body, the image of God procured immortality *(posse non mori),* as the outward dissolution of the forces (death) is but the result of an inward dissolution of the principle of life. With regard to the world, however, man obtained by it a power, in consequence of which the world becomes subject to him by love, and not by force; and by his knowledge of its nature (Genesis 2:19, 20), he is enabled to carry out God's will in it.

This habitual resemblance to God, which, with the image of God innate in man's nature, formed the natural, original state of man, was *lost by sin,* as the life of love, coming from God, which formed its basis, was destroyed by selfishness coming from the heart of man. It could only be restored by the absolute image of God the Son, source of the life of love for the world, assuming himself the form of man. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made flesh, is the real, personal restoration of the image of God in humanity. Since in the flesh he overcame sin for us by his death, and raised our nature to glory in his resurrection, man can again become partaker of the righteousness and spiritual glory which belong to him. By the Holy Spirit,

which fills our hearts with love for God, the image of God is restored in us in truth and uprightness. See C. Sartorius, *D. Lehre v. d. heiligen Liebe* (Stuttg. 1843), 1, 34 sq.); J. T. Beck, *D. christl. Lehrwissenschaft nach den bibl. Urkunden* (Stutt. 1841), 1, § 19; H. Martensen, *D. christl. Dogmatik* (Kiel, 1850), p. 156; J. Chr. K. Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis* (Nordlingen, 1851), 1, 248-254: G. Thomasius, *Christi Person u. Werk* (Erlangen, 1853), 1, 147-224; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 3,* 614; Knapp, *Theology,* sect. 53 et sq.; Winer. *Comparat. Darstellung,* p. 33; Watson, *Institutes* vol. 2, ch. 1; *Critici Sacri, "De Inmagine Dei,"* 1, 40; Fawcett, *Sermons,* p. 234; Dwight, *Theology,* 1, 345; South, *Sermons,* 1, 45; Grinfield, *Inquiry into the Image of God in Man* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Harness, *Sermons on the Image of God* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); *Bibliotheca Sacra, 7,* 409; Jackson, Thos., *Original State of Man, in. Works, 9,* 1; Van Mildert, *Works,* 5, 143; Harris, *Man Primeval* (N. Y. 1851,12mo).

Image of Jealousy

SEE JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF.

Imagery

(tyKæmi; *maskith',* an *image,* as rendered <03301>Leviticus 26:1; or *picture,* as rendered <04352>Numbers 33:52), only in the phrase *"chambers of his imagery"* (<26812>Ezekiel 8:12). The scenes of pictorial representation referred to by this phrase are connected with an instructive passage in the history of Ezekiel and the Jewish exiles, who were stationed in Assyria, on the banks of the Chebar. At one of their interesting prayer-meetings for the restoration of Israel, which had been held so often and so long without any prospect of brighter days, and when the faith and hopes of many of the unfortunates were waxing dim and feeble, Ezekiel, in presence of his friends, consisting of the exiled elders of Judah, was suddenly rapt in mystic vision, and graciously shown, for his own satisfaction, as well as that of his pious associates, the reasons of God's protracted controversy with Israel, and the sad necessity there was for still dealing hardly with them. Transported by the Spirit (not bodily, indeed, nor by external force, but in imagination) to the city and Temple of Jerusalem, he there saw, as plainly as if it had been with the eve of sense, atrocities going on within the precincts of the holy place-the perpetration of which in the very capital of Judaea, the place which God had chosen to put his name there, afforded proof of the woeful extent of national apostasy and corruption, and was

sufficient to justify, both to the mind of the prophet and his circle of pious associates, the severity of the divine judgments on Israel, and the loud call there was for prolonging and increasing, instead of putting a speedy end to, the dire calamities they had so long been suffering (Ezekiel 8), *SEE EZEKIEL*.

The first spectacle that caught his eye as he perambulated, in mystic vision, the outer court of the Temple that court where the people usually assembled to worship-was a colossal statue, probably of Baal, around which crowds of devotees were performing their frantic revelries, and whose forbidden ensigns were proudly blazoning on the walls and portals of the house of him who had proclaimed himself a God jealous of his honor (ver. 3; Lowth, ad loc.). Scarcely had the prophet recovered from his astonishment and horror at the open and undisguised idolatry of the multitude in that sacred enclosure, when his celestial guide bade him turn another way, and he would see greater abominations. Leading him to that side of the court along which were ranged the houses of the priests, his conductor pointed to a mud wall (ver. 7), which, to screen themselves from observation, the apostate servants of the true God had raised; and in that wall was a small chink, by widening which he discovered a passage into a secret chamber, which was completely impervious to the rays of the sun, but which he found, on entering it, lighted up by a profusion of brilliant lamps. The sides of it were covered with numerous paintings of beasts and reptiles-the favorite deities of Egypt; and with their eyes intently fixed on these decorations was a conclave of seventy persons, in the garb of priests — the exact number, and, in all probability, the individual members of the Sanhedrim who stood in the attitude of adoration, holding in their hands each a golden censer, containing all the costly and odoriferous materials which the pomp and magnificence of the Egyptian ritual required. “There was every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel portrayed round about.” The scene described was wholly formed on the model of Egyptian worship; and every one who has read the works of Wilkinson, Belzoni, Richardson, and others, will perceive the close resemblance that it bears to the outer walls, the sanctuaries, and the hieroglyphical figures that distinguished the ancient mythology of Egypt (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). What were the strange and unsightly images engraved on the walls of this chamber discovered by Ezekiel, and that formed the objects of the profane reverence of these apostate councilors, may be known from the following

metrical description, which the late Mr. Salt, long the British consul in Egypt, has drawn of the gods worshipped by the ancient idolatrous inhabitants of that country ("Egypt," in Hall's *Life of Salt*, 2, 416). Those who have prosecuted their researches among the rubbish of the temples, he says, have found in the deeply sequestered chambers they were able to reach

"The wildest images, unheard of, strange,
That ever puzzled antiquarians' brains:
Genii, with heads of birds, hawks, ibis, drakes,
Of lions, foxes, cats, fish, frogs, and snakes,

Bulls, rams, and monkeys, hippopotami,
With knife in paw, suspended from the sky;
Gods germinating men, and men turned gods,
Seated in honor, with gilt crooks and rods;

Vast scarabaei, globes by hands upheld,
From chaos springing, 'mid an endless field:
Of forms grotesque, the sphinx, the crocodile,
And other reptiles from the slime of Nile."

Picture for Imagery

In order to show the reader still further how exactly this inner chamber that Ezekiel saw was constructed after the Egyptian fashion, we subjoin an extract from the work of another traveler, descriptive of the great temple of Edfu, one of the admirable relics of antiquity, from which it will be seen that the degenerate priests of Jerusalem had borrowed the whole style of the edifice in which they were celebrating their hidden rites — its form, its entrance, as well as its pictorial ornaments on the walls from their idolatrous neighbors of Egypt; "Considerably below the surface of the adjoining building," says *he*, "my conductor pointed out to me a *chink in an old wall*, which he told me I should creep through on my hands and feet; the aperture was not two feet and a half high, and scarcely three feet and a half broad. My companion had the courage to go first, thrusting in a lamp before him: I followed. The passage was so narrow that my mouth and nose were almost buried in the dust, and I was nearly suffocated. After proceeding about ten yards in utter darkness, the heat became excessive, the breathing was laborious, the perspiration poured down my face, and I would have given the world to have got out; but my companion, whose person I could not distinguish, though his voice was audible, called out to

me to crawl a few feet further, and that I should find plenty of room. I joined him at length, and had the inexpressible satisfaction of standing once more upon my feet. We found ourselves in a *splendid apartment of great magnitude,* adorned with an incredible profusion of sacred *paintings and hieroglyphics"* (Madden's *Travels in Turkey, Egypt, etc.;* see also Maurice, *Indian Antiq.* 2, 212). In the dark recesses of such a chamber as this, which they entered like the traveler through a hole in the outer wall, and in which was painted to the eye the grotesque and motley group of Egyptian divinities, were the chief men at Jerusalem actually employed when Ezekiel saw them. With minds highly excited by the dazzling splendor, and the clouds of fragrant smoke that filled the apartment, the performers of those clandestine rites seem to have surpassed even the enthusiastic zeal of their ancestors in the days of Moses, when, crowding round the pedestal of the golden calf, they rent the air with their cries of "These be thy gods, 0 Israel!" Beneath a calmer exterior, the actors in the scene pointed out to 'Ezekiel concealed a stronger and more intense passion for idolatry. Every form of animal life, from the noblest quadruped to the most loathsome reptile that spawned in Egypt, received a share of their insane homage; and the most extraordinary feature of the scene was that the individual who appeared to be the director of these foul mysteries, the master of ceremonies, was Jaazaniah, a descendant of that zealous scribe who had gained so much renown as the principal adviser of the good king Josiah, and whose family had for generations been regarded as the most illustrious for piety in the land. The presence of a scion of this venerated house in such a den of impurity struck the prophet as an electric shock, and showed, better than all the other painful spectacles this chamber exhibited, to what a fearful extent idolatry had inundated the land. *SEE IDOLATRY*.

It might have been supposed impossible for men to have sunk to a lower depth of superstition than that of imitating the Egyptians in worshipping the monsters of the Nile, or the vegetable produce of their fields and gardens, had not the prophet been directed to turn yet again, and he would see greater abominations that they did. "Then he brought me to the gate of the Lord's house, which was towards the north; and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz" (ver. 14). This, the principal deity of the Phoenicians, and who was often called also by that people Adoni, that is, My Lord, became afterwards famous in the Grecian mythology under the well-known name of Adonis; and the circumstance of his 'being selected

for the subject of their most beautiful fiction by so many of the classic poets is a sufficient proof of the great popular interest his name and ritual excited among the idolaters of the ancient world. It is said to have originated in a tragic adventure that befell an intrepid and beautiful prince of Phoenicia, who was killed while hunting a wild boar, by which that land was infested, and whose untimely death in the cause of his country was bewailed in an annual festival held to commemorate the disastrous event. During the seven days that the festival lasted, the Phoenicians appeared to be a nation of mourners; and in every town and village a fictitious representation of Tammuz was got up for the occasion, and the whole population assembled to pour forth their unbounded sorrow for his hapless fate, more especially at Byblos, in Syria, where a temple was erected in honor of this national deity. A strange imposture was practiced to influence the public lamentations. There was in this temple a gigantic statue of the god, the eyes of which were filled with lead, which, on fire being applied within, of course melted and fell in big drops to the ground, a signal for the loud wailings of the by-standers, whose eyes, in sympathetic imitation, were dissolved in tears. Conspicuous among the crowd on such occasions, a band of mercenary females directed the orgies; and, in conformity with an ancient custom of bewailing the dead on anniversaries at the *doors of houses* (Potter's *Grecian Antiq.* bk. 4: ch. 3), others took their station at the *gate,* with their faces directed northwards, as the sun was said to have been in that quarter of the heavens at the time when Tammuz died. These violent efforts in mourning were always followed by scenes of the most licentious and revolting revelry, which, though not mentioned, are manifestly implied among the "greater abominations" which degraded this other group of idolaters. *SEE TAMMUZ.*

Besides the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the orgies of Tammuz, there was another form of superstition still, which in Jerusalem, then almost wholly given to idolatry, had its distinguished patrons. "Turn thee yet again," said his celestial guide to the prophet, "and thou shalt see greater abominations than these" (ver. 16). So he brought him "unto the inner court of the Lord's house, and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east: and they worshipped the sun towards the east." Perhaps of all the varieties of superstition, which had crept in among the Hebrews in that period of general decline, none displayed such flagrant dishonor to the God of Israel

as *this* (Clem. Alexandrinus, *Strom. 7*, 520); for, as the most holy place was situated at the west end of the sanctuary, it was impossible for these twenty-five men to pay their homage to the rising sun without turning their backs on the consecrated place of the divine presence; and accordingly this fourth circle is introduced last, as if their employment formed the climax of abominations the worst and most woeful sign of the times. Could stronger proofs be wasted that the Lord had not forsaken Israel, but was driven from them? This was the lesson intended, and actually accomplished by the vision; for while the prophet was made aware by this mystic scene of the actual state of things among his degenerate countrymen at home, he saw himself-and instructed the pious circle around him to see-a proof of the long-suffering and the just severity of God in deferring to answer their fervent and long-continued prayers for the emancipation of their country. *SEE SUN*.

Image-worship

the adoration of artificial representations of real or imaginary objects. *SEE IDOLATRY*.

I. *Image-worship among the Jews.* — It has always been a tendency of the human mind, untaught by true revelation, to embody the invisible deity in some visible form, and especially in the human form. This led to representations of God, or of the gods, as conceived by the mind, in painting or statuary, under all kinds of shapes, such as men, monsters, animals, etc. In the course of time these representations came to be considered as being themselves the gods, and to be worshipped in temples and on altars. The Jews, as worshippers of *one* God, were by the Law of Moses forbidden to make any image of Jehovah; but the people, corrupted by the example of the Egyptians, compelled Aaron to erect a golden calf in the Desert. After their entrance into Canaan, as the worship of Jehovah was not yet fully organized and accessible to all, they made use in their household devotions of images of the Invisible, and that practice became quite general; but, as the civil and religious organization of the Jews became more developed, this practice fell gradually into disuse, and-it was no longer tolerated under David and Solomon. After the separation between Judah and Israel, Rehoboam restored the use of images in the latter kingdom for political motives, erecting golden calves in Dan and Bethel. In the kingdom of Judah the worship of images found, however, but few partisans. After the captivity of Babylon we find no traces of it.

II. *In the Christian Church. — Images* were unknown in the worship of the primitive Christians; and this fact was, indeed, made the ground of a charge of atheism on the part of the heathen against the Christians. The primitive Christians abstained from the worship of images, not as the Romanists pretend, from tenderness to heathen idolaters, but because they thought it unlawful in itself to make any images of the deity. Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen were even of opinion that, by the second commandment, painting and engraving were unlawful to a Christian, styling them evil and wicked arts (Tertullian, *de Idol.* c. 3; Clem. Alexand. *Adunon. ad Gent.* p. 41; Origen, *contra Celsum, 6,* 182). Some of the Gnostic sects, especially the Basilidians (q.v.) and the Carpocratians (q.v.), made effigies of Christ. St. Paul, etc. *SEE GNOSTICS*. This example of professed philosophers was not without its influence on the Church, and it was seconded by a similar usage among the Manichmeans (q.v.), and by the steady pressure of heathen ideas and habits upon Christianity. Emblems, such as the dove, the fish, the anchor, vine, lamb, etc., engraved on seals, formed the first step; then came paintings representing Biblical events, saints or martyrs, etc., which were placed in the vestibule of the church. Yet this practice was unfavorably regarded by the synods of the 4th century. When, however, in the same century, Christianity was proclaimed the religion of the state, many distinguished persons embraced it, and its ceremonial became more imposing; and in the 5th century the use of painting, sculpture, and jewelry became general for the decoration of the churches. This resulted in the adoption of a regular system of symbolic religious images. Paulinus of Nola (q.v.) was chiefly instrumental in introducing these practices in the West, and, as the images were at first chiefly used in books intended for the instruction of the poor and the laity, *SEE BIBLIA PAUPERUM*, who were too ignorant to read, they probably did more good than harm at the time; but as the teachers of the Church became gradually more accommodating in their relations with the heathen, holding out greater privileges to them, and allowing them to retain their old usages while conforming to the outward forms of Christianity, the worship of images became so general that it had to be repeatedly checked by laws. In the 6th century it had grown- into a great abuse, especially in the East, where images were made the object of especial adoration: they were kissed, lamps were burned before them, incense was offered to them, and, in short, they were treated in every respect as the heathen were wont to treat the images of their gods. Some of the heads of the Church encouraged these practices from motives of

policy, while the more enlightened and evangelical portion strongly opposed them. This gave rise to the Iconoclasts (q.v.).

Neander describes the origin of the use of images in churches as follows: "It was not 'in the Church, but in the family, that religious images first came into use among the Christians. In their daily intercourse with men, the Christians saw themselves everywhere surrounded by the objects of pagan mythology, or, at least, by objects offensive to their moral and Christian sentiments. Representations of this sort covered the walls in shops, and were the ornaments of drinking-vessels and seal rings, on which the pagans frequently had engraved the images of their gods, so that they might worship them when they pleased. It was natural that, in place of these objects, so offensive to their religious and moral sentiments, the Christians should substitute others more agreeable to them. Thus they preferred to have on the goblets the figure of a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulder, which was the symbol of our Savior rescuing the repentant sinner, according to the Gospel parable. Clement of Alexandria says, in reference to the seal-rings of the Christians, 'Let our signets be a dove (the symbol of the Holy Spirit), or a fish, or a ship sailing towards heaven (the symbol of the Christian Church and of the individual Christian soul), or a lyre (the symbol of Christian joy), or an anchor (the symbol of Christian hope); and he who is a fisherman will not be forgetful of the apostle Peter, and of the children taken from the water; for no images of gods should be engraved on the rings of those who are forbidden all intercourse with idols; no sword or bow on the rings of those who strive after peace; no goblets on the rings of those who are the friends of sobriety.' Yet religious emblems passed from domestic use into the churches perhaps as early as the end of the 3rd century. The walls of them were painted in this manner. The Council of Elvira, in the year 303, opposed this innovation as an abuse, and forbade 'the objects of worship and adoration to be painted on the walls'" (Neander, *Church History,* 1, 292).

III. *Image worship in the Roman Catholic Church.* The Romanists deny the charge of worshipping images, or idolatry, which has often been and is still made against them by Protestants. They have always carefully refrained from such doctrinal *definitions* on the subject as would fully convict the Church of idolatry. In this respect the course of the Romish Church is similar to its procedure with regard to the doctrine *of good works,* which it presents in such a manner as might lead one to think that it strictly asserts the merits of Christ as alone rendering our works useful, whilst *in practice*

the believer is pointed to good works as the means of salvation. So, with regard to prayers to the Virgin and the saints, it draws a clear distinction between the *adoration* and the *worship* of saints, but practically the prayers of the Roman Catholics are more generally addressed to the saints than to Christ. The same takes place with regard to images. The Council of Trent (See. 25:*De invocatione Sanctorum,* etc.) states, "that the images of Christ and of the ever virgin Mother of God, and in like manner of other saints, are to be kept and retained, and that *due honor and veneration* is to be awarded to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honor with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves." The council quotes on this subject the second Synod of Nicaea. To this "honor and veneration" belong the solemn consecration of the images, offering up incense before them, the special prayers accompanying these ceremonies as contained in the *Pontificae Romanum,* other prayers for private use to be repeated before the images, and the indulgences granted to those who fulfill that duty, etc. All this shows that the Romish Church, while rejecting in form the *doctrine* of image worship, has introduced the *practice* among the people. The masses do not and cannot understand the subtle distinction made by the Church, and not always strictly observed even by the clergy. The Church knows of this evil, but places it among things she tolerates for the sake of charity, though she does not approve them. Yet some Roman Catholic theologians appear to have come very close indeed to the same conception as the masses on this point. Thomas Aquinas expressed his views of images in a dilemma: "A picture considered in itself is worthy of no veneration, but if we consider it as an image of Christ it may be allowable to make an internal distinction between the image and its subject, and *adoratio* and *latsica* are as well due to it as to Christ" (3 *Sent.* dist. 9, qu. 1, art. 2, 3; *Summa,* qu. 23, art. 4, 5). Bonaventura drew a correct conclusion from the principle: "Since all veneration shown to the image of Christ is shown to Christ himself, then the image of Christ is also entitled to be prayed to" *(Cultus latrice,* 1. 3, dist. 9, art. 1, qu. 2). Bellarmine says that "the images of Christ and the saints are to be adored not only in a figurative manner, but quite positively, so that the prayers are directly addressed to them, and not

merely as the representatives of the original (Ita ut ipsi [imagines] terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur et non ut vicem gerunt exemplaris). The image itself is in some degree holy, namely, by its likeness to one holy, its consecration and its use in worship; from whence it follows that the images themselves are not entitled to the same honor as God, but to less" *(De Inmaginibus,* 1. 2, c. 10), i.e. the difference between the divine worship and image worship is one of degree or quantity, not of nature or quality. Such theories, although far overstepping the limits of the decree of Trent, are yet freely permitted by the Romish Church; it neither openly admits nor officially condemns them, and thus leaves an opening for all possible degrees of idolatry, over which many an honest Roman Catholic priest mourns in secret.

History shows that the first tendency to image-worship was the result of a slow but continued degeneracy. The same arguments now used by the Romish Church to defend image-worship were rejected by the Christians of the first three centuries when used in the defense of idol-worship. The heathen said, We do not worship the images themselves, but those whom they represent. To this Lactantius answers *(Inst. Div.* lib. 2, c. 2), "You worship them; for, if you believe them to be in heaven, why do you not raise your eyes up to heaven? why do you look at the wood and stone, and not up, where you believe the originals to be?" The ancient Church rejected the use of all images *(Synod of Elkira,* 305, c. 36: "Placuit, picturas in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur"). The early Christians evidently feared that pictures in their churches would eventually become objects of prayer. The admission of images into the church in the 4th and 5th centuries was justified on the theory that the ignorant people could learn the facts of Christianity from them better than 'from sermons or books. But the people soon lost sight of this use of the images, and made *them* the objects of adoration. This took place earlier in the East than in the West; but the abuse gained ground in the latter region in a short time. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, broke several images, and had them taken out of the church, because he found that the people prayed to them. Gregory the Great proclaims that he does not allow any praying to *(adorari)* the images, and adds to this that Paulinus of Nola and Nilus had already said that paintings were placed in the church only in order that the uneducated might read on the walls what they were unable to read in books (lib. 9, ep. 105). He also laid down, as a general principle, in his letter to Secundinus, that it was expedient to use

the visible to represent the invisible (lib. 9, ep. 52). But he shows evidently that he is not speaking of a mere objective representation of Deity, for he says that he prostrates himself *(prosternimus)* before the images, making the well-known Roman Catholic condition that he thus really prays to Christ. The second Council of Nicnea (A.D. 787) decreed the validity of image-worship, and anathematized all who opposed it. The Frankish Church, on the other hand, though it did not forbid the use of images in the church, formally declared against their being worshipped. Charlemagne opposed to the decrees of the synod the so-called Caroline books (q.v.), in which it is expressly said that images are allowed in the church, but not to be prayed to, only to excite the attention on the subjects they commemorate, and to adorn the walls. "For," as it says further on, "if some enlightened persons, who do not pray to the image itself, but to him it represents, should pray *before* the image, it would mislead the ignorant, who pray only to what they see before their eyes" (lib. 3:16). The Synod of Frankfort (summoned by Charlemagne, A.D. 794, and consisting of 300 bishops) and the Synod of Paris (825) solemnly condemned image-worship. The latter council even ventured to reject the pope's contrary opinion in very strong terms. During the whole of the 9th century the matter was thus at rest, Claudius of Turin, Agobard, and other of the most important theologians of that period approving the action of the synods. Jonas of Orleans, an opponent of Claudius, expressly says, in his *De cultu imaginum.* that images are placed in the church "solummodo ad instruendas nescientium mentes." The Council of Trent, as cited above, recommends images as means of instructing the people, and to incite the faithful to imitate the saints; but in later times the Romish Church has added to this what the Frankish Church of the 8th and 9th centuries had so wisely rejected. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 233-235. The fluctuations of opinion and variations of discipline in the Romish Church on the subject of image-worship are well exhibited by Faber *(Difficulties of Romanism,* p. 10 et sq.). See White, *Bampton Lectures,* p. 8; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* chap. 13:§ 14; Spanheim, *Hist. Imaginum,* Opera, tom. 2; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.,* book 8:ch. 8; Tenison, *On Idolatry,* p. 269. sq.; Winer, *Comp. Darstellung, 3,* 1. See also articles *SEE ICONOCLASTS*; *SEE ICONOGRAPHY*; *SEE GREEK CHURCH*; *SEE ROMAN CHURCH*.

Imagination

(Lat. *imaginatio).* "The meaning of this word enters into many relationships, and is thereby rendered difficult to define. The principal

meaning is doubtless what connects it with poetry and fine art, from which the other significations branch off. The simplest mode of explaining this complicated relationship will be to state in separation-the different constituents of the power in question. We shall then see why and where it touches upon other faculties, which still require to be distinguished from it.

"**1.** Imagination has for its objects the *concrete,* the real, or the individual, as opposed to abstractions and generalities, which are the matter of science. The full coloring of reality is implied in our imagination of any scene of nature. In this respect, there is something common to imagination and memory. If we endeavor to imagine a volcano, according as we succeed, we have before the mind everything that a spectator would observe on the spot. Thus, sensation, memory, and imagination alike deal with the fullness of the actual world, as opposed to the abstractions of science and the reasoning faculties.

"The faculty called *conception,* in one of its meanings, has also to do with this concrete fullness, although, in what Sir William Hamilton deems the original and proper meaning of that word, this power is excluded. In popular language, and in the philosophy of Dugald, Stewart, conception is applied to the case of our realizing any description of actual life, as given in history or in poetry. When we completely enter into a scene portrayed by a writer or speaker, and approach the situation of the actual observer, we are often said to *conceive* what is meant, and also to imagine it; the best word for this signification probably is 'realize.'

"**2.** It is further essential to imagination in its strictest sense that there should be some original construction, or that what is imagined should not be a mere picture of what we have seen. Creativeness, origination, invention, are names also designating the same power, and excluding mere memory, or the literal reproduction of past experience. Every artist is said to have imagination according as he can rise to new combinations or effects different from what he has found in his actual observation of nature. A literal, matter-of-fact historian would be said to be wanting in the faculty. The exact copying of nature may be very meritorious in an artist, and very agreeable as an effect, but we should not designate it by the term imagination. There are, however, in the sciences, and in all the common arts, strokes of invention and new constructions, to which it might seem at first sight unfair to refuse the term in question, if originality be a leading feature in its definition. But still we do not usually apply the term

imagination to this case, and for a reason that will appear when we mention the next peculiarity attaching to the faculty.

"**3.** Imagination has for its ruling element some emotion of the mind, to gratify which all its constructions are guided. Here lies the great contrast between it and the creativeness of science and mechanical invention. These last are instrumental to remote objects of convenience or pleasure. A creation of the imagination comes home at once to the mind, and has no ulterior view.

"Whenever we are under the mastery of some strong emotion, the current of our thoughts is affected and colored by that emotion; what chimes in with it is retained, and other things kept out of sight. We also form new constructions that suit the state of the moment. Thus, in fear, we are overwhelmed by objects of alarm, and even conjure up, specters that have no existence. But the highest example of all is presented to us by the constructions of fine art, which are determined by those emotions called *aesthetic*, the sense of beauty, the pleasures of taste; they are sometimes expressly styled 'pleasures of the imagination.' The artist has in himself those various sensibilities to an unusual degree, and he carver and shapes his creations with a view to gratifying them to the utmost. Thus it happens that fine art and imagination are related together, while science and useful art are connected with our reasoning faculties, which may also be faculties of invention. It is a deviation from the correct use of language, and a confounding of things essentially distinct, to say that a man of science stands in need of imagination as well as powers of reason; he needs the power of *original construction*, but his inventions are not framed to satisfy present emotions, but to be instrumental in remote ends, which in their remoteness may excite nothing that is usually understood as emotion. Every artist exercises the faculty in question if he produces anything original in his art.

The name 'Fancy' has substantially the meanings now described, and was originally identical with imagination. It is a corruption *of fantasy*, from the Greek φαντασία. It has now a shade of meaning somewhat different, being applied to those creations that are most widely removed from the world of reality. In the exercise of our imagination we may keep close to nature, and only indulge the liberty of recombining what we find, so as to surpass the original in some points, without forcing together what could not co-exist in reality. This is the sober style of art. But when, in order to

gratify the unbounded longings of the mind, we construct a fairyland with characteristics altogether beyond what human life can furnish, we are said to enter the regions of fancy and the fantastical.

"The 'ideal' and 'ideality' are also among the synonyms of imagination, and their usual acceptation illustrates still further the property now discussed. The 'ideal' is something that fascinates the mind, or gratifies some of our strong emotions and cravings, when reality is insufficient for that end. Desiring something to admire and love beyond what the world can supply, we strike out a combination free from the defects of common humanity, and adorned with more than excellence. This is our 'ideal,' what satisfies our emotions, and the fact of its so doing is the determining influence in the construction of it" *SEE IDEALISM*.

Imani

is the name of the third sacred book of laws of the Turks, containing the directions for a reasonable conduct of life. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8:*830.

Imaum

or Imai is the title of a person belonging to a class of the Mohammedan Ulema (q.v.) or priestly body, but not set apart from the rest of the world like the clergy or priesthood, with whom he is usually classed. He is not ordained, nor is any sacred character conferred upon him. The name is Arabic, and signifies "he who is at the head." In this sense it is applied even to the sultan, "Imaum ul-Muslemin," or simply "Imaum," and is given to the most honored teachers of Mohammedanism, who in the first centuries of the Hegira developed and settled the opinion and law of Islam, as "those whose teachings are followed." The imaum, whose instruction generally extends only to the understanding of the Koran, calls the Moslem to prayer from the top of minarets, performs the rites of circumcision, marriage, burial, etc., and presides over the assembly of the faithful at prayers, except at the solemn noon prayers on Friday, which are under the superintendence of the khatib, a higher minister ("who is also called, from that circumstance, the *Irnaumn ul-Jumuc*, or Friday Iman"). He is elected to his office by the people, and confirmed by the authorities, to whom he remains subject in all civil and criminal matters; but he certainly enjoys many privileges; among others, he cannot be made to suffer death punishment as long as he retains his office as imaum. In spiritual affairs he becomes independent. He can resign his office and return to the laity whenever he

chooses. The imaums are greatly revered by the people. For striking an imaum a Turkish layman is punished with the loss of one of his hands, but a Christian with death. In dress he is distinguished from the laity by a turban somewhat broader, made of different material, by a long beard, and by long sleeves in his coat (tunic). See Taylor, *History of Mohammedanism,* ch. 8; Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8:*830. (J. H.W.)

Imitation of Christ

SEE EXAMPLE.

Im'la

(Heb. *Yinla',* לָעְמְיִ *replenisher;* Sept. Ιεμλά), the father of Micaiah, which latter was the prophet who ironically foretold the defeat of the allied kings of 'Judah and Israel against Ramoth-Gilead (2 Chronicles 18:8, 9). In the parallel passage (1 Kings 22:8, 9) his name is written IMLAH (Heb. *Yimlah',* הָלְמְיִ *id.;* Sept. Ιαμβλά). B.C. ante 896.

Im'lah

(1 Kings 22:8, 9). *SEE IMLA*. Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, a doctrine early broached in the Roman and Greek churches, that the Virgin Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin. Bernard, in the 12th century, rejected this doctrine in opposition to the canons of Lyons, but it was not much agitated until (1301) the Franciscan Duns Scotus took strong grounds in favor of the doctrine, and henceforward it became a subject of vehement controversy between the Scotists and Thomists. The Dominicans espoused the cause of the Thomists, who impugned the dogma; the Franciscans that of the Scotists, who defended it. Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan, in 1483 declared himself in favor of toleration on the point. The Council of Trent (Sess. 5) declared that the doctrine of the conception of all men in sin was not intended to include the Virgin. The controversy was revived in the University of Paris towards the close of the 16th century. During the pontificates of Paul V and Gregory XV, such was the dissension it occasioned in Spain, that both Philip and his successor sent special embassies to Rome in the vain hope that this contest might be terminated by a bull. The dispute ran so high in that kingdom that, in the military orders of St. James, of the Sword, of Calatrava, and of Alcantara, the knights, on their admission, vowed to maintain the doctrine. In 1708, Clement XI appointed a festival to be celebrated throughout the

Church in honor of the immaculate conception. It is firmly believed in the Greek Church, in which the feast is celebrated under the name of the Conception of St. Anne; but it was not till 1854 that it was made a dogma in the Roman Catholic Church.

Pope Pius IX, during his whole pontificate, has showed himself the most devoted of the worshippers of Mary. In his exile at Gaeta in 1849 he addressed his famous 'Encyclical on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception' (Feb. 2) to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the whole Catholic Church, affirming the existence of 'an ardent desire throughout the Catholic world that the apostolic see should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin.' These desires,' he adds, 'have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship.' A commission was appointed for the examination of the question, under the presidency of cardinal Fornarini; cardinal Lambruschini produced his tract, and Perrone the work — *De In 779 caculato B. V. Aarice conceptu;* Passaglio also wrote a large essay, and the results of these investigations were issued by the Propaganda press (2 vols. 4to). The special commission reported, in a full conclave of the Sacred College, May 27,1854. Answers had come from 602 bishops, all favorable to the dogma, though 52 doubted the opportuneness, and four the possibility of a decision. The 'special congregation' demanded the definition with alacrity and zeal. A consistory of consultation was proclaimed, and held at Rome Nov. 4, 1854; it was not a general council, nor was any authority attributed to it. Fifty-four cardinals, 46 archbishops, and about 400 bishops are reported to have been present at these deliberations; 576 votes are said to have been cast for the dogma, and only four against it; among the latter were the archbishop de Sibour, of Paris, on the ground that the pope had no power to decide such a question; and also the bishop Olivier, of Evreux, lately deceased, who sent in his vote by proxy. On the 8th of December, in St. Peter's, in the midst of the celebration of the 'Conception,' in the presence of more than 200 ecclesiastical dignitaries, and in answer to a petition presented by the Sacred College of the Cardinals, the supreme pontiff, with a 'tremulous'

voice, read in Latin the following decree: ‘We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been *revealed by God*, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by the faithful.’ The cannon of the castle of St. Angelo, the joyful chime of all the bells of Rome, the enthusiastic plaudits of the assembled thousands, the magnificent illumination of St. Peter’s church, and the splendor of the most gorgeous festive rites, gave response to the infallible decree. It was a grand pageant, befitting an idolatrous enthusiasm. The pope himself; with ‘trembling joy,’ crowned the image of the Virgin; medals of Australian gold were struck, and distributed in her honor. ‘Rome,’ say the beholders, ‘was intoxicated with joy.’ An infallible voice had spoken; a new article of faith was announced by ‘divine’ authority; the people rejoiced in hope that Mary would be yet more ‘propitious,’ that her ‘prevalent intercession would give peace and plenty, would stay the power of infidelity, put an end to insurrection, and crown Rome with higher honor and success.’ The controversy of seven hundred years is brought to a final decision; Rome is committed irrevocably to the worship of the ‘Virgin mother of God, conceived without original sin.’ ‘Roma locuta est,’ and doubt is now heresy. The work begun by the third general council at Ephesus in 431, proclaiming Mary ‘the mother of God,’ is declared to be consummated by the papal decree of Dec. 8, 1854, asserting the privilege of her immaculate conception on the authority of Peter’s chair.” For an account of the history of the dogma, and a full discussion of its theological merits, see Smith, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April 1855. See also *The Official Documents connected with the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception* (Lat. and Eng.), published with the approbation of the Abp. of Baltimore (Balt. 1856, 8vo). *SEE CONCEPTION*. *Theology of the Doctrine. — The* theology of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary has been the subject of many distinguished writers in the Roman, Greek, and Protestant churches. The greatest difficulties which the advocates of the doctrine have to contend against are really the following three: 1. It lacks the evident support of the Holy Scriptures. 2. It lacks the authority of the early Church, and may well be termed ‘a comparative novelty in theology.” 3. It is directly and most ‘distinctly opposed to the doctrine of original sin. As to the first, the scriptural arguments advanced by the advocates, they are certainly very slight and untenable, and have been virtually yielded by

the best of the Roman Catholic authorities, such as Perrone *(De Inmnac. B. V. Marice conceptu., etc.,* p. 35 sq., 57 sq., 112 sq.). There are only two passages which the best and most learned of Rome have adduced. The first of these is <01015>Genesis 3:15, the πρωτευαγγέλιον of divine revelation: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (she) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." "The argumentation here is curious. The received Vulgate reading, not found, however, in all the copies, is 'ipsa,' *she;* while the Hebrew reads awhμ he, or it; Jerome, too, reads αὐτός;' Sixtus V's edition of the Septuagint reads *abroq."* The best Roman critics (see De Rossi's criticism in *Pusey's Eirenicon,* 2, 385) discard the reading as it stands in the received Vulgate. Perrone, however, contends that it is indifferent which reading is adopted, because, at any rate, Mary could not have had the power to conquer the serpent except through Christ. But how does this prove the immaculate conception-give to the dogma "a firm foundation?" Simply for the reason that in these words a "special privilege is conferred upon Mary," and that special privilege could "only have been the immunity from original sin." But the privilege conferred is solely, even on the author's own ground, that she should be in some way a means of subduing Satan, and that she was this as the mother of our Lord. To assert that in order to be the mother of Christ, she must be free from original sin, is purely to beg the whole question. The "Letters Apostolic" of Pius IX upon the dogma sanction infallibly the application of the clause "bruise thy head" to Mar, who, the pope says, "has crushed the serpent's head with her *immaculate foot."* Another passage adduced, upon which Perrone lays less stress than on the one already cited, is the angelic salutation <42028>Luke 1:28, comp. 30, coupled with the words spoken by Elizabeth, <42042>Luke 1:42: "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with' thee: blessed art thou among women Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." They argue that the greeting Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, translated in the Vulgate by *gratiaplena,* means fullness of grace in a sense that necessitates exemption, from the very beginning of existence, from any possible taint of sin, and that the same meaning must necessarily be allowed to the expression "blessed art thou among women" (comp. Lie. bermann, *Instit. Theol.* 2, 833; Perrone, *Praelect. Theol.* 2, 651). Roman Catholic writers assign, however, no reason why these words should be so interpreted. "They are, in fact, uncritically and illogically forced into the service of the doctrine, and, as hi the case of the 'Protevangelium' of the

O.T., they offer no real support of it whatever." As for other passages of a mystical type which are used as a secondary evidence, they would be of value only' as confirming and illustrating any in which the fact was directly and undoubtedly stated, Certain it is that in the gospels Mary is represented *as she is,* and not as an immaculate being; that neither in the Acts nor in the Epistles, notwithstanding Paul's mute description of Christ's scheme of salvation, is she mentioned at all. The great trouble, in short, with Roman Catholic theologians, is that they transfer the sayings of the prophets and of the apostles concerning Jesus Christ, and all the passages which point to *one* mediator between God and man, virtually to Mary, the mother of Christ, instead of assigning this position to Christ, the Son of God.

The comparative novelty of the doctrine in theology is proved by history. There is not one great teacher of the Christian Church who, before the breaking out of the controversy between Lyons and Bernard in 1140 that is, Tor the first eleven centuries of our aera-was favorable to the doctrine as now propagated by the Church of Rome. "The question does not exist for them; they know nothing of this specific doctrine.; they speak in respect to original sin and the Seed of redemption in such a way as to prove that the immaculate conception of Mary could not have been any part of their creed. Their praises of the Virgin are often immoderate; they defend her perpetual virginity (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78; Jerome, *adv. Helvidianum,* etc.); many of them believe that she was 'sanctified' in the womb; most of them declare that she never was guilty of actual sin; but they do not know anything about her exemption from all infection of original sin. Augustine defends her only against the charge of actual sin *(De Natura et Gracia,* c. 36): 'Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, *cum de peccatis agitur,* haberi volo quaestionem.' This passage is quoted in favor of the dogma, but it plainly refers only to actual transgression, and it is contained in a reply to the position of Pelagius, that there were saints who had not sinned. In his treatise on the *Remission of Sins* (bk. 2, ch. 24:§ 38), this greatest of the Latin fathers says explicitly that Christ alone was without sin: 'Solus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam;' nor does he intimate any exception. In his work *De Genesi, ad lit.* c. 18, n. 32, he speaks of 'the body of Christ as taken from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of a mother with sinful flesh;' and he indicates a clear distinction between Mary's nature and Christ's nature in this respect. Augustine's followers make similar statements. Eusebius Emissenus (supposed by some to be

Hilary) on the 'Nativity' says, 'From the bond of the old sin is not even the mother of the Redeemer free.' Fulgentius writes, 'The flesh of Mary, which was conceived in unrighteousness in a human way, was truly sinful flesh;' and he adds that 'this flesh is in itself truly sinful.' referring to Paul's use of the term *'flesh'* to designate our common hereditary sinfulness. Others of the fathers make use of similar statements, irreconcilable with a belief in the immaculate conception. (See Perrone, p. 40 sq. Bandellus, *De Siygulari Puritate et Praerogativa Conceptionis Christi* [1470], a work by a Dominican, contains some four hundred testimonies against the dogma from the fathers: see also the work of the cardinal Turrecamata, *De Veritate Conceptionis* [1550]). It is, indeed, true that the fathers do not often speak directly upon the point in question; but this is for the simple reason, conclusive against the claim of universality, that they did not know anything, about it. The doctrine is declared, A.D. 1140, by Bernard, to be a 'novelty;' and he says that the festival is 'the mother of presumption, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of levity' (Ep. 174, *ad Canon Lugd.* § 5 sq.; comp. *Serm.* 78 *in Song of Solomon).* Others of the earlier fathers speak of Mary in such a way as is absolutely irreconcilable with the idea that they believed in her immaculate conception. Hilary (Psalm 119, lib. 3, § 12; comp. *Tracts for the Times*, No. 79, p. 36) declares that she is exposed to the fire of judgment. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, do not hesitate to speak of faults of Mary, of her being rebuked by Christ. 'If Mary.' says Origen, 'did not feel offence at our Lord's sufferings, Jesus did not die for her sins;' Chrysostom ascribes to her 'excessive ambition at the marriage festival at Cana;' Basil thinks that she, too, 'wavered at the time of the crucifixion;' all of which statements are utterly inconsistent, not only with the dogma of the immaculate conception, but also with a belief in her perfect innocency (comp. Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* § 99, note 30, with the references to Irenaeus, 3, 18; Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, 7; Origen, *in Lucam Hom.* 17; Basil, *Ep.* 260 (317); Chrysostom, *Hom.* 45 in *Matthew, Hom.* 21 *in John).* Tertullian, *De Carne Christi, §* 16, declares that 'Christ, by putting on the flesh, made it his, and *made it sinless;'* Irenaeus, that 'Christ made human nature pure *by* taking it;' Athanasius, on the 'Incarnation,' teaches the same doctrine, that 'Christ sanctified his own body,' and that 'he hath purified the body, which was in itself corruptible.' Of course, the body he assumed was not in and of itself sinless. Gregory of Nazianzum, and John of Damascus (730), teach expressly that the Virgin was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. If Christ, by assuming human nature in Mary, 'made it sinless,' it was not so before his

incarnation" (Smith, *ut sup.).* The view which some hold on the title of θεοτόκος, given to Mary at the Council of Ephesus, we think bears so wholly on the incarnation of Christ that we refrain from introducing it here. *SEE NESTORIANISM*. Of the numberless passages from the fathers which set forth the doctrine of the universality of sin, and the universal. need of redemption through Christ, without making the Virgin Mary the exception, we will speak under the third head. An additional source of evidence is afforded us by the early liturgies of offices of the Church. "They exalt Mary and her conception but they do never call it an 'immaculate' conception. It is only in the latest years that the term 'immaculate' has been introduced into the Western offices of the highest authority. The offices themselves, in honor of the Virgin, did not become current in the West till the 11th century. In the office for her birth, in the ancient churches, it is read that 'she was *sanctified* from the stain of sin;' in one of the German liturgies, 'that she was born with a propensity to sin;' in the Roman Church itself, the office spoke of the '*sanctification* of the Virgin.' This silence, and the late alteration of these offices, are conclusive as to the non-existence of the dogma. In the year 791 (al. 796) a council was held at Friuli (Concilium Forojuliense), called by Paulinus (Paulus), patriarch of Aquileia, during the pontificate of Adrian I, to consider the Trinity and the Incarnation, in respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit, and 'Adoptianism,' that is, the opinion maintained by archbishop Elipandus of Toledo, and others, that Christ in his human nature was the Son of God only by 'adoption.' A long and explicit Confession of Faith was published by this council, in the course of which it is said, '*Solus enim sine peccato natus est homo,* quoniam solus est incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto et immaculata Virgine novus homo. Consubstantialis Deo Patri in sua, id est, divina; consubstantialis etiam matri, *sine sordepeccati,* in nostra, id est, humana natura' '(Harduin, *Acta Concil.* 1714, 4:856, C.). If the belief in the immaculate *conception* of the Virgin had been any part of the orthodoxy of the times, it would have been impassible for a council to have spoken in this way of Christ, as '*alone born without sin;'* and the 'immaculateness' ascribed to the Virgin cannot possibly, in the connection, be interpreted of her conception, or even of her birth; for, if it could, then Christ could not be said to be the 'only' one of men *born* without sin" (professor Smith, *ut sup.).*

No better does the case fare in the medieval Church. "The amount of the argument and the result of the testimony here are, that the doctrine was

first invented in the 12th century, that it was opposed by the greatest and best of the scholastics, and that it made its way, in spite of this opposition, through the force of popular superstition, and from the necessary working out of the inherent tendencies of a system of creature-worship. Some of the mediaeval testimony we have already adduced; we add only the most important citations. Anselm (1070), though cited for the immaculate conception, teaches in his *Cur Deus Homo* (2, 16) that Mary was *conceived* in sin: 'Virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumptus est, est *in iniquitatibus concepta, et inpeccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cumn originali peccato nata est*, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt.'" (See also the close of that chapter and the next, 2, 17.) We thus notice that, up to the time of Bernard, that is, for the first eleven centuries of our era, no writer of the Church used such strong language about the holiness of the Virgin Mary as he did in his letter to the canons of Lyons (1140) already referred to. He writes "The mother of God was, without doubt, sanctified before she was born; nor is the holy Church in error in accounting the day of her nativity holy. I think that even a more abundant blessing of sanctification descended on her, which not only sanctified her birth, but also preserved her life from all sin, as happened to none other of the children of men. It was befitting, indeed, that the queen of virgins should pass her life in the privilege of a singular sanctity, and free from all sin, who, in bearing the Destroyer of all sin and death, obtained for all the gift of life." There is certainly, even here, no advocacy of the immaculate conception of Mary. Exactly similar views were held by Peter Lombard, whose *Four Books of Sentences* were "the theological text-book of the Middle Ages," and "upon which all the great scholastics made their comments and built their systems. He says *(Liber Sentent.* 3, distinct. 3) of the flesh of Mary, which our Lord assumed, that it was 'previously obnoxious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but by the operation of the Spirit it was cleansed.' The Holy Spirit, coming into Mary, purified her from sin, and from all desire of sin.'" Very explicit is also the testimony of Alexander of Hales, the irrefragable doctor and master of St. Bonaventura, the commentator on Lombard: "It was necessary that the blessed Virgin; in her generation should contract sin from her parents; she was sanctified in the womb." Bonaventura, the seraphic doctor, the glory of the Franciscans, who died in 1274, and was canonized in 1482, is exhaustless in the praise of Mary in his *Speculum* and *Corona.* He sanctifies her veneration in the most rapturous terms. Yet on this question he is also decided, explicitly declaring that "the sanctification

of the Virgin was *after* she had contracted' original sin;" she was "sanctified in the womb" (lib. 3 dist. 3, p. 1, qu. 2, 3). Albertus Magnus, who taught in Cologne 1260 to 1280, made the same avowals. Bonaventura was the pupil of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus of Bonaventura, and next succeeds the greatest of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas, "the angelic doctor," who died in 1274, was canonized in 1323, and in 1567 was declared by Pius V to be "teacher of the Church." In his *Summa Theologiae,* p. 3, qu. 27, art. 1, it stands, "Mary was sanctified in the womb." Art. 2. *"Not before the infusion of the soul;* for if she had been she would not have incurred the stain of original sin, and would not have needed the redemption of Christ." Art. 3. The complete deliverance from original sin was only given her when she conceived Christ ("Ex prole redundaverit in matrein totaliter fomite subtracto"). About the festival of the Conception, he says that the Roman Church does not observe it herself, yet it tolerates the custom of other churches: "Unde talis celebritas non est totaliter reprobanda." Such is the testimony of the most eminent mediaeval divines, to which we need not add names of less weight. It is not to be wondered at that, in the face of the difficulties to be encountered by the modern defenders of the immaculate conception, cardinal Perrone, "the general rector of the Roman College," and "the prince of contemporary theologians," is led to argue that if these scholastic divines had reasoned correctly from what they conceded about the birth of the Virgin, they would have made her conception immaculate; also, that what they teach can all be best explained in harmony with the doctrine; or, if not so, that they taught what they did as private teachers; as also that they were ignorant of antiquity; and again, that their views on original sin were such as allowed them to speak as they did; in fine, that they did not have any guidance from an infallible decision in what they uttered; and that while they were wrangling in the schools, the dogma was making its way among the people. All this goes to show that the mediaeval *testimony* is against it; that, as far as the Middle Ages are concerned, only isolated opinions are for the doctrine, and the weight of authority is against it. The only distinct argumentative attempt which Perrone makes to parry the force of their authority and arguments is the assertion that these doctors of the schools, when they speak of the conception of Mary, have reference to what he calls the first, or active conception, and not tooth passive, or the infusion of the soul into the seed. But this explanation is irrelevant, for two reasons; one is, that many of these doctors do not make this distinction, and, of course, they include both parts of the conception in

their statement. They make the distinction between “conception” and “sanctification,” and say that all that precedes sanctification belongs to the “conception,” and is infected with original sin; this, of course, includes the “passive” conception. Another reason that invalidates this mode of explanation is, that some of these doctors do make the very distinction in question, and yet maintain that the whole conception, both active and passive, was in original sin. Thus Alexander of Hales says that “the Virgin after her nativity, *and after the infusion of the soul into the body,* was sanctified;” Bonaventura asserts that the infusion of grace may have been soon *after the infusion of the soul,* and Aquinas declares expressly that the cleansing can only be from original sin; that the fault of original sin can only be in a rational creature, and, therefore, that *before the infusion of the rational soul* the Virgin was not sanctified. In fact, this mode of meeting the difficulty can’ only be carried through by supposing that the mediaeval divines believed that original sin could exist in the mere fleshly material derived from parents, an opinion widely abhorrent to their well-known views. We may therefore well say that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, the mother of Christ, is a “novelty in theology,” for the historical records of antiquity are silent; in the Middle Ages the great authorities are divided; and in modern times, as our historical sketch has shown, there have been perpetual contests and divisions. Twenty years ago hardly a single name of eminence among the Roman Catholics of Germany would have pronounced in its favor. Spain, it is true, continued her devotions, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the papacy.

There remains for us now only to consider the doctrine as opposed to the doctrine of original sin. The very necessity for a miraculous conception in the case of him who was to be without sin *SEE INCARNATION* is in itself a proof that every person conceived in a natural manner must be conceived in sin *SEE NATURE, HUMAN*, and the Bible is too express and unmistakable on this point, that all are conceived in sin, *SEE ORIGINAL SIN*. In the position which the Roman Catholic Church thus assumes, we encounter again the vital defects of her theology on original sin, that semi-Pelagianlism against which all the Protestant Confessions. have protested as unscriptural. “The Roman Catholic doctrine puts the essence of original sin solely in defect; makes it negative; asserting that it is only the want of that righteousness in which Adam was created; this is, in scholastic usage,

the ‘formal’ part, or the very essence of original, sin. Concupiscence is *not* of the nature of sin. This is the doctrine of original sin, which Perrone expressly lays down in the opening of his treatise (p. 2, 3 sq.), ‘that the essence of original sin is in the defect of grace or of original righteousness.’ This is the only view of the matter with which the dogma of the immaculate conception can possibly be reconciled. If this view is false-if original sin, as Protestants hold, according to the Scriptures, be positive and not negative, and come by descent, then the conclusion is irresistible that Mary, by descent, must have had a part therein. The dogma of her immaculate conception is possible only with a false view of the nature of the ‘sin of birth.’ Augustine could not have held it, nor could Aquinas. The dogma is conceived in a defective notion of original sin. Yet again, even with this defective view of original sin, the dogma is involved in difficulties and internal conflicts by what it asserts and implies as to the origin of the soul of Mary. The theory on which it rests is, that Mary’s soul was directly created by God. It declares that the Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception,’ was preserved immaculate. What is meant by ‘conception’ here? It is the so called ‘passive conception,’ or the infusion of the soul into the seed, the union of the soul of Mary with the body, prepared beforehand in the ‘active conception.’ Whence, now, this soul? It as *‘created.’* The ‘Letters,’ in another passage, say that Mary was the ‘tabernacle *created* by God himself.’ Pius IX also cites the formula of Alexander VII as having ‘decretive’ authority, and that formula declares ‘that Mary’s soul, at the first instant of *creation and of infusion* into the body.’ was preserved free from original sin. This hypothesis of ‘creationism’ is also the only hypothesis consonant with the doctrine. But now put these two positions together, namely, that original sin consists essentially in privation; that is, in the defect of original justice; and that Mary’s soul was directly created by God, and we arrive at the following difficulties and dilemmas. The position is this: When Mary’s soul was created and infused into her body, she was by grace preserved free from original sin. Would the original sin, from which she was kept, have come to her from her body or from her soul? — for it must have come from one or the other. If one says that it would have come from the soul, this involves the consequence that God usually creates original sin in the soul before it is united with the body, and, of course, before it is connected with Adam by descent. If one says, on the other hand, that original sin would have come to Mary from her ‘active conception,’ that is, from her prepared body, then it was already there, in germ and seed, before the infusion of the soul. God

either creates the human soul with original sin, or the original sin is from the parents. If the former, we have original sin without any connection with Adam; if the latter, Mary must have been really possessed of it. But it may be said original sin consists in defect, privation, and that the dogma means that God created Mary's soul perfectly holy. This raises another difficulty; for it is also asserted that he created her thus holy on the ground of Christ's merits, and that, had it not been for Christ's merits, she would have shared the sin of the race. This creation, now, must have been either through the race (the connection with Adam) or above the race either mediate or immediate. If through the race or mediate, then she must have had a part in its sinfulness; if above the race, or an immediate creation, then there is no theological, or rational ground for saying that, as far as her creation was concerned, she was liable to sin, or could be saved from it through Christ's merits. Nor can any relief be found by conjoining the two points, and asserting that the exemption from original sin concerns the time or point of *union* of the soul with the seed, the conjunction of the active with the passive conception. For the still unanswered question here is, and must be this: In the union of the soul with the body, from which of the two, soul or body, would the original sin have come, if grace had not prevented? — for it must have come from one or the other. If from the soul, then you have original sin without any connection with Adam; if from the body, then original sin must already have been there; if from both together, this simply dodges the question, or else resolves original sin into some act consequent upon the union-that is, into actual transgression. Nor is the matter helped by saying that original sin is essentially negative, privative; for the privation has respect to either the soul or the body, or to both conjoined, and the same dilemmas result. The 'Letters Apostolic,' in other passages, speak of the dogma in this wise: that the 'Blessed Virgin was free from all contagion of *body*, soul, and mind;' that she had 'community with men only in their nature, but not in their fault:' and that 'the flesh of the Virgin taken from Adam did not admit the stain of Adam, and on this account that the most blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself, formed by the Holy Spirit.' These expressions imply that the fault in the case could have been a fault of 'nature;' that the contagion might have been of the 'body;' that the 'stain from Adam' would, under other circumstances, have come to her through the 'flesh.' But in her 'active conception,' before the infusion of the soul and of grace, the 'nature.' the 'body,' the 'flesh,' were already extant, ere the 'passive conception' took place: were they with or without the fault? If with the fault, then you have original sin; if without,

then it would follow that the flesh, the body, the nature, *before* the passive conception, had been already delivered from the bondage of corruption. In short, if original sin come from the race, from the ‘active conception,’ then Mary must have had it; if it come from the ‘passive conception,’ then God is its direct author in every individual case. This dogma of the immaculate conception, then, contains contradictory elements; it rests on a false view of original sin. Even that false view cannot well be reconciled: it assumes the theory that souls are directly created, and here again it involves itself in inextricable difficulties in relation to original sin. It is opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and it is self-opposed.”

In conclusion, there is left to us only the present attitude of the Roman pontiff, who, since his declaration of infallibility, more than ever, is forced into a position which puts the matter of papal infallibility in a disagreeable dilemma and dualism. “The decree of Pius IX is in opposition to the express declarations of preceding pontiffs; pope is arrayed against pope; infallibility is discordant with infallibility. Not only has ‘a probable opinion become improbable.’ but Peter’s chair is divided against itself; and how, then, can that kingdom stand? The Jansenist Launov, in his *Praescriptions,* has collected the opinions adverse to or irreconcilable with the dogma, of seven of the successors of St. Peter, who never change. From pope Leo (440-461), the greatest and most learned of the early bishops of Rome, he cites four passages in which Leo declares that Christ alone ‘was innocent in his birth,’ alone was ‘free from original sin,’ and that Christ received from his mother ‘her nature, but not her fault;’ and he asserts that Mary obtained ‘*her own purification through her conception of Christ.’* This is wholly averse to the dogma. Innocent III, who called the Lateran Council in 1213, in a sermon on the ‘Assumption of Christ,’ comparing Eve and Mary, writes’: ‘Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed in culpa produxit; haec autem fuit *in culpa producta,* sed sine culpa produxit.’ Gregory says (590-604), ‘John the Baptist was conceived in sin; Christ *alone* was conceived without sin.’ Innocent V (1276), in his *Commentary on the Master of Sentences:* ‘Non convenit tantae Virgini ut *diu morata sit* in peccato;’ and he adds that she was sanctified quickly after the animation (that is, of the body by the soul), *although not in the very moment.* This is directly against the dogma. John XXII or Benedict XII (c. 1340) says that Mary ‘passed at *first from a state of original sin* to a ‘state of grace.’ Clement VI (1342-52), ‘I suppose, according to the common opinion as yet, that the blessed Virgin was in

original sin' *modicca moula,* 'because, according to all, she was *sanctified* as soon as she could be *sanctified.'*

"Thus the papacy, in committing itself to this new and idolatrous dogma, is in hostility to Scripture, to universal consent, and also to itself. It explains the sense of Scripture by tradition; and it explains the sense of tradition by an infallible expositor, and that infallible expositor contradicts itself. The new dogma makes *the whole of the early Church* to have been ignorant of a truth which is now declared to be necessary to the faith; it makes Leo, Innocent III, Innocent V, and Clement V to have taught heresy; it puts the greatest scholastic divines under the ban; and, while doing this, it declares that what is now decreed has always been of the faith of the Church, and that it is a part of the revelation of God, given through Christ and the apostles, and handed down b constant succession and general consent."

See Smith, in *Meth. Qu: Rev.* April 1855; *Christian Remembrancer,* Oct. 1855, p. 419; Jan. 1866, p. 175; July, 1868, p. 134; *Westminster Rev.* April. 1867, p. 155 sq.; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions,* 1, 103; Neander, *Chr. Dogmas,* 2, 599; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chretiennes, 1,* 291 sq., 435 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* p. 104 sq.; Milman. *Lat. Ch ristiasity,* p. 8,208; Preuss, *Die romische Lehre v. d. unbefleckten Emphfadngeiss a. d. Quellen dargestellt u. a Gottes Wort widerlegt* (Berlin, 1865); Blunt, *Theol. Encyclop.* 1, 328 sq. *SEE MARY*; *SEE MARIOLATRY.*

Immaculate-Conception Oath

is among the Roman Catholics the assurance by oath of a belief in and support of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. It was introduced by the Sorbonne in consequence of the disputes on this subject between the Franciscans and Dominicans *SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*, as a test oath for admission to an academical degree. The Jesuits made this a test oath also for other *privileges. — Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 404. (J. H. W.)

Immanent Activity of God

the pantheistical tenet that God does not exist outside of the world, as a free personal (transcendental) being, but inside of it as the highest unity of the world, because God cannot, according to it, be conceived of without the world. Saisset *(Mod. Pantheism,* 2, 91) thus sums it up:

"He (God) creates the world within himself, and thenceforth these is no separation of the Creator and the creature, for the creature is still the Creator considered in his eternal and necessary action." *SEE PANTHEISM*.

Imman'uel

(Heb. *Immanuel'*, לאֵנמָּע, sometimes separately לאֵנמָּע, *God with us*, as it is interpreted <40123>Matthew 1:23, where it is written Εμμανουήλ, as in the Sept.. and Anglicized "Emmanuel;" the Sept. however, in <23808>Isaiah 8:8. translates it μεθ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός; Vulg. *Enmmanuel)*, a figurative name prescribed through the prophet for a child that should be born as a sign to Ahaz of the speedy downfall of Syria (B.C. cir. 739; see <12160>2 Kings 16:9) and violent interregnum of the kingdom of Israel (B.C. 737-728; see <12150>2 Kings 15:30; comp. 17:1), before the infant should become capable of distinguishing between wholesome and improper kinds of food. The name occurs only in the celebrated verse of Isaiah (vii, 14), "Behold, a [rather *the*] virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name *Immanuel,"* and in another passage of the same prophet (<23808>Isaiah 8:8), where the ravaging army of the Assyrians is described as ere long to "fill the breadth of thy land, O *Immanuel,"* i.e. Judaea, with evident allusion to the former declaration. *SEE AHAZ*. In the name itself there is no difficulty; but the verse, as a whole, has been variously interpreted. From the manner in which the word God, and even Jehovah, is used in the composition of Hebrew names, there is no such peculiarity in that of Immanuel as in itself requires us to understand that he who bore it must be in fact God. Indeed, it is used as a proper name among the Jews at this day. This high sense has, however, been assigned to it in consequence of the application of the whole verse, by the evangelist Matthew (<40123>Matthew 1:23), to our divine Savior. Even if this reference did not exist, the history of the Nativity would irresistibly lead us to the conclusion that the verse-whatever may have been its intermediate signification-had an ultimate reference to Christ. *SEE ISAIAH*. The state of opinion on this point has been thus concisely summed up by Dr. Henderson in his note on the text: "This verse has long been a subject of dispute between Jews and professedly Christian writers, and among the latter mutually. While the former reject its application to the Messiah altogether-the earlier Rabbins explaining it of the queen of Ahaz and the birth of his son Hezekiah, and the later, as Kimchi and Abarbanel, of the prophet's own wife--the great body of Christian interpreters have

held it to be directly and exclusively a prophecy of our Savior, and have considered themselves fully borne out by the inspired testimony of the evangelist Matthew. Others, however, have departed from this construction of the passage, and have invented or adopted various hypotheses in support of such dissent. Grotius, Faber, Isenbiehl, Hezel, Bolten, Fritzsche, Pluschke, Gesenius, and Hitzig, suppose either the then present or a future wife of Isaiah to be the , *almah* [rendered 'virgin'], referred to. Eichhorn, Paulus, Hensler, and Ammon are of opinion that the prophet had nothing more in view than an ideal virgin, and that both she and her son are merely imaginary personages, introduced for the purpose of prophetic illustration. Bauer, Cube, Steudel, and some others, think that the prophet pointed to a young woman in the presence of-the king and his courtiers. A fourth class, among whom are Richard Simon, Lowth, Koppe, Dathe, Williams, Vou Meyer, Olshausen, and Dr. J. Pye Smith, admit the hypothesis of a double sense (q.v.): one, in which the words apply primarily to some female living in the time of the prophet, and her giving birth to a son according to the ordinary laws of nature; or, as Dathe holds, to some virgin, who at that time should miraculously conceive; and the other, in which they received a secondary and plenary fulfillment in the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus Christ." (See the monographs enumerated by Volbeding, *Index,* p. 14; and *Furst, Bib. Jud.* 2, 60; also Hengstenberg, *Christol. des A. T.* 2, 69, and the commentators in general; compare the *Stud. u. Krif.* 1830, 3:538.) This last seems to us the only consistent interpretation. That the child to be so designated was one soon to be born and already spoken of is clear from the entire context and drift of the prophecy. It can be no other than the Maher-shalal-hash-baz (q.v.), the offspring of the prophet's own marriage with the virgin prophetess, who thus became an eminent type of the Messiah's mother (Isaiah 8:18). *SEE VIRGIN*.

Immanuel, ben-Salomon Romi

a Jewish philosopher, commentator, and poet, was born at Rome about 1265. Endowed with great natural ability, and with a fondness for study, he soon made himself master of Biblical and Talmudic, as well as of Grecian and Latin literature. He was a contemporary of Dante, and, being much given to a cultivation of the same art in which Dante immortalized his name, "the two spirits, kindred, and yet different in many respects, formed a mutual and intimate attachment." He died about 1330. Immanuel wrote commentaries on the whole Jewish Bible, excepting the minor prophets and

Ezra. They are enriched not only by valuable grammatical and archaeological notes, but contain also some able remarks on the nature and spirit of the poetical books. 'It is greatly to be regretted that of all his exegetical works, which are in different public libraries of Europe, the *Commentary on Proverbs* and *Some Glosses on the Psalms* are the only ones as yet published, the former in Naples in 1486, and the latter in Parma in 1806. The introduction of his commentary on the Song of Songs has been published, with an English translation, by Ginsburg: *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs* (Lond. 1857, p. 49-55)" (Ginsburg in Kitto). He wrote also some philosophical treatises, and translated for his Jewish brethren the philosophical writings of Albertus the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and other celebrated philosophers. See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden. 7,* 307 sq.; Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift,* 1839, *iv.* 194 sq.; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 92 sq. (J. H.W.)

Immateriality

is a quality of God and of the human soul. The immateriality of God denotes that he forms an absolute contrast to *matter;* he is simple, and has no parts, and so cannot be dissolved; *matter,* on the other hand, is made up of parts into which it can be resolved. God is also free from the limitations to which matter is subject, i.e. from the limits of space and time. The immateriality of God is therefore the basis of the qualities of eternity, omnipresence, and unchangeableness. Thus the immateriality of the soul includes likewise simplicity as another of its qualities. This, of course, does not absolutely set it above the limitations of space and time, since the soul needs the body for a necessary organ of its life; nor does it set aside any further development, but it certainly includes indestructibility, and thus serves as a proof of immortality (q.v.). The *materiality* of the soul was asserted by Tertullian, Arnobins, and others, during the first three centuries. Near the close of the fourth, the immateriality of the soul was maintained by Augustine, Nemesius, and Mamertfus Claudianus. See Guizot, *History of Civilization,* 1, 394; Krauth, *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 245. *SEE IMMENSITY OF GOD*; *SEE SOUL, TRADUCTION OF*.

Immediate Imputation of Sin

SEE IMPUTATION.

is explained by Dr. J. Pye Smith *(First Lines of Christ. Theol.* p. 138) to be the *absolute necessity of being,* considered in relation to space. 'There is with God no diffusion nor contraction, no extension nor circumspection, or any such *relation to space* as belongs to limited natures. God is equally near to, and equally far from, every point of space and every atom of the universe. He is universally and immediately *present,* not as a body, but as a spirit; not by motion, or penetration, or filling, as would be predicated of a diffused fluid, or in any way as if the infinity of God were composed of a countless number of finite parts, but in a *way peculiar* to his own spiritual and perfect nature, and of which we can form no conception." In the passages of <18107>Job 11:7-9; <10827>1 Kings 8:27 (<14618>2 Chronicles 6:18); <19907>Psalm 139:7-13; <23601>Isaiah 66:1; <24233>Jeremiah 23:23, 24; <30912>Amos 9:2, 3; <40604>Matthew 6:4, 6; <44724>Acts 17:24, 27, 28; also <23402>Isaiah 40:12-15, 21, 22, 25, 26, "the representations are such as literally indicate a kind of diffused and filling subtle material; but this is the condescending manner of the Scriptures, and is evidently to be understood with an exclusion of material ideas. Metaphysical or philosophical preciseness is not in the character of scriptural composition, nor would it ever suit the bulk of mankind; and *no language* or *conceptions* of men can reach the actual expression of the truth, or be any other than analogical. When the Scriptures speak of "God *being in heaven,"* they mean his supremacy in all perfection, and his universal dominion."

Immensity and omnipresence, again, are distinguished in that "the former is *absolute,* being the necessary inherent perfection of the Deity in itself, as infinitely exalted above all conception of space; and that the latter is relative, arising out of the position of a created world. The moment that world commenced, or the first created portion of it, there *was* and *ever* remains the divine presence *(*συνουσία, *adessentia).*"

The qualities of *extension* and *divisibility* are those of *body,* not of a pure, proper, highest *spirit.* "Socinus and his immediate followers denied a proper ubiquity, immensity, or omnipresence to the essence or substance of the Deity, and represented the universal presence of God spoken of in Scripture as denoting only the acts and effects of his power, favor, and aid." Des Cartes and his followers held "that the essence of the Deity is *thought,* and that it has no relation to space." See J. Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theology,* edited by W. Farrar (2nd ed. Lond. 1861);

Augustine, *De Civ. Dei,* 20; Bretschneider, *Dogmatik,* 1, 396 sq. *SEE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.*

Im'mer

(Heb. *Immer',* rMa, *talkative,* or, according to Furst, *high;* Sept. Ἐμμήρ), the name of several priests, mostly near the time of the Exile.

1. The head of the sixteenth sacerdotal division; according to David's appointment (1 Chronicles 24:14). B.C. 1014.

2. The father of Pashur, which latter so grossly misused the prophet Jeremiah (Jeremiah 20:1). B.C. ante 607. By many the name is regarded here as put patronymically for the preceding.

3. One whose descendants to the number of 1052 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 37; Nehemiah 7:40). He is very possibly. the same with the father of Meshillemoth (Nehemiah 11:13) or Meshillemith (1 Chronicles 9:12), certain of whose descendants took a conspicuous part in the sacred duties at Jerusalem after the Exile; and probably the same with the one some of whose descendants divorced their Gentile wives at the instance of Ezra (Ezra 10:20). B.C. much ante 536. By some he is identified with the two preceding.

4. One who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon, but was unable to prove his Israelitish descent (Ezra 2:59; Nehemiah 7:61). B.C. 536. It does not clearly appear, however, that he claimed to belong to the priestly order, and it is possible that the name is only given as that of a place in the Babylonian dominions from which some of those named in the following verses came.

5. The father of Zadok, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Nehemiah 3:29). B.C. ante 446. — He was, perhaps, the same as No. 3.

Immersion, the act of plunging into water, especially the person of the candidate in Christian baptism, as performed by the Baptist (q.v.) denomination, and occasionally by others. There are two controversies that require to be noticed under this head.

I. *Is this mode or act essential to the validity of the ordinance itself? — The* affirmative of this question is maintained by those denominationally

styled “Baptists,” and is denied by nearly all other classes of Christians. For the arguments on both sides, see the article *SEE BAPTISM*.

II. *Are the terms “immerse,” “immersion,” etc. preferable or more correct in a version of the Scriptures, than “baptize,” “baptism,” etc.? —* The affirmative of this question is taken by many, but not by all Baptists, and it is approved, to some extent at least, by certain scholars in most other denominations, while the negative is held by the vast majority of Bible readers. The change was actually made by Dr. Campbell in his work on the Gospels, and recently a systematic effort has been made on a large scale to give currency to the alteration by the translations put forth under the auspices of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. *SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES*, 5. The arguments for this rendering are set forth in all their strength by Dr. Conant, in a note to his translation of ⁴⁰⁰²⁶Matthew 2:6, as follows (to each of which we subjoin the counter arguments):

“**1.** This word expressed a particular act, viz. *immersion* in a fluid or any yielding substance. See the Appendix to this volume, sections 1-3.” The Appendix thus referred to is Dr. Conant’s treatise *On the Meaning and Use of Baptism*, etc. The proofs there given, however, do not seem to sustain this precise point; the passages cited do indeed show that βαπτίζειν means to *whelm* or envelop with a liquid, but do not indicate any uniform *method*, such as dipping, plunging; nor do they necessarily imply motion on the part of the subject *into* the fluid, as “‘immersion” clearly does.

“**2.** The word had no other meaning; it expressed this act, either literally or in a metaphorical sense, through the whole period of its use in Greek literature. Append. sect. 3.” This assertion is palpably refuted by the fact that Dr. Conant himself, in but a part of these very quotations here appealed to, has ventured to render βαπτίζειν by “immerse;” for he is very frequently constrained to translate it “immerge,” “submerge,” “dip,” “plunge, “imbathe,” “whelm,” etc. These words, it is true, have the same general signification; but, supposing that they were in every case suitable renderings (which in many cases they are not), yet they do not establish the identical point in dispute, namely, the exclusive translation by “immerse,” etc. as if “the word had no other meaning.”

“**3.** Its grammatical construction with other words, and the circumstances connected with its use, accord entirely with this meaning, and exclude

every other. Append. sect. 3:2." On the contrary, the prepositions and cases by which it is followed, being generally iv with the *dative,* indicate precisely the opposite conclusion; insomuch that in even the comparatively few instances where "immerse" can be given as a rendering at all, it is scarcely allowable except by the ambiguity "immersed *in,"* which in English is used for "immersed *into."* In the Greek language, as every scholar knows, no such imprecision exists.

"**4.** In the age of Christ and his apostles, as in all periods of the language, it was in common use to express the most familiar acts and occurrences of everyday life; as, for example, *immersing an axe in water, to* harden it; *wool in a dye,* to color it; an *animal in water,* to drown it; a ship *submerged* in the waves; rocks *immersed* in the tide; and (metaphorically) *immersed in cares, in sorrow, in ignorance, in poverty, in debt, in stupor and sleep,* etc. Append. sect. 3:1." Rather these examples should be rendered, an axe *tempered by* cold water, wool *tinged with* dye, *drowned in* water, *sunk by* the waves, *covered with* the tide, *overwhelmed with* cares, etc. *The familiarity* of the word is another matter, belonging to the next argument.

"**5.** There was nothing sacred in the word itself, or in the act which it expressed. The idea of sacredness belonged solely to the relation in which the act was performed. Append. sect. 4:7." This fact is no good reason why, when it is manifestly employed in such sacred relations, it should not be rendered by a term appropriate to such a sacredness. This argument applies only to those passages in which the word occurs in a secular sense; about these there is no dispute.

"**6.** In none of these respects does the word *baptize,* as used by English writers, correspond with the original Greek word." This has already been met in substance above. The remainder of the arguments, with one exception, need not be reproduced, as they are of a *doctrinal* character, aimed at the *odium theoloaicum,* which is a method of reasoning inconclusive, if not unworthy in a philological question.

"**11.** In rendering the Greek word by *immerse,* I follow the example of the leading vernacular versions, made from the Greek, in the languages of Continental Europe, and also of the critical versions made for the use of the learned." Facts, however, do not support this claim with any uniformity. The modern versions, of course, render according to the theological leanings of their authors, and, were they unanimous, they could

not be permitted to decide a question of this kind *by authority.* The best and oldest guides, the early Latins, freely transfer the term *baptizo,* giving it a regular termination like other native verbs; they rarely, if ever, render by "immergo," "immersio," etc., but usually give "tingo," or, at most, "mergo." See Dale, *Classic Baptism* (Philad. 1867), which thoroughly reviews the instances of the use of βαπτίζω. In a subsequent volume, *Judaic Baptism* (Philad. 1870), Dr. Dale meets the whole controversy in question, and proves conclusively the incorrectness of translating βαπτίζω by "immerse."

There are other positive arguments against the substitution of "immerse" as an equivalent to βαπτίζειν

1. The word is no more English than "baptize;" one is of Latin derivation, and the other Greek, while neither is of Saxon origin. Yet both are perfectly intelligible, and it is pretty certain that, but for the advantage which "immerse" gives to one party in polemics, it would never have been thought worth while to make the exchange.

2. "Immerse," as a compound word, does not correspond etymologically with the Greek. There is nothing answering to the *"in" in* βαπτίζω*;* it should have been ἐμβαπτίζω (which seldom occurs), or, rather, εἰσβαπτίζω (which is never used at all, obviously on account of the incongruity between the native force of the primitive, and the *motion* inherently implied in εἰς).

3. The outrageous awkwardness of such phrases as "he will immerse you in holy spirit and fire" (sic Conant), rendered necessary by this change, is a sufficient critical objection to the proposed rendering, were there no other argument against it. A theory that breaks down in this shocking manner the moment it is applied deserves only a summary rejection.

4. These translators are consistent with themselves in rejecting the expression "John the Baptist," calling him instead *John the Immerser*. But they ought to go one step further, and themselves abjure the title of "Baptists," which they pre-eminently arrogate, and should name themselves appropriately "the Immersionists." It is highly creditable that the mass of that large denomination are not disposed to be drawn into this specious innovation.

Immolation

(Lat. *immolatio)* is the name of a ceremony performed in the sacrifices of the Romans. It consisted in throwing some sort of corn or frankincense, together with the *mola* or salt cake, and a little wine, on the head of the victim. See Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art,* 2, 197. *SEE SACRIFICE*. (J. H.W.)

Immorality

SEE MORALS.

Immortality

is the perpetuity of existence after it has once begun (Lat. *immortalitas, not dying).* ‘‘If a man die, shall he live again?’ is a question which has naturally agitated the heart and stimulated the intellectual curiosity of man, wherever he has risen above a state of barbarism, and commenced to exercise his intellect at all.” Without such a belief, Max Muller *(Chips from a German Workshop,* 1, 45) well says, “religion surely is like an arch resting on one pillar, like a bridge ending in an abyss.” It is very gratifying, therefore, to the believer, and a fact worthy of notice, that the affirmative on this question is assumed more or less by all the nations of earth, so far as our information reaches at the present day, although, it is true, their views often assume very vague and even materialistic forms.

I. *Ideas of rude Nations.* — We concede that the views of most rude heathen nations, both ancient and modern, respecting the state of man after death are indeed dark and obscure, as well as their notions respecting the nature of the soul itself, which some of them regard as a kind of aerial substance, resembling the body, though of a finer material. Still it is found that the greater part of mankind, even of those who are entirely uncultivated, though they may be incapable of the higher philosophical idea of the personal immortality of the soul, are yet inclined to believe at least that the soul survives the body, and continues either forever, or at east for a very long time. This faith seems to rest in uncultivated nations, or, better perhaps, races,

1, upon the *love of life,* which is deeply planted in the human breast, and leads to the wish and hope that life will be continued even beyond the grave;

2, upon *traditions* transmitted from their ancestors;

3, upon *dreams,* in which the dead appear speaking or acting, and thus confirming both wishes and traditions. *SEE NECROMANCY*.

1. *Hindus.* — In the sacred books of the Hindus called the Veda, "immortality of the soul, as well as personal immortality and personal responsibility after death, is clearly proclaimed" (Miller, *Chips,* 1, 45). (We have here a refutation of the opinion that has hitherto been entertained, that the goal of Hinduism is absorption [q.v.] into the Universal Spirit, and therefore loss of individual existence, and that the Hindus as well as Brahmans believe in the transmigration [q.v.] of the soul, and a refutation by a writer who is most competent to speak. Professor Roth, another great Sanskrit scholar, in an article in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society* [iv, 427], corroborates Prof. Muller in these words: "We here [in the Veda] find, not without astonishment, beautiful conceptions on immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter. As if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able [which Müller (2, 267) holds] to arrive at it by its own strength.") Thus we find these passages: "He who gives alms goes to the highest place in heaven; he goes to the gods" (Rev. 1, 125, 56). "Even the idea, so frequent in the later literature of the Brahmans, that immortality is secured by a son, seems implied, unless our translation deceives us, in one passage of the Veda (7, 56, 24): 'O Maruts, may there be to us a strong son, who is a living ruler of men; through whom we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode; then may we come to your own house!' One poet prays that he may see again his father and mother after death (Rv. 1:24, 1); and the fathers are invoked almost like gods, oblations are offered to them, and they are believed to enjoy, in company with the gods, a life of never-ending felicity (Rv. 10:15, 16). We find this prayer addressed to Soma (Rv. 9:113, 7): 'Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal, imperishable world place me, O Soma! Where king Vaivasvata reigns, where the secret plague of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal! Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal! Where wishes and desires are, where the bowl of the bright Soma is, where there is food and rejoicing,

there make me immortal! Where there is happiness and delight, where joy. and pleasure reside, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal!'"

2. *Chinese.* — While it is true that Confucius himself did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, that he rather purposely seems to have avoided entering upon this subject at all, taking it most probably like Moses, as we shall see below, simply for granted (comp. Muller, *Chips,* 1, 308), it is nevertheless implied in the worship which the Chinese pay to their ancestors. Another evidence, it seems to us, is given by the absence of the word death from the writings of Confucius (q.v.). When a person dies, the Chinese say "he has returned to his family." "The spirits of the good were, according to him (Confucius), permitted to visit their ancient habitations on earth, or such ancestral halls or places as were appointed by their descendants, to receive homage and confer benefactions. Hence the duty of performing rites in such places, under the penalty, in the case of those who, while living, neglect such duty, of their spiritual part being deprived after death of the supreme bliss flowing from the homage of descendants" (Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius*, Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo).

3. *Egyptians.* — Perhaps we may say that the idea of immortality assumed a more definite shape among the Egyptians, for they clearly recognized not only a *dwelling-place of the dead;* but also a future judgment. "Osiris, the beneficent god, judges the dead, and, 'having weighed their heart in the scales of justice, he sends the wicked to regions of darkness, while the just are sent to dwell with the god of light.' The latter, we read on an inscription, 'found favor before the great God; they dwell in glory, where they live a heavenly life; the bodies they have quitted will forever repose in their tombs, while they rejoice in the life of the supreme God.' Immortality was thus plainly taught, although bound up with it was the idea of the preservation of the body, to which they attached great importance, as a condition of the soul's continued life; and hence they built vast tombs, and embalmed their bodies, as if to last forever."

4. *Persians.* — In the religion of the Persians, also, at least since, if not previous to the time of Zoroaster, a prominent part is assigned to the existence of a future world, with its governing spirits. "Under Ormuz and Ahriman there are ranged regular hierarchies of spirits engaged in a perpetual conflict; and the soul passes into the kingdom of light or of

darkness, over which these spirits respectively preside, according as it has lived on the earth well or ill. Whoever has lived in purity, and has not suffered the *divs* (evil spirits) to have any power over him, passes after death into the realms of light."

5. *American Indians. — The* native tribes of the lower part of South America believe in two great powers of good and evil, but likewise in a number of inferior deities. These are supposed to have been the creators and ancestors of different families, and hence, when an Indian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who presides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, *Researches into the early History of Mankind, and the Development of Civilization*, Lond. 1868). Another American tribe of Indians, the *Mandans*, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: "The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterraneous lake. A grapevine 'extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buffalo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight and closed upon herself and the rest of the nation the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die. to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the sins of the wicked will not enable them to cross" (Tyler). The *Choctaw* tribe's belief in a future state is equally curious. "They hold that the spirit lives after death, and that it has a great distance to travel towards the west; that it has to cross a dreadful, deep, and rapid stream, over which, from hill to hill, there lies a long, slippery pine log, with the bark peeled off. Over this the dead have to pass before they reach the delightful hunting grounds. The good walk on safely, though six people from the other side throw stones at them: but the wicked, trying to dodge the stones, slip off the log, and fall thousands of feet into the water which is dashing over the rocks" (see Brinton, p. 233 sq.).

6. *Polynesians.* — The natives of Polynesia "imagine that the sky descends at the horizon and incloses the earth. Hence they call foreigners 'palangi' or 'heaven-bursters,' as having broken in from another world outside. According to their views, we live upon the ground floor of a great house, with upper stories rising one over another above us, and cellars down below. There are holes in the ceiling to let the rain through, and as men are supposed to visit the dwellers above, the dwellers from below are believed to come sometimes up to the surface, and likewise to receive visits from men in return."

7. *New Hollanders.* — The native tribes of Australia believe that all who are good men, and have been properly buried, enter *heaven* after death. "Heaven, which is the abode of the two good divinities, is represented as a delightful place, where there is abundance of game and food, never any excess of heat or cold, rain or drought, no malign spirits, no sickness or death, but plenty of rioting, singing, and dancing for evermore. They also believe in an evil spirit who dwells in the nethermost regions, and, strange to say, they represent him with horns and a tail, though one would think that, prior to the introduction of cattle into New Holland, the natives could not have been aware of the existence of horned beasts" (Oldfield).

8. *Greenlanders.* — "The Greenlander believes that when a man dies his soul travels to Torlgarsuk, the land where reigns perpetual summer, all sunshine, and no night; where there is good water, and birds, fish, seals, and reindeer without end, that are to be caught without trouble, or are found cooking alive in a huge kettle. But the journey to this land is difficult; the souls have to slide five days or more down a precipice, all stained with the blood of those who have gone down before. And it is especially grievous for the poor souls when the journey must be made in winter or in tempest, for then a soul may come to harm, or suffer the other death, as they call it, when it perishes utterly, and nothing is left. The bridge Es-Sirat, which stretches over the midst of the Moslem hill, finer than a hair, and sharper than the edge of a sword, conveys a similar conception." Tyler, on whose works we mainly rely for the information here conveyed on rude nations, traces the idea of a bridge in Java, in North America, in South America, and he also shows how in Polynesia the bridge is replaced by canoes, in which the dead were to pass the great gulf. It is noteworthy that the Jews, also, when they first established a firm belief in immortality, imagined a bridge of hell, which all unbelievers were to pass.

II. *Ideas of more cultivated Nations. — Wherever* pagan thought and pagan morality reach the highest perfection. we find their ideas of the immortality of the soul gradually approaching the Christian views. The first trace of a belief in a future existence we find in Homer's *Iliad* (23, 103 sq.), where he represents that Achilles first became convinced that souls and shadowy forms have a real existence in the kingdom of the shades (Hades) by the appearance to him of the dead Patroclus in a dream. These visions were often regarded as divine by the Greeks (comp. *Il.* 1, 63, and the case of the rich man and Lazarus in <4167>Luke 16:27). Compare also the article HADES *SEE HADES* . But, while in the early Greek paganism the idea of the future is everywhere melancholic, Hades, or the realms of the dead, being to their imagination the emblem of gloom. as may be seen from the following: "Achilles, the ideal hero, declares that he would rather till the ground than live in pale Elysium," we find that, with the progress of Hellenic thought, a higher idea of the future is found to characterize both the poetry and philosophy of Greece, till, in the Platonic Socrates, the conception of immortality shines forth with a clearness and precision truly impressive. "For we must remember, O men," said Socrates, in his last speech, before he drained the poison cup, "that it depends upon the immortality of the soul whether we have to live to it and to care for it or not. For the danger seems fearfully great of not caring for it. [Compare Locke's statement: If the best that can happen to the unbeliever be that he be right, and the worst that can happen to the believer be that he be wrong, who in his madness would dare to run the venture?] Yea, were death to be the end of all, it would be truly a fortunate thing for the wicked to get rid of their body, and, at the same time, of their wickedness. But now, since the soul shows itself to us immortal, there can be for it no refuge from evil, and no other salvation than to become as good and intelligible as possible." More clearly are his views set forth in the *Apology* and the *Phaedo,* in language at once rich in faith and in beauty. "The soul, the immaterial part, being of a nature so superior to the body, can it," he asks in the *Phaedo*, "as soon as it is separated from the body, be dispersed into nothing, and perish? Oh, far otherwise. Rather will this be the result. If it take its departure in a state of purity, not carrying with it any clinging impurities of the body, impurities which during life it never willingly shared in, but always avoided, gathering itself into itself, and making the separation from the body its aim and study-that is, devoting itself to true philosophy, and studying how to lie calmly; for this is true philosophy, is it not? — well, then, so prepared, the soul departs into that invisible region which is of its

own nature, the region of the divine, the immortal, the wise, and then its lot is to be happy in a state in which it is freed from fears and wild desires, and the other evils of humanity, and spends the rest of its existence with the gods." This view, or better doctrine of the immortality of the soul, held by Socrates and his disciple Plato, implied a double immortality, the past eternity as well as that to come. They certainly offer a very striking contrast to the popular superstitions and philosophy of their day, which in many respects recall the views held by the Hindus. The people, especially those who held the most enlarged views up to this time, had "entertained what might be termed a doctrine of *semi-immortality.* They looked for a continuance of the soul in an endless futurity, but gave themselves no concern about the eternity which is past. But Plato considered the soul as having already eternally existed, the present life being only a moment in our career; he looked forward with an undoubting faith to the changes through which we must hereafter go" (Draper, *Istell. Development of Europe,* p. 118; compare below, Philosophical Argument).

III. *Ideas of the Jewish Nation. —*

1. It has frequently been asserted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the O.T. The Socinians in the 16th and 17th centuries took this ground. Some have gone so far as to construe the supposed silence of the O.T. Scriptures on this subject into a formal denial of the possibility of a future life, and have furthermore fortified their positions by selecting some passages of the Old Testament that are rather obscure, e.g. <2109>Ecclesiastes 3:19 sq.; <2388>Isaiah 38:18; <9906>Psalm 6:6; 30:10; 88:11; 115:17; <1807>Job 7:7-10; 10:20-22; 14:7-12; 15:22. In the most odious manner were these objections raised by the "Wolfenb Uittel Fragments" (see the fourth fragment by *Lessing, Beitrdge z. Gesch. u. Lit. a. d. Wolfenbüttelschen Bibliothek, 4:*484 sq.). Bishop Warburton, on the other hand, derived one of his main proofs of the divine mission of Moses from this supposed silence an the subject of immortality. "'Moses," he argues, "being sustained in his legislation and government by immediate divine authority, had lot the same necessity that other teachers have for a recourse to threatenings and punishments drawn from the future world, in order to enforce obedience." In a similar strain argues professor Ernst Stahelin in an article on the immortality of the soul (in the *Foundations of our Faith,* Lond. and N. York, 1866, 12mo, p. 221 sq.): "Moses and Confucius did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, they seemed purposely to avoid entering-upon the subject; *they simply took it for granted.* Thus

Moses spoke of the tree of life in Paradise of which if the man took he should live forever, and called God the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus implying their continued existence, since God could not be a God of the dead, but only of the living; and Confucius, while in some respects avoiding all mention of future things, nevertheless enjoined honors to be paid to departed spirits (thus assuming their life after death) as one of the chief duties of a religious man." Another evidence of the belief of the Jews at the time of Moses and in subsequent periods in the immortality of the soul, as a doctrine self-evident, and by them universally acknowledged and received, is the fact that the Israelites and their ancestors resided among the Egyptians, a people who, as we have seen above, had cherished this faith from the remotest ages (comp. Herodotus, 2, 123, who asserts that they were the first who entertained such an idea). It is further proved that the Jews believed in immortality,

(a) from the laws of Moses against *Necromancy* (q.v.), or the invocation of the dead, which was very generally practiced by the Canaanites (comp. Deuteronomy 18:9-12), and which, notwithstanding these laws, is found to have been prevalent among the Jews even at the time of king Saul (1 Samuel 28), and later (comp. Psalm 106:28, and the prophets);

(b) from the name which the Jews gave to the kingdom of the dead, ᾅδης), which so frequently occurs in Moses as well as subsequent writings of the O.T. That Moses did not in his laws hold up the punishments of the future world to the terror of transgressors is a circumstance which redounds to his praise, and cannot be alleged against him as a matter of reproach, since to other legislators the charge has been laid that they were either deluded or impostors for pursuing the Very opposite course. Another reason why Moses did not touch the question of the immortality of the soul is that he did not intend to give a system of theology in his laws. But so much is clear from certain passages in his writings, that he was by no means ignorant of this doctrine. Compare Michaelis, *Argumenta pro Immortalitate Animi e Mose Collecta,* in the *Syntagm. Comment.* 1 (Göttingen, 1759); Lüderwald, *Unters. von d. Kenntniss eines künffigen Lebens i. A. Test.* (Helmstudt, 1781); Semler, *Beantwortung d. Fragen d. Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenonnten;* Seiler, *Observ. ad psychologiam sacran* (Erlang. 1779).

"The following texts from the writings of Moses may be regarded as indications of the doctrine of immortality, viz. Genesis 5, 22,24, where it is

said respecting Enoch, that because he lived a pious life *God took him,* so that he was no more among men. This was designed to be the reward and consequence of his pious life, and it points to an invisible life with God, to which he attained without previously suffering death. <01735>Genesis 37:35, Jacob says, 'I will go down to "the grave" (l/av) unto my son.' We have here distinctly exhibited the idea of a place where the dead dwell connected together in a society. In conformity with this idea we must explain the phrase *to go to his fathers* (<01515>Genesis 15:15), or *to be gathered to his people* [more literally, *to enter into their habitation or abode]* (<01258>Genesis 25:8; 35:29; <04024>Numbers 20:24, etc.). In the same way many of the Indian savages (as we have already seen) express their expectation of an immortality beyond the grave. Paul argues from the text <01479>Genesis 47:9, and similar passages where Jacob calls his life a *journey,* that the patriarchs expected a life after death (<581113>Hebrews 11:13-16; yet he says, very truly, πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας). In <402223>Matthew 22:23, Christ refers, in arguing against the Sadducees, to <020306>Exodus 3:6, where Jehovah calls himself the God of Isaac and Jacob (i.e. their protector and the object of their worship), long after their death. It could not be that their ashes and their dust should worship God; hence he concludes that they themselves could not have ceased to exist, but that, as to their souls, they still lived (comp. <581113>Hebrews 11:13-17). This passage was interpreted in the same way by the Jews after Christ (Wetstein, ad loc.). In the subsequent books of the O.T. the texts of this nature are far more numerous. Still more definite descriptions are given of l/av] and the condition of the departed there; e.g. <232409>Isaiah 14:9 sq.; also in the Psalms and in Job. Even in these texts, however, the doctrine of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked in the kingdom of the dead is not so clearly developed as it is in the N.T.; this is true even of the book of Job. All that we find here with respect to this point is only obscure intimation, so that the Pauline πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες is applicable, in relation to this doctrine, to the other books of the O.T. as well as to those of Moses. In the Psalms there are some plain allusions to the expectation of reward and punishment after death, particularly <191715>Psalm 17:15; 49:15, 16; 73:24. There are some passages in the prophets where a *revivification of-the dead* is spoken of, as <232619>Isaiah 26:19; <271202>Daniel 12:2; Ezekiel 27; but, although these do not teach a *literal* resurrection of the dead, but rather refer to the restoration of the nation and land, still these and all such figurative representations presuppose the proper idea that an invisible part of man survives the body, and will be hereafter united to it. Very clear is also the passage

(21207)Ecclesiastes 12:7, The body must return to the earth from whence it was taken, but the spirit to God who gave it,' evidently alluding to (01019)Genesis 3:19. *SEE SHEOL*.

"From all this we draw the conclusion that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not unknown to the Jews before the Babylonian exile. It appears also from the fact that a general expectation existed of rewards and punishments in the future world, although in comparison with what was afterwards taught on this point there was at that time very little definitely known respecting it, and the doctrine, therefore, stood by no means in that near relation to religion and morality into which it was afterwards brought, as we find it often in other wholly uncultivated nations. Hence this doctrine is not so often used by the prophets as a motive to righteousness, or to deter men from evil, or to console them in the midst of suffering. But on this very account the piety of these ancient saints deserves the more regard and admiration. It was in a high degree unpretending and disinterested. Although the prospect of what lies beyond the grave was, as Paul said, the promised blessing which they saw only from afar, they yet had pious dispositions, and trusted God. They held merely to the general promise that God their Father would cause it to be well with them even after death ((19736)Psalm 73:26, 28, 'When my strength and my heart faileth, God will be the strength of my heart, and my portion forever'). But it was not until after the Babylonian captivity that the ideas of the Jews on this subject appear to have become enlarged, and that this doctrine was brought by the prophets, under the divine guidance, into a more immediate connection with religion. This result becomes very apparent after the reign of the Greciai kings over Syria and Egypt, and their persecutions of the Jews. The prophets and teachers living at that time (of whose writings, however, nothing has come down to us) must therefore have given to their nation, time after time, more instruction upon this subject, and must have explained and unfolded the allusions to it in the earlier prophets. Thus we find that after this time, more frequently than before, the Jews sought and found in this doctrine of immortality and of future retribution, consolation, and encouragement under their trials, and a motive to piety. Such discourses were therefore frequently put in the mouths of the martyrs in the second book of Maccabees, e.g. 6:26; 7:9 sq.; comp. 12:4345; see also the Book of Wisdom, 2, 1 sq.; and especially 3:1 sq., and the other apocryphal books of the O.T. At the time of Christ, and afterwards, this doctrine was universally received and taught by the Pharisees, and was, indeed, the

prevailing belief among the Jews, as is well known from the testimony of the N.T., *of* Josephus, and also of Philo. Tacitus also refers to it in his history, 'Animas praelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternas putant.' Consult an essay comparing the ideas of the apocryphal books of the O.T. on the subjects of immortality, resurrection, judgment, and retribution, with those of the N.T., written by Frisch, in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur,* b. 4; Ziegler, *Theol. Abhandl.* pt. 2, No. 4; Flugge, *Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit,* etc., pt. 1. The Sadducees, boasting of a great attachment to the O.T., and especially to the books of Moses, were the only Jews who denied this doctrine, as well as the existence of the soul as distinct from the body" (Knapp, *Theology, §* 149). (See Johannsen, *Vet. Heb. notiones de rebus post mortem,* Hafni 1826.) *SEE RESURRECTION*.

2. Among the modern Jews, the late celebrated Jewish savant and successor to Ronan at the Sorbonne, professor Munk, regarded as one of the strongest evidences which the O.T. affords for a doctrine of the immortality of the soul the expression "He was gathered to his people," so frequent in the writings of the O.T. The Rev. D. W. Marks, in a series of *Sermons* (Lond. 5611 1851), p. 103 sq., says of it: "It has generally been supposed that 'to be gathered to one's people' is an ordinary term which the sacred historian employs in order to convey the idea that the person to whom it is applied lies buried in the place where the remains of the same family are deposited. But whoever attentively considers all the passages of the Bible where this expression occurs will find, says Dr. Munk, that being gathered to one's ancestors' is expressly distinguished from the rite of sepulture. Abraham is 'gathered unto his people,' but he is buried in the cave which he bought near Hebron, and where Sarah alone is interred. This is the first instance where the passage 'to be gathered to one's people' is to be met with; and that it cannot mean that Abraham's bones reposed in the same cave with those of his fathers is very clear, since the ancestors of the patriarch were buried in Chaldaea, and not in Canaan. The death of Jacob is related in the following words: 'And when Jacob had finished charging his eons, he gathered up his feet upon the bed, and he expired, and was gathered unto his people' (01433Genesis 49:33). It is equally certain that the phrase 'he was gathered unto his people' cannot refer to the *burial* of the patriarch, because we learn from the next chapter that he was embalmed, and that the Egyptians mourned for him seventy days; and it is only after these three score and ten days of mourning are ended that Joseph

transports the remains of his father to Canaan, and inters them in the cave of Machpelah, where the ashes of Abraham and ‘Isaac repose. When the inspired penman alludes to the actual burial of Jacob he uses very different terms. He makes no mention then of the patriarch ‘being gathered to his people,’ but he simply employs the verb rbq; ‘to bury:’ ‘And Joseph went, up to bury his father.’ The very words addressed by Jacob on his deathbed to his sons, ‘I am about to be gathered unto my people; bury me with my fathers,’ afford us sufficient evidence that the speaker, as well as the persons addressed, understood the expression ‘being gathered to one’s people’ in a sense totally different from that of being lodged within a tomb. But a stronger instance still may be advanced. The Israelites arrive at Mount Hor, near the borders of Edom, and immediately is issued the divine command, ‘Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, for he shall not come into the land which I have given to the children of Israel. Strip Aaron of his garments, and clothe in them Eleazar his son. And Aaron shall be gathered, and there he shall die.’ No member of his family lay buried on Mount Hor; and still Aaron is said to have been there ‘gathered to his people.’ Again, Moses is charged to chastise severely the Midianites for having seduced the Israelites to follow the abominable practices of rwp l[b (‘Baal Peor’); and, this act accomplished, the legislator is told ‘that he will be gathered unto his people.’ This passage certainly cannot mean that Moses was to be gathered in the grave with any of his people. The Hebrew lawgiver died on Mount Abarim; and the Scripture testifies ‘that no one ever knew of the place of his sepulcher;’ and still the term to be gathered to his people is there likewise employed. Sufficient instances have now been cited to prove that wym[la ãsah is to be understood in a different sense from the rite of sepulture, and that the Hebrews in the times of Moses *did* entertain the belief in another state of existence, where spirit joined spirit after the death of the body.

“But, although the position here assumed seems very tenable, it is nevertheless true that the Israelites certainly did not have a very *clear* conception of the future existence of the soul, and ‘that life and immortality’ were not brought to light *very distinctly* before Christ came, for whom the office was reserved of making clearly known many high matters before but obscurely indicated” *(Journal of Sacred Literature, 8,* 179).

IV. *New-Testament Views.* — When Jesus Christ appeared in this world, the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.), the fables of poets of a lower world, and the corruption which was prevalent among the nations had fully destroyed the hope, to say nothing of a belief, in future existence. It was left for him to declare the existence of the soul after death, even though the "earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved" (2 Corinthians 5, 1), with great certainty and very explicitly, not only by an allusion to the joys that await us in the future world, and to the dangers of retribution and divine justice (<40>Matthew 10:28), but also in refutation of the doctrines of the unbelieving Sadducees (<40>Matthew 22:23 sq.; <41>Mark 12:18 sq.; <42>Luke 20:28 sq.). Jesus Christ, said Paul, "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and *immortality* to light" (<55>2 Timothy 1:10), and "will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life' *(ἀφθαρσίαν)* (<45>Romans 2:6 sq.). The original for eternal life here used *(ἀφθαρσία)* denotes nothing else than the immortality of the soul, or a continuation of the substantial being, of man's person, of the *ego,* after death, by the destruction of the body (comp. <40>Matthew 10:28; <42>Luke 12:4). *SEE ETERNAL LIFE*; and on the origin of the soul, and its pre-existence to the body, the article *SEE SOUL*.

It is evident from the passages cited that Christ and his apostles did more to illustrate and confirm the belief in the immortality of the soul, as cherished at the present day, than had been done by any nation, even the Jews included. "He first gave to it that high practical interest which it now possesses;" and it is owing to Christianity that the doctrine of the soul's immortality has become a common and well-recognized truth — no mere result of speculation, as are those of the heathen and Jewish philosophers, nor a product of priestly invention-but a light to the reason, and a guide to the conscience and conduct. "The aspirations of philosophy, and the materialistic conceptions of popular mythology, are found in the Gospel transmuted into a living, spiritual, and divine fact, and an authoritative influence, not only touching the present life, but governing and directing it."

V. *Christian Views.* — In the early Christian Church the views on the immortality of the soul were very varied. There were none that actually denied, far from it, nor even any that doubted its possibility. "But some of them, e.g. Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus, on various grounds, supposed

that the soul, though mortal in itself, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality as a promised reward, by its union with the spirit and the right use of its liberty, or, in the opposite case, perishes with the body. They were led to this view partly because they laid so much stress on freedom, and because they thought that likeness to God was to be obtained only by this freedom; and partly, too, because they supposed (according to the trichotomistic division of human nature) that the soul *(ψυχή)* receives the seeds of immortal life only by the union with the spirit *(πνεῦμα),)* as the higher and free life of reason." This view was also afterwards introduced into the Greek Church by Nicholas of Methone (compare Hagenbach, *Doctrines,* 2, 16). "And, lastly, other philosophical hypotheses concerning the nature of the soul doubtless had an influence. On the contrary, Tertullian and Origen, whose views differed on other subjects, agreed on this one point, that they, in accordance with their peculiar notions concerning the nature of the soul, looked upon its immortality as essential to it" (Hagenbach, 1, 158). "The schoolmen of the Middle Ages in the Western Church considered the immortality of the soul a *theological truth;* but their chief leaders, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, were at issue on the question whether reason furnishes satisfactory proof of that doctrine. As Anselm of Canterbury had inferred the existence of God himself from the idea of God, so Thomas Aquinas proved the immortality of the soul, in a similar manner, by an *ontological* argument: 'Intellectus apprehendit esse absolute et secundum omne tempus. Unde omne habens intellectum naturaliter desiderat esse semper, naturale autem desiderium non potest est inane. Omnis igitur intellectualis substantia est incorruptibilis' (compare Engelhardt, *Dogmzengesch.* 2, 123 sq.). On the other hand, Scotus, whose views were more nearly allied to those of the Nominalists, maintained: 'Non posse demonstrari, quod anima sit immortalis' *(Comm. in M. Sentent.* bk. 2, dist. 17, qu. 1; comp. bk. 4, dist. 43, qu. 2). Bonaventura, on the contrary, asserted: 'Animam esse immortalem, auctoritate ostenditur et ratione' *(De Nat. Deor.* 2, 55). Concerning the further attempts of Moneta of Cremona (13th century), William of Auvergne (bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249), and Raimund Martini *(Pugio Fidei* adv. Maur. p. 1, ch. 4), to prove the immortality of the soul, compare Minscher, *Dogmengeschichte,* ed. by Von Colln, p. 92 sq." (Hagenbach). On the views since the Reformation, *SEE SOUL, IMMORTALITY OF*.

VI. *Philosophical Argument.* — There are many writers, both in philosophy and theology, who deny that the immortality of the soul can be proved apart from revelation. E. Stahelin *(Foundations of our Faith, p.* 232) says: "We might take up a line of argument used by philosophy both in ancient and modern times-from Socrates down to Fichte-to prove the immortality of the inner being; an argument derived from the assertion that the soul, being a unity, is, as such, incapable of decay, it being only in the case of the complex that a falling to pieces, or a dissolution, is conceivable." "But;" he continues, "the abstruse nature of this method leads us to renounce a line of argument from which, we freely confess, we expect little profitable result. For, after all, what absolute proof have we of this unity of the soul? Can we subject it to the microscope or the scalpel, as we can the visible and tangible? It must content us for the present simply to indicate that the instinct and consciousness of immortality have nothing to fear from the most searching examination of the reason, but find far more of confirmation and additional proof than of contradiction in the profoundest thinking. Further, that this instinct and consciousness do actually exist, and are traceable through all the stages and ramifications of the human race, is confirmed to us by our opponents themselves that there is in man something which is deeper and stronger than the maxims of a self-invented philosophy, namely, the divinely created nobility of his nature, the inherent breath of life, breathed into him by God, the relation to the Eternal, which secures to him eternity." Watson *(Institutes,* 2, 2) goes even further, and declares that nowhere else but in the Bible is there any "indubitable declaration of man's immortality," or "any facts or principles so obvious as to enable us confidently to infer it. All *observation* lies directly against the doctrine of man's immortality. He *dies,* and the probabilities of a future life which have been established upon the unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life, and the capacities of the human soul, are a presumptive evidence which has been adduced, as we shall afterwards show, only by those to whom the doctrine had been transmitted by tradition, and who were therefore in possession of the *idea;* and even then, to have any effectual force of persuasion, they must be built upon antecedent principles furnished only by the revelations contained in holy Scripture. Hence some of the wisest heathens, who were not wholly unaided in their speculations on these subjects by the reflected light of these revelations, confessed themselves unable to come to any satisfactory conclusion. The doubts of Socrates, who expressed himself the most hopefully of any on the subject of a future life, are well known; and Cicero,

who occasionally expatiates with so much eloquence on this topic, shows, by the skeptical expressions which he throws in, that his belief was by no means confirmed."

The first attempt of a philosophical tenet on the doctrine of immortality is offered in Plato's *Phaedo.* On it the New Platonics reared their structure, adorned with many fanciful additions. All scientific attempts throughout the Middle Ages, and up to our own day, have been modified views, allied more or less to Platonism. In opposition to these, the French materialism of the 18th century attempted to destroy, or at least undermine, the belief in immortality.' Not less materialistic is the position of the Pantheists, headed by Spinoza. "These hold that the World-Soul, which, in their opinion, produces and fills the universe, also fills and rules man; nay, that it is only in him that it reaches its-special end, which is self-consciousness, and attains to thought and will. It is true, they go on to say, that at the death of the individual this World-Soul retreats from him, just as the setting sun seems to draw back its rays into itself; and that self-consciousness now sinks once more into the great, unconscious, undistinguished spirit-ocean of the whole." The answer to this ridiculous position has been best given by M'Cosh *(Intuitions of the Mind,* p. 392 sq.): "We can *conceive* of air thus rushing into air, and of a bucketful of-water losing itself in a river; and why? because neither air nor water ever had a separate and conscious personality. The soul, as long as it exists, must retain its personality as an essential property, and must carry it along with it wherever it goes. The moral conviction clusters round this personal self. The being who is judged, who is saved or condemned, is the. same who sinned and continued in his sin, or who believed and was justified when on earth."

Kant, Locke, and other metaphysicians, on the other hand, like some theologians, as we have seen above, also exclude the immortality of the soul from the province of natural theology. "They deem it impossible to prove our future existence from the creation, or even from the admitted attributes of the Creator, and are thus in singular opposition to the ancient Platonists, who regarded the eternal continuance of our being as the more obvious doctrine of natural theology, and inferred from it the divine existence as the less direct intimation of nature. It is said that much of the reasoning employed by pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul is unsound. This is a fact, and yet by no means invalidates their right to believe in the conclusion which they deduced illogically. There are many truths, the proof of which lies so near to us that we overlook it. Believing a

proposition firmly, we are satisfied with the mere pretence of an argument for its support; and searching in the distance for proofs which can only be found in immediate contact with us, we discover reasons for the belief which, long before we had discovered them, was yet fully established in our own minds; and yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine, although, in point of fact, the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them. If they were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their weakness would be: obvious at once; but, as they have nothing to sustain, their insufficiency is the less apparent; our belief continues, notwithstanding the frailness of the arguments which make a show of upholding it, and thus the very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion, which remains firm in despite of them. That the immortality of the soul has been firmly believed in by men destitute of a written revelation will not be denied by fair-minded scholars. It probably would never have been doubted had not some learned, though injudicious controversialists, as Leland and others, deemed it necessary to magnify the importance of the Bible by undervaluing the attainments of heathen sages. The singular attempt of Warburton to prove that the authority of the Mosaic writings is evinced by their not teaching the doctrine of a future state led him to an equally paradoxical attempt to show that the phraseology of pagan sages furnishes no valid evidence of their belief in the soul's immortality. But each of these efforts was abortive; and if each had been successful, such a kind of success would have resulted in even greater evils than have come from the want of it. The fact, then, that our existence in a future world has been an article of faith among pagan philosophers indicates that this doctrine is an appropriate part of natural theology. But, even if it had not been thus believed by heathens, it ought to have been; and the arguments which convince the unaided judgment of its truth are also reasons for classifying the doctrine among the teachings of nature. These arguments may be conveniently arranged under six different classes: first, the *metaphysical, which* prove that the mind is entirely distinct from the body, and is capable of existing while separate from it; that the mind is not compounded, and will not therefore be dissolved into elementary particles; that, being imperceptible, it cannot perish except by an annihilating act of God (comp. Dr. M'Cosh's argument above cited); secondly, the *analogical,* which induces us to believe that the soul will not be annihilated, even as matter does not cease to exist when it changes its form; thirdly, the *teleological,* which incline us to think that the mental powers and the tendencies so imperfectly developed in this life will not be

shut out from that sphere of future exertion for which they are so wisely adapted; fourthly, the *theological,* which foster an expectation that the wisdom of God will not fail to complete what otherwise appears to have been commenced in vain, that his goodness will not cease to bestow the happiness for which our spiritual nature is ever longing, and that his justice will not allow the present disorders of the moral world to continue, but will rightly adjust the balances, which have now for a season lost their equipoise; fifthly, the *moral,* which compel us to hope that our virtues will not lose their reward, and to fear that our vices will not go unpunished in the future world, which seems to be better fitted than the present for moral retribution; and, sixthly, the *historical,* the general belief in a future state of rewards and punishments, the expectations of dying men, the premonitions of the guilty, and the tenacious hopes of the beneficent. All these arguments are in favor of our unending existence, and there are none in opposition to it; and it is an axiom that whatever has existed and now exists, will, unless there be special proof to the contrary, continue to exist" *(Bibliotheca Sacra, May,* 1846, art. 2).

The *natural proofs* of the immortality of the soul are treated very skillfully by professor Chace, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for February, 1849. First he analyzes the Phaedo of Plato, and finds it to contain the following arguments for immortality:

1. From the capacity and desire of the soul for knowledge, beyond what in this life is attainable;

2. From the law of contraries, according to which, as rest prepares for labor, and labor for rest; as light ends in darkness, and darkness in light; so life, leading to death, death must, in turn, terminate in life;

3. From the reminiscences of a previous existence, which the soul brings. with it into the present life;

4. From the simple and indivisible nature of the soul; only compound substances undergo dissolution;

5. From the essential vitality of the soul itself. He adds that although these arguments did not amount, in the estimation of Socrates, "to an absolute proof of the doctrine, he thought them sufficient not only to deprive death of all its terrors, but to *awaken* in the mind of a good man, when approaching death, the calm and cheerful hope of a better life." These

arguments, however, are far behind the present state of science. The second and third rest on purely imaginary foundations; the fourth and fifth are inconclusive; and the first only, we grant, has a real, though subordinate value. Cicero adds to these arguments one from the *consensus gentium,* a universal prevalence of a belief in immortality. Of Butler's argument for immortality in the *Analogy,* the professor remarks that it is perhaps less fortunate than any other part of that great work. "Both of the main arguments employed by him are no less applicable to the lower animals than to man, and just as much prove the immortality of the living principle connected with the minutest insect or humblest infusoria as of the human soul. It is not a little remarkable that this fact, which in reality converts the attempted proof into a *reductio ad absurdum* of the principles from which it is drawn, should not have awakened in the cautious mind of Butler a suspicion of their soundness, and led him to seek other means of establishing the truth in question. These he would have found, and, as we think, far better suited to his purpose, in the facts and principles so ably and so fully set forth in his chapters on the moral government of God, and on probation considered as a means of discipline and improvement. Indeed, we have always been of the opinion that these two chapters contain the only real and solid grounds for belief in a future life which the work presents; the considerations adduced in the one particularly appropriated to that object serving at furthest only to answer objections to the doctrine." Professor Chace founds his own argument chiefly upon the gradual and progressive development of life in our planet, from the epoch of its earliest inhabitant down to the present hour, which development, taken in connec*tion* with the capacities and endowments of the soul, indicates, on the part of the Creator, a purpose to continue it in being.

See, besides the authorities already referred to, Marsilius Ficinus, *De Imortalitate Animae* (Par. 1641, fol.); an extract of it is given in Buhle, *Gesch. d. neueren Philosophie,* 2, 171 sq.; Spalding, *Bestimmung des Menschen* (Leips. 1794); Struvius, *Hist. Doct. Graecorum et Romanorum1n, de Statu Aniaruru post nortem* (Alten, 1803 8vo); Meier, *Philosophische Lehre v. Zustand der Seele* Mendelssohn, *Phaedon* (Berlin, 1821); Hamann, *Unsterblichkeit* (Leips. 1773, 8vo); Jacobi, *Philos. Beweis. d. Unsterblichkeit* (Dessau, 1783); Fichte (J. G.), *Destination of Man* (tr. by Mrs. R. Sinnett, London, 1846, 12mo); Jean Paul Richter, *Das Campaner-Thal.* (Frankf. 1797, 8vo); Olshausen, *Antiq. Patrum de Immortalitate Sententice* (Regiom. 1827, 4to); Herrick, *Sylloqe*

Scriptorum de Immortalitate, etc. (Regensb. 1790, 8vo); Knapp, *Theology*, *§* 149; Htiffell, *Ueber d. Unsterblichkeit d. menschlichen Seele* (Carlsruhe, 1832); Hase, *Evangel. Protest. Dogmatik*, *§* 82, 8; Duncan, *Evidence of Reason for Immortality* (1779, 8vo); Tillotson, *Sermons, 9,* 309; Hale, Sir Matthew, *Works,* 1, 331; Stanhope, *Boyle Lectures* (1702, 4to, senn. 3); Foster, *Sermons,* 1, 373; Sherlock, *Works,* 1, 124; Dwight, *Sermons,* 1, 145; Channing, *Works, 4,* 169; Chalmers, *Works, 10,* 415; Drew, *on Immortality* (Philadel. 1830, 12mo); Newman, *The Soul* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); *Quarterly Review,* Aug. 1834, p. 35; *New York Review,* 1, 331; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection,* p. 209-212; Robert Hall, *Works,* 1, 189; 2, 373; Howe, *Works,* 8vo ed., p. 193; *Amer. Bible Repository, 10,* 411; *Christian Spectator, 8,* 556; *New Englander, 9,* 544 sq.; 11:362 sq.; 14:115 sq., 161 sq.; *Alfeth. Quart. Rev.* July 1864, p. 515; Oct. 1863, p. 685; July, 1860, p. 510; Jan. 1865, p. 133; *Bib. Sacra,* 1860, p. 810 sq.; *Baptist Quart. Rev.* 1870, April, art. 5; *Journal of Speculative Philosophy,* April, 1870, art. 1; Schalberg (Dr. J.), *Unsterblichkeit o. d. pers. Fortdauer d. Seele a. d. Tode* (3rd edit. Naumberg, 1869); Egomet, *Life and Immortality* (Lond. 1860); Schott, *Sterben u. Unsterblichkeit* (Stuttg. 1861); Dumesnil, *'lmmiortalite* (Paris, 1861); Naville, *La Vie Eternelle* (Par. 1863); Huber, *Idee d. Unsterblichkeit* (MAunich, 1864); Baguenault de Pullihesse, *L'Immortalite* (Par. 1864); Pfaff, *Ideen e. Artzes ü. d. Unsterblichkeit d. Seele* (Dresden, 1864); Wilmarshof, *Das Jenseits* (Lpz. 1863); Nitzsch, *Systema of Christian Doctrine* (see Index); Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christ. Theol.* p. 144, 352, 357; Saisset, *Modern Pantheism* (Edinburgh, 1863, 2 vols. 12mo), 1, 140 sq., 263; 2, 36 sq.; Alger, *History of Future Life* (3rd ed. Phila. 1864); Schneider, *Die Unsterblichkeitsidee,* etc. (Regensb. 1870, 8vo); Brinton. *Myths of the New World* (N. Y. 1868, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Immovable Feasts

SEE FEASTS.

Immunities of the Clergy

SEE IMMUNITY.

Immunity, Ecclesiastical

In ecclesiastical jurisprudence a distinction is made between ecclesiastical immunity *(immnunitas ecclesiastica)* and the immunity of the Church

(inmunitas ecclesice). The latter is the right of refuge or asylum (q.v.), the former denotes the exemption of the Church from the general obligations of the community. The ministers of religion have at all times and in all countries enjoyed particular privileges and liberties. This was the case with the priests of pagan Rome, whose privileges were transferred to the Christian clergy by Constantine. Among these privileges we notice particularly exemption from taxes *(census),* from menial service *(munera sordida),* etc. To this was added also the privilege of separate spiritual jurisdiction. *SEE JURISDICTION, ECCLESIASTICAL*. These immunities belonged to the members of the clergy, their wives, children, domestics, and to the goods of the Church, but did not extend to their private property, or to persons entering the clergy simply to free themselves from civil charges. In 532 Justinian added to these privileges that of guardianship, permitting presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons to act as guardians or trustees, but not extending the privilege to bishops or monks *(Nov.* 123, cap. 5; *Anth. Presbyteros C.* cit. 1, 3). The ancient Germans also granted great privileges to their priests. Julius Caesar considered them as the next class to the nobility, and said, "Magno (Druides) sunt apud eos honore" *(De bello Gallico,* lib. 6, cap. 13). "Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt, militiae vocationis omniumque rerum habent immunitatem" *(ib.* cap. 14). When Germany was Christianized, the clergy preserved the same privileges, besides those granted them by the Roman law, which was recognized as the standard *(secundum legema Romanum ecclesia vivit [Lex Ribuaria,* tit. 58, § 1, etc.]). The stipulation of the third Council of Toledo in 589, can. 21 (c. 69, can. 12, qu. 2) that the auditors, bishops, and clergy should not be subject to compulsory services, was also granted afterwards *(Capitulare* a. 744, cap. 7; compare Benedict's *Capitularien-sammlung,* lib. 3, cap. 290). The protection which the Church granted to all who connected themselves with it soon became a source of great profit; it was known in the 6th century under the name of *mitium,* or *mittium legitimum* (Roth, *Gesch. d. Benefcialwesens* [Erlangen, 1850], p. 163 sq.). To this right of protection of the Church was subsequently added that of collecting and appropriating to its own use the taxes which would otherwise have been levied on its proteges by the fiscal officers: this right was called *emunitas,* and was conferred by the kings. These fiscal taxes included fines, etc., of which the holders of immunities became the recipients. In after times the Church obtained also the right of assembling armies, which was called *territorium* (see *Formuloe Andegavenses,* 4, 8, 21, 22, etc.), and which laid the

foundation of the subsequent ecclesiastical principalities (see Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutchlands,* vol. 2, § 97; Waitz, *Deutsche Veifassungsgeschichte,* 2, 290 sq., 570 sq.). These immunities were further specified in the laws of the French kingdom (see *Capitula synodi Vernensis a.* 755, c. 19, 28; *Cap. Motens.* a 756, c. 8, etc.), as were also those of the individual members of the clergy, and of the Church properties. St. Louis decided that each church should have a piece of land *(mansus)* free from all taxations, etc. *(Capit.* a. 816, c. 10, 25; can. 23, qu. 8). Such properties subject to taxes as did come into the hands of the Church did not, however, become free on that account, unless by an especial favor of the king *(Capit. 3, Caroli ill.* a. 812, c. 11; *Capit. 4, Ludov.* a. 819, c. 2). The immunities were, however, greatly abused, and lost their importance, notwithstanding the decisions of the Council of Trent, Sess. 25:cap. 20 ("Ecclesise et ecclesiarum personarum immunitatem Dei ordinatione et canonicis sanctionibus constitutam esse"), and the bull *In caena Domini* (q.v.). To what extent the properties of the clergy and of the Church are now free has been settled by subsequent decrees. As a rule, the clergy are free from the general taxes, and from the personal duties of private citizens. The candidates for priests' orders and students in theology are usually exempt from military service. The churches and their property enjoy generally the same privileges as the government buildings and state property. Personal immunity from taxes, military services, etc., is regularly granted to the clergy, as also to teachers, in Protestant as well as in Roman Catholic countries. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, 6,* 642; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope* (see Index); Augusti, *Handbuch d. christ. Archaöl.* 1, 303 sq.

Immutability

the divine attribute of unchangeableness indicated in the great title of God, I AM. So ⁵⁹⁰¹⁷James 1:17: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." ¹⁹³¹¹Psalm 33:11: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations;" ^{19A225}Psalm 102:25-27: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end." God is immutable as to his essence, being the one necessary being. He is immutable also in ideas and knowledge, since these are eternal. "If we consider the nature of God, that he is a self-

existent and independent Being, the great Creator and wise Governor of all things; that he is a spiritual and simple Being, without parts or mixture such as might induce a change; that he is a sovereign and uncontrollable Being, whom nothing from without can affect or alter; that he is an eternal Being, who always has and always will go on in the same tenor of existence; an omniscient Being, who, knowing all things, has no reason to act contrary to his first resolves; and in all respects a most perfect Being, who can admit of no addition or diminution; we cannot but believe that, both in his essence, in his knowledge, and in his will and purposes, he must of necessity be unchangeable. To suppose him otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect being; for if he change it must be either to a greater perfection than he had before or to a less; if to a greater perfection, then was there plainly a defect in him, and a privation of something better than what he had or was; then, again, was he not always the *best,* and consequently not always God: if he change to a lesser perfection, then does he fall into a defect again; lose a perfection he was possessed once of, and so ceasing to be the best being, cease at the same time to be God. The sovereign perfection of the Deity, therefore, is an invincible bar against all mutability; for, whichever way we suppose him to change, his supreme excellency is nulled or impaired by it. We esteem changeableness in men either an imperfection or a fault: their natural changes, as to their persons, are from weakness and vanity; their moral changes, as to their inclinations and purposes, are from ignorance or inconstancy, and therefore this quality is no way compatible with the glory and attributes of God" (Charnock, *On the Divine Attributes).*

"Various speculations on the divine immutability occur in the writings of divines and others, which, though often well intended, ought to be received with. caution, and sometimes even rejected as bewildering or pernicious. Such are the notions that God knows everything by *intuition;* that there is no succession of ideas in the divine mind; that he can receive no new idea; that there are no affections in God, for to suppose this would imply that he is capable of *emotion;* that if there are affections in God, as love, hatred, etc., they always exist in the same degree; or else he would suffer change: for these and similar speculations, reference may be had to the schoolmen and metaphysicians by those who. are curious in such subjects; but the impression of the divine character, thus represented, will be found very different from that conveyed by those inspired writings in which God is not spoken of *by men,* but speaks of *himself;* and nothing could be more easily

shown than that most of these notions are either idle, as assuming that we know more of God than is revealed; or such as tend to represent the divine Being as rather a necessary than a free agent, and his moral perfections as resulting from a blind physical *necessity* of nature more than from an essential moral excellence; or, finally, as unintelligible or absurd. The true immutability of God consists, not in his adherence to his *purposes*, but in his never changing the *principles* of his administration; and he may therefore, in perfect accordance with his preordination of things, and the immutability of his nature, purpose to do, under certain conditions dependent upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that an immutable adherence to the *principles* of a wise, just, and gracious government requires it. Prayer is in Scripture made one of these conditions; and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he has not, we may be assured, entangled his actual government of the world with the bonds of such an eternal predestination of particular events as either to reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able himself, consistently with his decrees, to answer it, whenever it is encouraged by his express engagements." See Watson, *Institutes*, 1, 401; 2, 492; Perrone, *Tractctus de Deo*, part 2, ch. 2. Knapp, *Theology, §* 20; Graves, *Works, 3:*283; Dorner, in *Jahrbuch f. deutsche Theologie, 1859,* 1860 (see Index). *SEE ATTRIBUTES*; *SEE GOD*.

Im'na and Im'nah

the name of several men, of different form in the original, which is not accurately observed in the English Version.

1. Hebrew YIMNA' ([nm;y" *restrainer;* Sept. Ἰμανά, Vulg. *Jemnna*, Auth. Vers. "Irmna"), one of the sons apparently of Helem, the brother of Shamer, a descendant of Asher, but at what distance is not clear (1Ch 7:35 1 Chronicles 7:35). B.C. prob. cir. 1618. *SEE HOTHAM*.

2. Hebrew YIMNAH' (hnm;y" *fortunate;* Sept. in Ge 46:17 Genesis 46:17, Ἰεμνά, Vulg. *Jemna*, Auth. Vers. "Jimnah;" in Nu 26:44 Numbers 26:44, Ἰαμίν and Ἰαμινί, *Jemnsa* and *Jemnaitce*, "Jimna" and "Jimnites;" in 1Ch 7:30 1 Chronicles 7:30, Ἰεμνά, *Jemna*, "Imnah"), the first-named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family who bore his name. B. C. 1874.

3. (Same Hebrew name as last; Sept. Ἰεμνά, Vulg. *Jemnta,* Auth.Vers. "Imnah'). The father of Kore, which latter was the Levite in charge of the east gate of the Temple, and appointed by Hezekiah over the free-will offerings (2 Chronicles 31:14). B. C. 726.

Impanation

(Latin, *impanatio;* from *in* and *panis,* bread; otherwise *assumptio),* a name given to one of the many different shades of the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The theory was first presented in the 12th century by Ruprecht of Deutz in the following shape *(Opera* ed. Col. 1602, 1, 267; *Comm. in Exodus* 2, 10): "As God did not alter human nature when he incarnated divinity in the womb of the Virgin Mary, uniting the Word and the flesh into one being, so he does not alter the substance of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, which still retain the material properties by which they are known to our senses *(sensibus subacium),* while by his Word he brings them (the component elements) into combination with the identical body and the identical blood of Christ. As the Word descended from on high (a *summo),* not to become flesh, but to assume the flesh *(assumnendo camern),* so are the bread and wine, from their inferior *(ab imo)* position, raised into becoming flesh and blood of Christ, without, therefore, being transmuted *(non mutatum)* in such a manner as to acquire the taste of flesh or the appearance of blood, but do, on the contrary, imperceptibly become identical with both in their essence, partaking of the divine and human immortal substance, which is in Christ. It is not the effect of the Holy Ghost's operation *(affectus)* to alter or destroy the nature of any substance used for his purpose, but, on the contrary, to add to that substance some qualities which it did not at first possess" *(De Opp. Spirit.* s. 3, p. 21, 22). In his work *De divinis Officiis* (2, 9; *Opp.* 2, 762), he says: "The Word of the Father comes in between the flesh and the blood which he received from the womb of the Virgin, and the bread and wine received from the altar, and of the two makes a joint offering. When the priest puts this into the mouth of the believer, bread and wine are received, and are absorbed into the body; but the Son of the Virgin remains whole and unabsorbed in the receiver, united to the Word of the Father in heaven. Such as do not believe, on the contrary, receive only the material bread and wine, but none of the offering." His contemporary, Alger, or Adelher, of Lüttich, writing in defense of the dogma of transubstantiation (1. 3, *De sacram. corp. et sarng. D.* in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* t. 21, Lugdun. 1677), was the first to make use of the

expression *inpanatio* in this sense (p. 251), "In pane Christum *impanatun* sicut Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum." Before him, however, Guitmund of Aversa had, in 1190, used the same word to express the probable meaning of Berengar *(Bibl. Max. Patr.* Lugdun. 18:441), whose supporters are sometimes called *Adessenarii* (q.v.) (from *adesse,* to be present).

The doctrine of impanation was afterwards, in the Reformation period, but wrongly, attributed to Osiander by Carlstadt. Some Roman Catholic writers, e.g. Bellarmine *(Dissert. de impan. et consubstant.* Jense, 1677), Du Cange, and others, accused Luther of having revived the old error of impanation. The *Formula Concordice* (1577) declares that the "mode of union between the body of Christ and the bread and wine is a mystery," and does not decide positively what that mode is, but only negatively what it is not. "It is not a *personal* union, nor is it *consubstantio;* still less is it a union in which change of substance is wrought *(transubstantiatio),* nor a union in which the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread and wine *(impanatio),* but a union which exists only in this sacrament, and therefore is called *sacramsentalis."* See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 644; Knapp, *Theology, §* 146; and the articles *SEE LORD'S SUPPER*; *SEE CONSUBSTANTIATION*; *SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION*.

Impeccabiles

a name given to certain heretics in the ancient Church, who boasted that they were incapable of sin, and that there was no need of repentance; such were some of the Gnostics, Priscillianists, etc. *SEE IMPECCABILITY*.

Impeccability

the state of a person who *cannot sin,* or who, by grace, is delivered from the possibility of sinning. Some speculations have appeared in the world upon the supposed peccability of the human nature of Christ, founded chiefly on certain expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hebrews 4:15) and elsewhere, asserting that Christ was "in all points tempted like as we are." It is argued, on, the other hand, that as the Scripture has been silent on this point, it is both needless and presumptuous to attempt to draw any inferences from such expressions as that above cited; and that we should acquiesce in, and be satisfied with, the declaration that "in him is no sin" (1 John 3:5). See Art. 15 of Church of England, "Of Christ alone without sin." Impeccability, or, at least, sinless perfection, has also been

claimed for every true child of God upon the authority of 1 John 3:9, though improperly, the word "cannot" requiring to be taken (as in many other passages of Scripture) in such a latitude as to express, not an *absolute impossibility* of sinning, but "a strong disinclination," in the renewed nature, to sin "in such a manner and to such a degree as others." — Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus* (Edinb. 1858,12mo), p. 46; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmas Chret.* (see Index). *SEE CHRIST, SINLESSNESS OF*; *SEE PERFECTION*; *SEE SANCTIFICATION*.

Imperiali, Laurent

a Roman Catholic prelate of whose early life nothing is known, was born about the year 1612, and was created cardinal in 1652 by pope Innocent X. He died Sept. 21, 1673. — Migne, *Encyclop. Thsol. 31,* 1094.

Imperiali, Joseph Rene

an Italian prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Oria, April 26, 1651. Descending from a high family, and enjoying the intercession of great prelates, he took orders in his Church, and was rapidly promoted. In 1690 Innocent XI created him cardinal, and he was sent as ambassador to Ferrara. At the papal conclave in 1730 he came within one vote of being elected the incumbent of the papal throne. He died Jan. 15, 1737. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 25:*833; Migne, *Encyclop. Theol. 30,* 1094 sq.

Implicit Faith

SEE FAITH.

Impluvium

anciently a large area or spot of ground between the great porch of the church and the church itself. Because uncovered and exposed to the air, it was called *atrium* or *impluvium.* Eusebius called it αἴθριον. "In this court or church-yard was the station of the energumens (q.v.), and that class of penitents called προσκλαίοντες or *flentes.* These persons were commonly entitled χειμάζοντες or χειμαζόμενοι, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all changes of the weather" (Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* p. 725 sq.). The practice of burning their dead in the impluvium was initiated in the 4th century, but it did not become general

until after the 6th century. There were also frequently buildings auxiliary to the church edifice placed in the impluvium, such as the baptisteries, places where the candidates of the Church were instructed and prepared for baptism, etc. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v. (J. H. W.)

Importunity

(ἀναιδεία) IN PRAYER, an important element of success (<42108>Luke 11:8), as evincing earnestness, a faith that takes no denial, and especially a perseverance that continues to intercede until the request is granted (compare <42180>Luke 18:1; <52517>1 Thessalonians 5:17); *SEE PRAYER*.

Imposition of Hands

a ceremony used by most Christian churches in ordination, and by others in confirmation. The expressions generally used in the Scriptures for the rite of *imposition of hands* are: µycæor tyvæ(ms)µ with dyµ l[µ etc., in the O.T.; and ἐπιτιθημι, τίθημι χεῖρα τινί, ἐπί τινα, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν in the N.T. *SEE HAND*.

I. *Origin and symbolical Meaning of the Act.* — The practice of the imposition of hands as a symbolical act is of remote antiquity. It is "a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior either by age or spiritual position towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a desire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the high-priest to the scape-goat from the congregation (<031421>Leviticus 14:21); but, in general, the gift is of something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands." The principle of the practice seems to rest on the importance of the hand itself, both in the bodily organism and in the moral activity of man, in its power and in its action. Thus we find the hand raised in anger, extended in pity, the avenging hand, the helping hand, etc. In Greek a distinction exists between the hand extended to shelter or protect *(χεῖρα ὑπερέχειν)*, and the hand held out imploringly (*χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν);* consequently between the powerful, directing hand of God, and the imploring hand of man. The *Biblical* signification of the imposition of hands rests, in general, on the consideration of the hand as the organ of *transmission*, both in the real and in the symbolical sense. This results from the fact that not only did the

party offering sacrifice bless the offering by the imposition of hands, but by the same act he, as sinner, imparted to it also his sins and his curse (see <03104>Leviticus 1:4; 3:2; 8:14 sq.; 16:21, 24). *Bähr (Symbolik d. moscischen Cultus,* 2, 339) rejects this idea of transmission of sin by the laying on of hands on the expiatory victim; he considers it only as a symbol of "renunciation of one's own," and argues from the fact of a like imposition of hands in the case of thanksgiving offerings. According to Hofmann *(Schriftbeweis,* 2, 1, p. 155), the imposition of hands in sacrifices signified the power of the party offering it over the life of the victim. Baumgarten, on the contrary *(Comanentar z. Pentateuch,* 1, 2, p. 180), and Kurtz *(Das mosaische Opfer,* p. 70; *Gesch. d. A. B.* p. 332), maintain the idea of transmission. The imposition of hands on all offerings presents no difficulty when we adhere to the general notion of transmission; the thanksgiving offering is by it made the recipient of the giver's feelings. This idea of transmission is especially manifest in the imposition of hands in consecration or blessing. Thus, "in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands (<01814>Genesis 48:14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands (<04718>Numbers 27:18; <05349>Deuteronomy 34:9); cures seem to have been wrought by the prophets by imposition of hands (2 Kings 5, 11); and the high-priest, in giving his solemn benediction, stretched out his hands over the people (<03922>Leviticus 9:22). The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting (<40193>Matthew 19:13; <40823>Mark 8:23; 10:16). One of the promises at the end of Mark's Gospel to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands (<41618>Mark 16:18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight (<44917>Acts 9:17), and Publius's father was healed of his fever (<44808>Acts 28:8) by imposition of hands."

II. *Classification of Biblical Uses.* — More particularly, the imposition of hands, in the O.T., may be divided into (1) the patriarchal-typical laying on of hands in blessing; (2) the legal-symbolical, in consecration to office; and (3) the prophetico-dynamical in healing. The former (see <01814>Genesis 48:14) is a sort of typical transmission of a promised hereditary blessing continued, through the party thus blessed, on his posterity; the second (see <02910>Exodus 29:10; <04718>Numbers 27:18) is a legal figurative imparting of the rights of office, and a promise of the blessing attached to it; the third is the transmission of a miraculous healing power for the restoration of life (<12034>2

Kings 4:34). Yet in the latter case we must notice that the prophet put his hands on the hands of the child, and covered it with his whole body. Thus this transmission points us, in its yet imperfect state, to the N. Test. The N.T. imposition of hands is symbolical of the transmission of spirit and life. Here, as in the O.T., we find three uses: (1) the spiritual-patriarchal imposition of hands by our Lord and the apostles; (2) the spiritual-legal, or official imposition of hands; (3) the healing imposition of hands. Christ lays his hands on the sufferers, and they are cured. But the bodily gifts he thus transmits are joined to spiritual gifts; he cures under the condition of faith (<41065>Mark 6:5). The more the people become imbued with the idea that the curative effects are connected with the material imposition of hands, the more: he operates without it (<41523>Mark 5:23, 41; 7:32). Sometimes he healed only by a word. The full grant of his Spirit and of his calling he represented in a real, but symbolical manner, when he extended his hands over his apostles in blessing at the Mount of Olives (<42450>Luke 24:50). This imposition of the hands of the Lord on his apostles, in connection with the imparting of his Spirit, is the source of the *apostolical* imposition of hands. It was also originally a blending of the symbol and its fulfillment (see <44817>Acts 8:17), as well as of the bodily and spiritual imparting of life (<44917>Acts 9:17). From this general imposition of hands, under which Christians received the baptism of the Spirit, came the official, apostolic imposition of hands (<44103>Acts 13:3; <540414>1 Timothy 4:14). At the same time, the example of Cornelius (Acts 10) shows that the apostolical imparting of the Holy Spirit was not restricted to the forms of official or even general imposition of hands.

III. *Ecclesiastical Uses.* — In the early Church, the imposition of hands was practised in receiving catechumens, in baptism, in confirmation, and in ordination. Cyprian derives its use from apostolical practice *(Ep.* 72, *ad Stephan.; Ep.* 73, *ad Jubaean.)';* so also does Augustine *(De Bapt. 3,* 16). That the imposition of hands in receiving catechumens was different from that used in baptism, etc., is shown by Bingham (bk. 10:ch. 1). Its use in baptism was general as early as Tertullian's time (Coleman; *Ancient Christianity,* ch. 19:§ 4). This probably gave rise to confirmation. After that rite was introduced, imposition of hands became its chief ceremony. It was generally performed by the bishop, but elders were authorized to do it in certain cases, in subordination to the bishop. *SEE CONFIRMATION*.

In ordination, the imposition of hands was an essential part of the ceremony from an early period, but not in the ordination of any class below deacons. *SEE ORDINATION*.

In the modern Church, imposition of hands is considered by the Romanists as an essential part of the sacraments of baptism, ordination, and confirmation *(Concil. Tri Deuteronomy* Sess. 23). "As in the ancient Church this rite existed in two forms-the actual laying on of hands, which was called *chirothesia;* and the extending the hand over or towards the person, which was styled *chirotonia* — so in the Roman Catholic Church the former is retained as an essential part of the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders; the latter is employed in the administration of the priestly absolution. Both forms are familiarly used in blessing. In the mass, also, previous to the consecration of the elements of bread and wine, the priest extends his hands over them, repeating at the same time the preparatory prayer of blessing" (Wetzer's *Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:*853). The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church employ it as a symbolical act, in confirmation and ordination; the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and Congregational churches employ it only in ordination. Great stress is also laid on the performance of this rite in the Greek Church. In the Russo-Greek Church there exist some sects *without priests,* "because in their idea the gift of consecration by laying on of hands, which had continued from the apostles down to Nicon (q.v.), had been lost by the apostacy of Nicon, and of the clergy seduced by him, and thus all genuine priesthood had become impossible" (Eckardt, *Modern Russia, p.* 261 sq., London, 1870, 8vo). It is particularly pleasing to notice the many ingenious devices of these sects to provide for a" priesthood descended from the apostles, in order to enable at least the performance of the rite of marriage, which they do not legalize unless performed by an *accepted* priest. The Jews assert that the laying on of hands, together with the Sanhedrim, ceased after the death of Rabbi Hillel, the "prince," who flourished in the 4th century. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 5, 504; Bing*ham, Orig. Eccles.* bk. 2, ch. 22; bk. 3, ch. 1; bk. 12, ch. 3; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* p. 122, 369, 411; *Apost. and Primit. Ch.* (Phila. 1869, 12mo), p. 185 sq.; Augusti, *Handb. d. Archäologie, 3* 222; Hall, *Works,* 2, 876; B. Baur, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1865, p. 343 sq.; Rothe, *Arfange d. christl. Kirche,* p. 161, etc. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index,* p. 74, 145. *SEE BENEDICTION*.

Impost

Picture for Impost

(Lat. *impositus)* is an architectural term for the horizontal moldings or capitals on *the top* of a pilaster, pillar, or pier, from which an arch-springs. "In classical architecture the form varies in the several orders; sometimes the entablature of an order serves for the impost of an arch. In Middle-Age architecture imposts vary according to the style; on pillars and the small shafts in the jambs of doorways, windows, etc., they are usually complete *capitals."* See Parker, *Concise Glossary of' Architecture,* p. 128; Wolcott, *Sacred Archaeology,* p. 325.

Impostor, Religious

a name appropriately given to such as pretend to an extraordinary commission from heaven, and who terrify the people with false denunciations of judgments. Too many of these have abounded in almost all ages. They are punishable in some countries with fine, imprisonment, and corporeal punishment.

Impostoribus

SEE IMPOSTORS, THE THREE.

Impostors, the Three

(Impostoribus, De tribus). Towards the end of the 10th century a rumor became current that there had appeared a book under the above title, in which the author attempted to prove that the world had been grossly deceived three times (by the founders of the three principal religions). In the latter part of the 13th century this supposed work attracted great attention among theologians and *savans,* particularly on account of the mystery which shrouded its origin, its author, and even its contents, for it was not only well-nigh impossible to procure a copy of the book, but even the contents were hardly known definitely to anybody. Towards the close of the 16th century the rumors concerning this book were again set on foot. The most extravagant ideas prevailed, and the authorship of the unknown work was in turn attributed to the emperors Frederick I and II, Averrhoes, Petrus a Vineis, Alphonso X, king of Castile, Boccaccio, Poggio, L. Aretin, Pomponazzio, Machiavelli, Erasmus, P. Aretino, Ochinus, Servetus, Rabelais, Gruetus, Barnaud, Muret, Nachtigall,

Giordano Bruno, Campanella, Milton, etc. It is no wonder that soon a number of books, entirely different from each other, made their appearance, each claiming to be the original work. The four most important were:

1. Vincentii Panurgi *Epistola ad cl. virum Joannem Baptistum Morinum de tribus imspostoribus* (Paris, 1644);

2. *De tribus Nebulonibus* (namely, Thomas Aniello, Oliver Cromwell, Julius Mazarinus);

3. *History of the three famous Impostors* (Lond. 1667);

4. Christiani Kortholdi *Liber de tribus magnis impostoribus* (nempe Eduardo Herbert de Cherbury, Thoma Hobbes, et Benedicto de Spinosa) (Kiloni, 1680).

In 1716 an unknown person of Haag claimed to possess the original in his library, and that it was the work of Petrus a Vireis, containing the thoughts of the emperor Frederick II, and written in 1230. Several copies of this work appeared soon after in French; the owner claimed to have made a vow not to copy the book, which, however, did not prevent him from translating it. A German *chevalier d'industrie* named Ferber finally published a work under the title of *De tribus impostoribus, des trois imposteurs* (Franefort sur le Main, 1721), but it was found to be only the work *L'Esprit de-Spinoze* (which had been published in MS. at the beginning of the 18th century) under a new name. In the mean time there appeared a Latin work of the same title, the MS. of which bears the date of 1598. This may be the original work, though probably the date has been altered, as it bears internal evidence of having been written about 1556 or 1560. Nothing is known of its author, except that, judging from the bad Latin in which it is written, he could not have belonged to the educated classes. Some think that the original title could hardly have been *De tribus impostoribus*, as it does not call either of the founders of the three religions — Moses, Christ, Mohammed outright impostors, but that the real title must have been *De imposturis religionum.* The existing MSS. present two different recensions: 'one, the shortest, bears the latter title; the other, which is longer, and is evidently an enlarged and altered edition, has the title *De tribus impostoribus.* Yet, with the exception of a few unimportant passages, the two are essentially alike.

The author attacks the morality of the Jews and of the Christians, saying that Abraham wished to honor God by offering up human sacrifices, and that the Christians wickedly pray for the destruction of their enemies that polygamy is permitted by Moses, and even by some of the passages of the N.T., etc. “That twice two make four is so self-evident that there is no necessity of bringing all the mathematicians together to demonstrate it; but religions are so diversified that they do not agree either in the premises, the arguments, or the conclusions, and any one brought up in one of them is likely to continue to believe his own, whatever it be, the only true religion, to the exclusion of all others.” Hence the author rejects equally the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions, and proposes that every point of belief should be established by a system of witnesses and counter-witnesses, forming a regular *processus in infinitum.* See Rosenkranz, *Der Zweifel am Glauben* (Halle, 1830); F.W. Genthe, *De impostura relig. breve compendium* (Lpz. 1833); Prosper Marchand, *Dict. Historique,* 1, 312 sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought,* p. 212 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Iist;* bk. 3:cent. 13:pt. 1, ch. 2, p. 284, note 5; Herzog, *Theol. Encyklop. 6,* 645; *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1862, p. 164 sq. (J. H. W.)

Impotency

the want of procreative power, is, according to the ecclesiastical law of the Roman Catholic Church, a good ground for either of the two parties annulling the marriage, if the impotency existed at the time the contract was entered into (cap. 2, 3, 4, X, *De frigidis,* 4,15). But the defect must not only be proved by competent medical advisers, but also pronounced by them as incurable (cap. 4:14, X, *De probationibus, 2,* 19; cap. 5, 6, 7, X, *De frigidis, 4,* 15; *Resolutio* 96 to *Sess.* 24 of the Tridentine Council of 1731, 1732, in the Leipzig edition by Richter, p. 258 sq.). If any doubt arises the marriage contract continues in force three years longer, to further test the impotency of the person so accused. At the expiration of this additional term of trial the oath of one or both of the parties is necessary to obtain permission for separation. The oldest ecclesiastical laws of the Protestants follow in the main these practices (compare Goschen, *Doctrina de matrimonio,* note 6, p. 102-106; Eichhorn, *Kirchenrecht,* 2, 348; Permanender, *Kirchenrecht,* p. 697; Walter, *Kirchenrecht,* p. 305). In Great Britain this practice is sanctioned by the civil law of the land (compare Chambers, *Encyclop,* 5, 1127). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 3:*474. *SEE MATRIMONY.* (J. H.W.)

Imprecation

an appeal to God, invoking his curse upon (1) either one's self or (2) another. For the former, *SEE OATH*. The latter, which occurs frequently in the so-called "imprecatory Psalms" (see Edwards, *On the Divine Imprecations*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1, 97; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* App. 1861; *British and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1864; Heine, *Abus. Ps, 109, imprec.* Helmst. 1739), is justified partly by the atrocity of some of the crimes execrated (e.g. that of Doeg), and partly by the fact of special authority in the act of inspiration. *SEE ACCURSED*; *SEE CANAANITES, DESTRUCTION OF*; *SEE PSALMS*.

Imprisonment

SEE PRISON; *SEE PUNISHMENTS*.

Improperia

(Lat. *taunts).*

(1.) Reproaches of Jesus against the Jewish people. *SEE CAPERNAUM*; *SEE JERUSALEM*.

(2.) In the Roman Catholic ritual, certain verses which reproach the Jews with ingratitude, and which, while the priest and other ecclesiastics present kiss the cross, are chanted by two singers personifying Christ, in such a manner that after each verse one chorus replies in the Greek and another in the Latin, praises to God; or the accusation as uttered by the priests is repeated on the part of the choir. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8,* 838. (J. H.W.)

Impropriation

in Great Britain, a parsonage or ecclesiastical living, the profits of which are in the hands of a layman; in which case it stands distinguished from *appropriation,* which is where the profits of a benefice are in the hands of a bishop, college, etc., though the terms are now used promiscuously in England.

Impulse

The desires or sensations of the soul are manifested by impulses, which tend either to the realization of some idea, the acquirement of something exterior to ourselves, or the repulsion of something disagreeable or hurtful.

The impulses accompanying divers thoughts and feelings may, according to their expression, be corporeal, spiritual, or intellectual. We must be careful how we are guided by impulses in religion. “There are many,” as one observes, “who frequently feel singular impressions upon their minds, and are inclined to pay a very strict regard unto them. Yea, some carry this point so far as to make it almost the only rule of their judgment, and will not determine anything until they find it *in their hearts to do it,* as their phrase is. Others take it for granted that the divine mind is notified to them by sweet or powerful impressions of some passages of sacred writ. There are other; who are determined by visionary manifestations, or by the impressions made in dreams, and the interpretations they put upon them. All these things, being of the same general nature, may very justly be considered together; and it is a matter of doubt with many how far these things are to be regarded, or attended to by us, and how we may distinguish any divine impressions of this kind from the delusions of the tempter, or of our own evil hearts. But whoever makes any of these things his rule and standard, forsakes the divine word; and nothing tends more to make persons unhappy in themselves, unsteady in their conduct, or more dangerously deluded hi their practice, than paying a random regard to these impulses, as notifications of the divine will.”-Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary,* s.v.; Kant,. *Grundlegung z, Metaphysik der Sitten* (pref. p. 10, 63); *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* (1853, No. 15); Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklopadie;* Herzog, *Real Encyklopadie,* 2, 126. *SEE ENTHUSIASM*; *SEE PROVIDENCE*.

Impurity

want of that regard to decency, chastity, or holiness which our duty requires. Impurity, in the law of Moses, is any legal defilement. Of these there were several sorts: some were voluntary, as the touching a dead body, or any animal that died of itself; of any creature that was esteemed unclean; or touching things holy by one who was not clean, or was not a priest; the touching one who had a leprosy, one who had a gonorrhea, or who was polluted by a dead carcass, etc. Sometimes these impurities were involuntary, as when any one inadvertently touched bones, or a sepulcher, or anything polluted; or fell into such diseases as pollute, as the leprosy, etc. The beds, clothes, and movables which had touched anything unclean, contracted also a kind of impurity, and in some cases communicated it to others. These legal pollutions were generally removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged overhead in the water, and either had his clothes on when he did so, or washed himself

and his clothes separately. Other pollutions continued seven days, as that which was contracted by touching a dead body. Some impurities lasted forty or fifty days, as that of women who were lately delivered, who were unclean forty days after the birth of a boy, and fifty after the birth of a girl. Others, again, lasted till the person was cured. Many of these pollutions were expiated by sacrifices, and others by a certain water or lye made with the ashes of a red heifer sacrificed on the great day of expiation. When the leper was cured, he went to the Temple and offered a sacrifice of two birds, one of which was killed, and the other set at liberty. He who had touched a dead body, or had been present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor. The saints and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Savior, in the Gospel, has strongly inculcated that they are not outward and corporeal pollutions which render us unacceptable to God, but such inward pollutions as infect the soul, and are violations of justice, truth, and charity. *SEE UNCLEANNESS*.

Imputation

in the O.T. בָּשַׁב in the N.T. λογίζομαι, is employed in the Scriptures to designate any action, word, or thing, as accounted or reckoned to a person; and in all these it is unquestionably used with reference to one's *own* doings, words, or actions, and not with reference to those of a *second* person (comp. <01516>Genesis 15:6; <19631>Psalm 105:31; <04316>Numbers 25:6; 18:27; <10919>2 Samuel 19:19; <19102>Psalm 31:2; <03018>Leviticus 7:18; 17:4; <20714>Proverbs 27:14; <47619>2 Corinthians 5:19; <55416>2 Timothy 4:16; <45403>Romans 4:3-23; <48306>Galatians 3:6; <59023>James 2:23). The word *imputation* is, however, used for a certain theological theory, which teaches that

(1) the sin of Adam is so attributed to man as to be considered, in the divine counsels, as his own, and to render him guilty of it;

(2) that, in the Christian- plan of salvation, the righteousness of Christ is so attributed to man as to be considered his own, and that he is therefore justified by it. *SEE FALL OF MAN*.

I. "Whatever diversity there may exist in the opinions of theologians respecting imputation, when they come to express their own views definitely. they will yet, for the most part, agree that the phrase *God imputes the sin of our progenitors to their posterity*, means that *for the sins committed by our progenitors God punishes their descendants.* The term *to impute* is used in different senses.

(a.) It is said of a *creditor*, who charges something to his debtor as debt, e.g. <57018>Philemon 1:18.

(b.) It is transferred to human *judgment* when any one is punished, or declared deserving of punishment. *Crime* is regarded as a *debt*, which must be cancelled partly by actual restitution and partly by punishment.

(c.) This now is applied to God, who imputes sin when he pronounces men guilty, and treats them accordingly, i.e. when he actually punishes the sin of men (Ὀφι β-ωφξ, λογίζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν, <19202>Psalm 32:2).

The one punished is called ˆ/[;acn; in opposition to one to whom jqÞx]l æb2Þvj; who is *rewarded* (<19631>Psalm 106:31; <45404>Romans 4:3)" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 76).

1. The stronghold of the doctrine of imputation, with those who maintain the high Calvinistic sense of that tenet, is <45512>Romans 5:12-19. "The greatest difficulties with respect to this doctrine have arisen from the fact that many have treated what is said by Paul in the fifth of Romans-a passage wholly popular, and anything but formally exact and didactic-in a learned and philosophical manner, and have defined terms used by him in a loose and popular way by logical and scholastic distinctions. Paul shows, in substance, that all men are regarded and punished by God as sinners, and that the ground of this lies in the act of one man; as, on the contrary, deliverance from punishment depends also upon one man, Jesus Christ. If the words of Paul are not perverted, it must be allowed that in Romans 5, 12-14 he thus reasons: The cause of the universal mortality of the human race lies in Adam's transgression. He sinned, and so became mortal. Other men are regarded and treated by God as punishable, because they are the posterity of Adam, the first transgressor, and consequently they too are mortal. Should it now be objected, that the men who lived from Adam to Moses might themselves have personally *sinned*, and so have been punished with death on their own account, it might be answered that those who lived before the time of Moses had no express and positive law which

threatened the punishment of sin, like those who lived after Moses. The positive law of Moses was not as yet given; they could not, consequently, be punished on account of their own transgressions, as no law was as yet given to them (ver. 14). Still they must die, like Adam, who transgressed a positive law. Hence their mortality must have another cause, and this is to be sought in the imputation of Adam's transgression. In the same way, the ground of the justification of man lies not in himself, but in Christ, the second Adam.

"We find that the passage in Romans 5 was never understood in the ancient Grecian Church, down to the 4th century, to teach *imputations* in a strictly philosophical and judicial sense; certainly. Origen, and the writers immediately succeeding him, exhibit nothing of this opinion. They regard *bodily death* as a *consequence* of the sin of Adam, and not as a *punishment,* in the strict and proper sense of this term. Thus Chrysostom says, upon Romans 5:*12*,Ἐκείνου πεσόντος (Ἀδάμ), καὶ οὐ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου θνητοί. Cyril *(Adv. Anthropom.* c. 8) says, Οἱ γεγονότες ἐξ αὐ τοῦ (Ἀδάμ), ὡς ἀπὸ φθαρτοὶ γεγόναμεν.

"The *Latin* Church, on the other hand, was the proper seat of the strict doctrine of imputation. There they began to interpret the words of Paul as if he were a scholastic and logical writer. One cause of their misapprehending so entirely the spirit of this passage was, that the word *imputare* (a word in common use among civilians and in judicial affairs) had been employed in the Latin versions in rendering ver. 13 of Romans 5; and that ἐφ᾽ ᾧ (ver. 12) had been translated *in quo,* and could refer, as they supposed, to nobody but Adam. This opinion was then associated with some peculiar philosophical ideas at that time prevalent in the West, and from the whole a doctrine *de imputatione* was formed, in sense wholly unknown to the Hebrews, to the N.T., and to the Grecian Church. This clearly proves that the Grecian teachers, e.g. those in Palestine, took sides with Pelagius against the teachers of the African Church.

2. "Many have inferred the justice of imputation from the supposition that Adam was not only the *natural* or *seminal,* but also the *moral* head of the human race, or even its *representative and federal head.* They suppose, accordingly, that the sin of Adam is imputed to us on the same principle on which the doings of the head of a family, or. of the plenipotentiary of a state, are imputed to his family or state, although they had no personal

agency in his doings. In the same way they suppose Christ took the place of all men, and that what he did is *imputed* to them. According to this theory, God entered into a *league* or *covenant* with Adam, and so Adam represented and took the place of the whole human race. This theory was invented by some schoolmen, and has been adopted by many in the Romish and Protestant Church since the 16th century, and was defended even in the 18th century by some Lutheran theologians, as Pfaff of Tiibingen, by some of the followers of Wolf (e.g. Carpzov, in his *Comm. de Imputatione facti proprii et alieni),* and by Baumgarten, in his *Dogmatik,* and disputation *'de imputatione peccati Adamitici.'* But it was more particularly favored by the Reformed theologians, especially by the disciples of Cocceius, at the end of the 17th and commencement of the 18th century, e.g. by Witsius, in his *(Economia feaderum.* They appeal to 2007Hosea 6:7, They transgressed the covenant, like Adam, i.e. broke the divine *laws.* But where is it said that Adam was the federal head, and that his transgression is imputed to them? On this text Morus justly observes, 'Est mera comparatio Judaeorum peccantium cum Adamo peccante.' Other texts are also cited in behalf of this opinion.

"But, for various reasons, this theory cannot be correct. For

(a.) the descendants of Adam never empowered him to be their representative and to act in their name.

(b.) It cannot be shown from the Bible that Adam was informed that the fate of all his posterity was involved in his own.

(c.) If the transgression of Adam is imputed, by right of covenant, to all his posterity, then, in justice, all their transgressions should be again imputed to him as the guilty cause of all their misery and sin. What a mass of guilt, then, would come upon Adam! But of all this nothing is said in the Scriptures.

(d.) The imputation of the righteousness of Christ cannot be alleged in support of this theory; for this is imputed to men only by their own will and consent. This hypothesis has been opposed, with good reason, by John Taylor, in his work on original sin."

3. "Others endeavor to deduce the doctrine of imputation from the *scientia media* of God, or from his fore-knowledge of what is conditionally possible. The sin of Adam, they say, is imputed to us because God foresaw

that each one of us would have committed it if he had been in Adam's stead, or placed in his circumstances. Even Augustine says that the sin of Adam is imputed to us *propter consensionem,* or *consensum praesumptum.* This theory has been advanced, in modern times, by Reusch, in his *Introductio in Theologiasn revelatam,* and in Bremquell's work *Die gute Sache Gottes, bei Zurechnung des Falls* (Jena, 1749). But it is a new sort of justice which would allow us to be punished for sins which we never: committed, or never designed to commit, but only might possibly have committed under certain circumstances. Think a moment how many sins we all should have committed if God had suffered us to come into circumstances of severe temptation. An innocent man might, by this rule, be punished as a murderer because, had he lived at Paris on St. Bartholomew's night, in 1572, he might, from mistaken zeal, have killed a heretic."

II. "Since none of these hypotheses satisfactorily explain the matter, the greater part of the moderate and Biblical theologians of the Protestant Church are content with saying, what is manifestly the doctrine of the Bible, that the imputation of Adam's sin consists in the prevailing *mortality* of the human race, and that this is not to be regarded as *imputation* in the strict judicial sense, but rather as the consequence of Adam's transgression" (Knapp, *Theology, §* 76).

III. "The enlightened advocates of imputation do after all disclaim the actual *transfer* of Adam's sin to his posterity. They are well aware that the human mind cannot be forced up to such a point as this. But they do still urgently contend for the idea that all Adam's posterity are *punished* for his sin, although they did not, in fact, commit it; and that in this sense, therefore, they are all guilty of it. Turretin's view is, that Adam's sin imputed is the ground or cause why men are born-with original sin *inherent,* i.e. with natural depravity; and this is, in his view, the *punishment* inflicted because of Adam's sin imputed to them. And with him many others agree. But Calvin, Edwards, Stapfer, and others, reject the doctrine of the real imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, while they maintain that native inherent depravity is the consequence of it, which is chargeable to us as sin. This Turretin declares to be no *imputation* at all, i.e. a real rejection of his doctrine. Rejecting these views of Turretin, then, Edwards, in order to account for it how all men came to be born with *inherent* sin, labors to show that there is a *physical and psychological unity* between

Adam and all his posterity. According to him, this would account for the *commencement* of native depravity, and when commenced it is imputed to us as sin, and therefore punishable, on legal ground, with temporal and eternal evil. But Turretin makes all to be *punishment* from the outset, and that on the ground of the sin of Adam, which is actually imputed to his descendants" (Stuart *on Romans,* 5, 19, p. 592). Dr. H. B. Smith, in an article in the *Christian Union,* takes the advanced ground that while it must be con ceded "that there is a proper interpretation," and that Adam's posterity do inherit, "by virtue of their union with him, certain penal consequences of the great apostasy." *man can be "delivered" from these evils by "divine grace," and "that for original sin, without actual transgression, no one will be consigned to everlasting death"* [italics are ours]. In an article in the *Princeton Theological Essays* (1, 138 sq.), a member of the Presbyterian Church takes even more liberal ground. "We know that it is often asserted that Augustine and his followers held the personal unity of Adam and his race ... Let it be admitted that Augustine did give this explication of the ground of imputation. Do we reject the doctrine because we reject the reason which he gives to justify and explain it? .. It is no special concern of ours what Augustine held on this point. .. Any man who holds that there is such an ascription of the sin of Adam to his posterity as to be the ground of their bearing the punishment of that sin, holds the doctrine of impatation, whether he undertakes to justify this imputation merely on the ground that we are the children' of Adam, or on the principle of representation, or of *scientia media;* or whether he chooses to philosophize on the nature of unity until he confounds all notions of personal identity, as President Edwards appears to have done."

IV. The question of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to believers is very skillfully treated by Watson *(Theological Institutes,* pt. 2, chap. 23), himself a believer in the doctrine of imputation in a modified way. We give here a summary of his statement of the subject.

There are three opinions as to imputation.

(I.) The high Calvinistic, or Antinomian scheme, which is, that "Christ's *active* righteousness is imputed unto us as ours" In answer to this, we say,

1. It is nowhere stated in Scripture.

2. The notion here attached to Christ's *representing* us is wholly gratuitous.

3. There is no weight in the argument that, “as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness was accounted ours ‘for our sins were never so accounted Christ’s as that he *did* them.

4. The doctrine involves a fiction and impossibility inconsistent with the divine attributes.

5. The acts of Christ were of a loftier character than can be supposed to be capable of being the acts of mere creatures. 6. Finally, and fatally, this doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man’s justification from Christ’s “obedience unto death” to Christ’s active obedience to the precepts of the law.

(II.) The opinion of Calvin himself, and many of his followers, adopted also by some Armenians. It differs from the first in not separating the active from the passive righteousness of Christ, for such a distinction would have been inconsistent with Calvin’s notion that justification is simply the remission of sins. This view is adopted, with certain *modifications*, by Armenians and Wesley. But there is a slight difference, which arises from the different senses in which the word *imputation* is used: the Armenian employing it in the sense of accounting to the believer the benefit of Christ’s righteousness; the Calvinist, in the sense of reckoning the righteousness of Christ as ours. An examination of the following passages will show that this latter notion has no foundation in Scripture: Psalm 32-l; <24236>Jeremiah 23:6; <23524>Isaiah 45:24; <45621>Romans 3:21, 22; <46103>1 Corinthians 1:30; <47521>2 Corinthians 5:21; <45518>Romans 5:18, 19. In connection with this last text, it is sometimes attempted to be shown that, as Adam’s sin is imputed to his posterity, so Christ’s obedience is imputed to those that are saved; but (Goodwin, *On Justification);*

(1.) The Scripture nowhere affirms either the imputation of Adam’s sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe.

(2.) To *impute* sin, in Scripture phrase, is to charge the guilt of sin upon a man, with a purpose to punish him for it. And

(3.) as to the *imputation* of *Adam’s sin to his posterity* if by it is meant simply that the guilt of Adam’s sin is charged upon his whole posterity, let it pass; but if the meaning be that all Adam’s posterity are made, by this imputation, formally sinners, then the Scriptures do not justify it.

(III.) The imputation *of faith* for righteousness.

(a.) *Proof* of this doctrine. —

1. It is expressly taught in Scripture (Romans 4:3-24, etc.); nor *is faith* used in these passages by metonymy for the object of faith, that is, the righteousness of Christ.

2. The testimony of the Church to this doctrine has been uniform from the earliest ages — Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, etc., down to the 16th century.

(b.) *Explanation* of the terms of the proposition that "faith is imputed for righteousness."

1. *Righteousness.* To be accounted *righteous* is, in the style of the apostle Paul, to be *justified,* where there has been personal guilt.

2. *Faith.* It is not faith generally considered that is imputed to us for righteousness, but faith (trust) in an atonement offered by another in our behalf.

3. *Imputation.* The non-imputation of sin to a sinner is expressly called "the imputation of righteousness without works;" the imputation of righteousness is, then, the non-punishment or pardon of sin; and by imputing faith for righteousness, the apostle means precisely the same thing.

(c.) The *objections* to the doctrine of the imputation of faith for righteousness admit of easy answer.

1. The papists err in taking the term justification to signify the making men morally just.

2. A second objection is, that if believing is imputed for righteousness, then justification is by works, or by somewhat in ourselves. In this objection, the term *works* is used in an equivocal sense.

3. A third objection is, that this doctrine gives occasion to boasting. But

(1.) this objection lies with equal strength against the doctrine of imputed righteousness.

(2.) The faith itself is the gift of God.

(3.) The blessings which follow faith are given in respect to the death of Christ.

(4.) Paul says that boasting is excluded by the law of faith.

(IV.) The theologians who assert the extreme doctrine of imputation are ably answered by the closing words of an article on this subject in Chambers's *Cyclopaedia,* 5, 529: "To *impute* sin is to deal with a *man as a sinner,* not on account of his own act, or at least not primarily on this account, but on account of the act of another; and to *impute* righteousness is to deal with man as righteous, not because *he is so,* but on account of the righteousness of Christ *reckoned as his,* and received by faith alone. The act of another stands in both cases for our own act, and we are adjudged--in the one case condemned, in the other acquitted--lot for what we ourselves have done, but for what another has done for us.

"This is a fair illustration of the tyranny which technical phrases are apt to exercise in theology as in other things. When men coin an imperfect phrase to express a spiritual reality, the reality is apt to be forgotten in the phrase, and men play with the latter as a logical counter, having a force and meaning of its own. *Imputation of sin* and *imputation of righteousness* have in this way come to represent legal or pseudo-legal processes in theology, through the working out of the mere legal analogies suggested by the word. But the true spiritual reality which lies behind the phrases in both eases is simple enough. *Imputation of sin* is, and can be nothing else than, the expression of the spiritual unity of Adam and his race. Adam 'being the root of all mankind,' the stock which has grown from this root must, share in its degeneracy. The law of spiritual life, of historical continuity, implies this, and it requires no arbitrary or legal process, therefore, to account for the sinfulness of mankind as derived from a sinful source. We are sinners because Adam fell. The fountain having become polluted, the stream is polluted. We are involved in his guilt, and could not help being so by the conditions of our historical existence; but, nevertheless, his sin is not our sin, and cannot, in the strict sense, be imputed to us, for sin is essentially voluntary in every case-an act of self-will, and not a mere quality of nature; and my sin, therefore, cannot be another's, nor another's mine. In the same manner, the highest meaning of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ lies in the spiritual unity of the believer with Christ, so that he is one with Christ, and Christ one with him, and in an true sense he becomes a partaker of the divine nature. The notion

of legal transference is an after-thought-the invention of polemical logic-and the fact itself is deeper and truer than the phrase that covers it. *The race one with Adam,* the *believer one with Christ,* are the ideas that are really true in the phrases *imputation of sin* and *imputation of righteousness."*

See Watson, *Institutes,* 2, 215, 241; Knapp, *Theology.* § 76, 115; Whitby, *De imputatione Peccati Adamitici;* Taylor, *Doctrine of Original Sin;* Wesley, *Sermons, 1,* 171-4; Edwards, *On original Sins;* Walch, *De Obedientia Christi Activa* (Gottingen, 1754, 4to); Walch, *,Neueste Religionsgeschichte, 3,* 311; *Princeton Rev.* April, 1860; Baird, *The First and Second Adam* (Philadelphia, 1860. 12mo); *Princeton Repertory,* 1830, p. 425; Whately, *Difficulties of St. Paul,* Essay 6; Stuart, *On Romans,* Excursus 5, 6. *SEE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST*; *SEE JUSTIFICATION*.

Im'rah

(Heb. *Yimrah',* hr;myæ *refractoriness;* Sept. Ἰεμρά), one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chronicles 7:36). B.C. post 1612. *SEE HOTHAM*.

Im'ri

(Heb. *Inmri',* yrIma;, *eloquent),* the name of two men.

1. (Sept. omits either this or the preced. name, giving only Ἀμρί;. Vulg. *Omrai).* The son of Bani, and father of Omri of Judah (1 Chronicles 9:4). B.C. much ante 536.

2. (Sept. Ἀμαρί, Vulg. *Amri).* The "father" of Zaccur which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Nehemiah 3:2). B.C. ante 446.

Ina

king of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex from 689 to 729, celebrated as the principal legislator of the Anglo-Saxons, deserves mention here on account of his enactments in favor of religious observances. He was the first in that portion of England who made the laws of Christianity the basis of all civil and social relations. Particular regard was paid to the observance of the Sabbath day; the rite of baptism was ordered to be performed on infants within thirty days after their birth, etc. His relation with the see of

Rome was very intimate. He made several journeys to the Eternal City, and originated in his dominions the payment of the annual tribute of the "Peter's pence." See Riddle. *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 310; Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* p. 93 sq. (J. H.W.)

Inability

in theology, is generally used to denote want of power to do the will of God. It is *natural* inability when the hindrance is physical; *moral* inability when the hindrance lies in the will. This distinction has special prominence in American theology, and has been the subject of a great deal of controversy between New-school and Old school Calvinists, and also between Calvinists and Armenians. The New school contend that man is naturally able to obey God, but morally unable. The Old school deny both natural and moral ability. The Armenians deny natural and moral, but assert *gracious* ability on the part of man to accept Christ, and so to obey God.

The following paragraphs present well the Old school view of the subject. "It has long been a boast, in certain quarters, that it is the glory of American theology that it has enabled us to hold fast to the doctrine of inability, and yet so to explain it as to make the sinner inexcusable, and to prevent him from abusing it to purposes of carnal apathy and desperation. This happy result, which the Bible ascribes to the Holy Ghost, is supposed to be accomplished by showing men that they have full *natural* ability to fulfill God's requirements; that they have no inability, but simply a want of will, or purpose, or inclination, to obey the Gospel, which they have full power to remove, *if they will.* While this language is used by many in a sense which, as explained by themselves, at all events coheres with the doctrine that man has lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, it is used by others to express and vindicate the dogma that men are perfectly able to make themselves Christians at pleasure. This is Pelagialism, without even a decent disguise. Yet it is this very class who make the most of the distinction in question. They think it a convenient and safe shelter for their doctrines that man can make himself a new heart. This class claim that Edwards was the inventor of this distinction; that it is the distinguishing characteristic and special property of his followers; that therefore they are the true Edwardeans, because they are the patrons and inheritors of this his grand discovery in theology. It can easily be shown, however,

1. That whatever of truth is connected with this distinction was familiar to theologians not only before the time of Edwards, but from the time when the heresies of Pelagius first occasioned thorough discussion of the subject of sin and grace.

2. That Edwards did not regard himself as introducing any novel doctrines or discoveries on the subject.

A formerly distinguished champion of New school doctrines recently said in a public speech, with great truth, 'that the common idea that the power of Edwards's system lies in the distinction of natural and moral ability is a fallacy.' This was well understood before his day. It lies in his views or spiritual light, which constitute the key to his whole treatise on the Religious Affections.' All who have read this treatise, or his sermons on the 'Natural Blindness of Men in Religion,' and on The Reality of Spiritual Light,' must concede the justness of this statement. The great principle of his work on the Affections is that 'they arise from divine illumination.' The amount of truth contained in the proposition that man is naturally able, but morally unable, to obey God's commands, may be thus stated:

1. Man is really unable to do things spiritually good without divine grace. But this inability is moral, because it pertains to our moral nature. It does not excuse, because it is our sin; and the greater it is, the greater is our sin.

2. This corruption and inability do not destroy any of the faculties of will, affection, or intelligence, which are essential to humanity, moral agency, or responsibility. They only vitiate the state and action of those faculties with reference to things moral and spiritual. All power remains which would be requisite to the fulfillment of God's commands if we were holy. Any hindrance, or want of power or opportunity, which would prevent us from fulfilling any command of God if we were morally good, excuses the non-performance of it, and this alone. So far, then, as the assertion that we have natural ability is intended to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth. So far as it is used, or is adapted to convey the idea that we have ability to remove our sinful corruption without the prevenient and efficacious grace of God, or that our inability, though moral, is such that we can resume it by the strength of our own will, or that it is not by nature, it contains a dangerous error. It is not only contrary to Scripture and all Christian experience, but it is inconceivable that any state or act of the unregenerate will of man should make him a holy being. The corrupt tree cannot bring forth such good fruit.

Nay, as all Christians find to their sorrow, they cannot, although partially sanctified, by any power of their wills, exclude all corruption from their souls. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that they *cannot* do the things that they *would.* When they *would* do good, evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the phrase 'natural ability,' according to its natural import, fairly express, or, rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt natures, which is not adequate to produce the result. Man has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?" — *Princeton Review,* July, 1854, No. 10:p. 512 sq.

The Armenian doctrine is (1) that the unregenerate have complete ability, through the efficient grace of Christ, to comply with the conditions of justification as offered under the covenant of grace; (2) that the regenerate have ability, through the grace of Christ, to do the will of God, i.e. to avoid voluntary transgression thereof. The following criticism of the Armenian view, by an eminent New-England divine, with a comment on it, is taken from the *Christian Advocate,* Dec. 15, 1859. The parts in brackets are added by the commentator. "The Armenian theory of man's inability or want of power is the same [as the Calvinistic], excepting a vain attempt to conceal its revolting aspect by the still greater absurdity of what is called a gracious ability. The advocates of this theory plainly subvert and virtually deny the grace of God in their very attempt to magnify it; for if man has not ability or power to obey God without grace [divine operation, or 'favor to sinners'], then he does not sin in not obeying, since a being who cannot act morally right cannot act morally wrong. Such a being cannot be truly said to receive or to be capable of receiving grace, for grace is favor to sinners. Besides, what does the supposed grace of God [here evidently in the sense of *divine efficiency]* do? Does it give man *power to obey?* then man has power to obey, as he must have before he obeys.' But even this is no security that he will obey. [What Armenian ever pretended that it is?] Adam sinned with this power. The grace [exercise of divine efficiency],

then, does not meet the exigency of the case. [Is invariable obedience essential, then, to a proper human ability? In that case, what would become of Dr. Taylor's own theory?] Is it said he has power to use the grace [what does the word mean here?] furnished? But what power is this? Until man has *power to obey,* it is absolutely inconceivable that he should obey, for I the act of obedience is *his own* act, done in the exercise of *his own* power to obey. Thus the grace of God [the Holy Ghost], according to this scheme, must, by a direct act of creation, impart some new essential mental faculty or power to the sound of man to qualify it to act morally right or wrong. Without the grace of God man has not a human soul, for he has not the true and essential nature of such a soul-the *power* requisite to moral action. [We have been wont to think of 'power' as an *attribute,* not as a *'nature.']* He cannot be a sinner, and of course grace to him cannot be grace to a sinner. Grace is no more grace" (Taylor, *Lectures on the Moral Government of God,* 2, 123). The comment is as follows: "In the first place, Dr. Taylor falsely represents the Armenian as asserting the gracious ability of man, in general terms, to keep the divine law, whereas we only affirm this of the regenerate. In the second place, he continually shuffles in his use of the term grace, as will be seen by our bracketed insertions of equivalents, wherever the context fixes the sense. In the third place, we see no possible relevancy in his argument against a divinely imparted 'power to obey,' from the fact that the possession of this power does not insure its invariable exercise any more than it did in Adam's case. If the professor had inferred the impossibility of our theory of ability from the conceded fact that the earth revolves upon its axis, we should not have been more at loss to perceive the. pertinency or logical force of the reasoning. Finally, he forgets that in the economy of redemption, '*ability to use grace'* is an *'ability to obey.'* God's prime requirement of a sinner is repentance and return to service; and in the arrangements of the remedial scheme under which we live, the sinner possesses a complete, though not a constitutional and independent 'ability to obey' this 'requirement." For the New-England view, *SEE NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY*. *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE PELAGIANISM*; *SEE GRACE*. For a full discussion of the New-school theory, see Hodgson, *New Divinity Examined* (N. Y. 12mo); *Princeton Review,* July, 1854. See also *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1861; *Bib. Sacra,* 1863, p. 324 sq., 608 sq.; 1865, p. 503; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 49, 263; 1868, p. 610; *British Quart. Rev.* July, 1867; *New Englander,* 1868, p. 486, 490, 496-9, 511, 553.

In antis

a term for a temple which has upon the façade two columns, detached, standing between two *antce* that terminate the side walls of it. Specimens are the temples at Rhamnus and Sunium. — Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art,* 2, 200.

Incantation

(Lat. *incantatio; incanto,* to chant a magic formula, compound of *in,* intensive, and *canto,* to sing) denotes "one of the most powerful and awe-inspiring modes of magic (q.v.), viz., that resting on a belief in the mysterious power of words solemnly conceived and passionately uttered." "There is in the human voice, especially in its more lofty tones, an actual power of a very wonderful kind to stir men's hearts. When to this we add that poetic utterance is a special and exceptional gift; that the language of primitive nations is crude and unmanageable, the words being as difficult to weld together as pieces of cast iron; that it is only when the poet's mind has risen to unusual heat that he can fuse them into those rhythmical sequences that please the ear and hang together in the memory; that, in short, his art is a mystery to himself-an inspiration-we need not wonder at the feeling with which everything in the form of verse or meter was viewed. The singing or saying of such compositions which could thus stir the blood of the hearers they knew not how, what other effects might it not produce?" To the power which the superstitious belief of the people, up to and even through the Middle Ages, gave to incantations, especially when accompanied, as they generally were, with the concocting of drugs and other magical rites, there is hardly any end. "They could heal or kill. If they could not raise from the dead, they could make the dead speak, or 'call up spirits from the vast deep' in order to unveil the future. They could extinguish fire; darken the sun or moon; make fetters burst, a door or a mountain fly open; blunt a sword; make a limb powerless; destroy a crop, or charm it away into another's barn." It is especially the heathenish nations that in their prayers, whether for blessings or for curses, partake largely of the nature of magical incantations. "They are not supposed to act as petitions addressed to a free agent, but by an inherent force which even the gods cannot resist. This is very marked in Hinduism and Buddhism, but it actually pervades all superstitious worship, though sometimes quite disguised. They think they shall be heard for their much speaking.' For almost every occasion or operation of life there were appropriate formulas

to be repeated in order to secure success; and many of these, with that reverence for antiquity and conservative tendency which always characterize superstition, continue to live in popular memory, although often the words are so old as to be unintelligible. Thus, among the Romans, in the days of Cato, incantations were common for curing dislocations, full of words the meaning of which had been lost. A form of words used to this day in Shetland for healing a sprain call be traced back to the 10th century. In its earliest form, as found in an old German manuscript, it narrates how their native gods, Woden and Baldur, riding out to hunt, Baldur's horse dislocated its foot, and how Wolden, using charmed words, set bone to bone, etc., and so healed the foot. The repetition of this rhymed narration acted as a charm to heal other lamed horses. A modern version of this tradition, current in Norway even in our day, makes the accident happen to the horse of *Jesus*, and Jesus himself perform the cure-in Shetland, also, the Lord (Jesus) is substituted for Woden: and the formula is applied to the healing of persons' limbs as well as those of horses. The operation is thus described in R. Chambers's *Popular Rhymes of Scotland:* 'When a person has received a sprain, it is customary to apply to an individual practiced in casting the "wresting-thread." This is a thread spun from black wool, on which are cast nine knots, and tied round a sprained leg or arm. During the time the operator is putting the thread round the affected limb, he says, but in such a tone of voice as not to be heard by the bystanders, nor even by the person operated upon:

"'Our Lord rade,
His foal's foot slade;
Down he lighted,
His foal's foot righted.

Bone to bone,
Sinew to sinew,
Blood to blood,
Flesh to flesh.

Heal, in name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *SEE MAGIC*; *SEE WITCHCRAFT*.

Incapacity

in the ecclesiastical sense, is absolute unfitness for ordination. Thus women (<01016>Genesis 3:16; <540212>1 Timothy 2:12; <461434>1 Corinthians 14:34, 35) and

unbaptized persons are *incapacitated* from ordination. Baptism is essential to church membership, and therefore the basis of further advancement in the Church: “Cum baptismus sit fundamentum omnium sacramentorum ante susceptionem baptismi non suscipiatur aliud sacramentum” (c. 60, can. 1 qu. 1, Capit. Theodori Canterb.); also c. 1, 10:*De presbytero non baptizato* (3, 43); c. 3, 10, eod. (Innocent III a. 1206); c. 2, *De cognatione spirituali* in 6 (4, 3) Bonifacii VIII. So the early Church declared that he who has not received in due form the baptism of water is not a member of the visible church, and cannot therefore be ordained. The Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, in c. 19 (c. 52, can. 1, qu. 1), directs that the clergy of the Paulinists ὠho did not perform baptism regularly) and of other sects were to be rebaptized and ordained on their return to the Catholic Church, and that such persons as had been previously ordained, but not baptized, should at once receive baptism, and then be reordained (c. 112, dist. 4, *De consecr.* [Leo a. 4581; c. 60, can. 1, qu. 1; comp. *Capit.* lib. 6. c. 94, and other quoted passages), although, according to the decision of pope Innocent II (c. 2, 10:*De presb. non bapt.;* c. 34,151, dist. 4:*De* consecr.),the subordination of a baptized priest ordained by an unbaptized did not necessarily follow. *SEE IRREGULARITY*.

The incapacity of women for ordination was believed to be so fully authorized by the passages above cited from the Bible that it was never questioned by the Church. God had made woman subject to the rule of man; she could therefore not instruct a congregation likely to be composed also of men *(Cone. Carthag. 4,* a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29; dist. 23:c. 20; dist. 4, *De consecr.).* It is from this point of view that Tertullian regards this question when he says *(De velandis virginibss,* c. 8): “Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed non docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec allius virilis muneris nedum sacerdotalis officiis sortem ubi vindicare.” Ina like strain argue Augustine (c. 17, can. 33, qu. 5) and others. The early Church therefore declared that no woman should be ordained *presbytera* (vidua) *(Conc. Laodic.* a. 372, c. 11 in c. 19, dist. 32), nor diacona, or diaconissa *(Concil. Arausicanum* 1, a. 441, can. 26; *Epaonense,* a. 517, can. 21; *Aurelianense* 2, a. 533, can. 18 [ed. Brunc. 2, 126, 170, 187]; compare c. 23, can. 27, qu. 1, *Novella Justiiniani 6:*cap. 5); though educated and pious, they are not to teach in the congregations *(Conc. Carthag. 4,* a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29, dist. 23; c. 20, dist. 4:*De consecr.).* Abbesses were not to bless the nuns, to hear confessions, or to preach in public (c. 10, 10, *Deponit. et remiss.* [5, 38] Innocent III a. 1210).

The Evangelical Church teaches the necessity of baptism (Augsb. Conf. art. 9, etc.), and also that “the female sex was not ordained by God to rule, either in the Church, or in secular positions where a specially strong understanding and good counsel are requisite. But they are ordered to take care of their household, and to see after it diligently” (Luther, in Walch’s *Werke,* 2, 1006). The ground which the Reformers took on this question was up to our day approved by the Protestant churches at large. Among the Friends, however, no such distinction has ever been recognized. Indeed, the tendency of the present age is to abolish the rule altogether, and females in several instances have actually been installed as pastors in this country, while in other cases their ability in the pulpit has been freely acknowledged even among evangelical denominations. Yet even this hardly satisfies the advocates of “women’s rights” (q.v.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6:*617. (J. H. W.)

Incardinare

in the language of the Church of the Middle Ages, is the appointment of any *strange* bishop, presbyter, deacon, or a person of some other class of the priesthood, to this or that church, in which he was to perform services in part or exclusively, or even the appointment to one particular church. The election of a cardinal was also called *incardinare, Fuhrmann, Handworterbuch d. Kirchengesch,* 2, 435.

Incardinati clerici

fugitive or foreign priests appointed to a church, in contrast with the appointment of a native and regular priest. — Pierer, *Universal Lexicon, 8,* 840.

Incarnation

(Lat. *in,* and *caro,* flesh), the permanent assumption of a human form by a divine personage.

I. *False or Pretended Incarnations of Heathen Religions. — The* mythologies of most nations afford traces, although faint, of the idea of incarnation. If, as Vinet has suggested, there can be no religion without an incarnation, the pseudo-incarnations of false religions may be regarded as so many gropings for the truth, “if haply they might feel after him” who at some time should become incarnate. These incarnations express the

deepest need of our common nature. Sin has so isolated man from God that he feels there is no hope of his restoration except "the gods come down in the likeness of men." This idea confronts us from all parts of the world, whether in the avatars of the Hindu, the election and worship of the Lama of Thibet, the metamorphoses of the Greek and Roman mythologies, or the wilder worship of the aborigines of America. The earlier Christian apologists attributed these caricatures of the true incarnation to Satan, and alleged that "he invented these fables by imitating the truth." Neander makes the profound suggestion that "at the bottom of these myths is the earnest desire, inseparable from man's spirit, for participation in the divine nature as its true life its anxious longing to pass the gulf which separates the God-derived soul from its original-its wish, even though unconscious, to secure that union with God which alone can renew human nature, and which Christianity shows us as a living reality. Nor can we be astonished to find the facts of Christianity thus anticipated in poetic forms (embodying in imaginative creations the innate yet indistinct cravings of the spirit) in the mythical elements of the old religions, when we remember that human nature itself, and all the forms of its development, as well as the whole course of human history, were intended by God to find their full accomplishment in Christ" *(Life of Christ*, chap. 2, sec. 12). The want that thus expresses itself in these fabled avatars lies at the foundation of idolatry. The unsatisfied nature of mall demands that his Deity should be near him-should dwell with him. It first leads him to represent the Deity by the work of his own hands, and then to worship it (see Tholuck, *Predigten*, 2, 148). Or we may look upon these avatars as so many faint and distant irradiations of the holy light that shone upon the Garden through the first promise given to man. On the contrary, Kitto denies "that there is in Eastern mythology any incarnation in any sense approaching that of the Christian, and that least of all is there any where it has been most insisted on" *(Daily Bible Illus.* on John 1, 14). Cocker, in his late work *(Christianity and Greek Philosophy,* N. Y. 1870, 8vo, p. 512), advances the theory that the idea. of "a pure spiritual essence without form and without emotion, pervading all and transcending all, is too vague and abstract to yield us comfort," and that therefore the need of an incarnation "became consciously or unconsciously '*the desire of nations'* "by ''the education of the race" and "by the dispensation of philosophy. The idea of an incarnation was not unfamiliar to human thought, *it was no new or strange idea to the heathen mind.* The numberless metamorphoses of Grecian mythology, the incarnations of Brahma, the avatars of Vishnu, and

the human form of Krishna, had naturalized the thought (Young, *Christ of History*, p. 248)." See Dorner, *Lehre v. der Persons Christi*, 1, 7 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, *9:*250; Weber, *Indische Studien*, 2, 411 sq.

Among the ancient Egyptians, Apis or *Hapi*, "the living bull," was esteemed to be the emblem and image of the soul of Osiris, who, as Pliny and Cicero say, was deemed a god by the Egyptians. "Diodorus derives the worship of Apis from a belief that the soul of Osiris had migrated into this animal; and he was thus supposed to manifest himself to man through successive ages;" while Strabo calls "Apis the same as Osiris" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. 1, 290, 291). "About the time when Cambyses arrived at Memphis, Apis appeared to the Egyptians." Their great rejoicings led that prince to examine the officers who had charge of Memphis. These responded "that one of their gods had appeared to them-a god who, at long intervals of time, had been accustomed to show himself in Egypt" 'Herod. 3:27). Mnevis, the sacred bull of Heliopolis, was also a representative of Osiris, and with Apis, the sacred bull of Memphis, was worshipped as a god throughout the whole of Egypt. Ammianus says that Mnevis was sacred to the sun, while Apis was sacred to the moon (see Rawlinson's *Hersod.* 2, 354, Engl. edition). Hardwick, however, adduces Wilkinson as regarding it "a merit of the old Egyptians that they (lid not *humanize* their gods; and yet he admits that their fault was rather the elevation of animals and emblems to the rank of deities;" Hardwick denies that the idea of incarnation is to be found in the old. Egyptian creed *(Christ and other Masters,* 2, 351). *SEE APIS*.

The mythology of the Hindis presents a vast variety of incarnations, the inferior avatars that have appeared in various ages being innumerable. The object of the avatar is declared by Vishnu himself, who, in the form of Krishna, thus addresses Arjuna: "Both I and thou have passed many births; mine are known to me, but thou knowest not thine. Although I am not in my nature subject to birth or decay, and am the lord of all created beings, yet, having command over my own nature, I am *made evident* by my own power; and as often as there is a decline of virtue, and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world, I make myself evident. Thus I appear from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of virtue" *(Bhagavad-Gita,* p. 40). With this declaration accord, for the most part, the objects of the ten more conspicuous avatars of this deity, although the details of them abound in puerilities and obscenity. In the *Matsya,* or Fish avatar, Vishnu took the

form of a human being issuing from the body of a fish, for the recovery of the sacred books which had been stolen from Brahma by the daemon Hayagriva. The *Kurna,* or Tortoise avatar, supported the earth sinking in the waters. The prayer of Brahma for assistance when the whole earth was *covered with water* called forth a third avatar of Vishnu, that of the *Vardaha,* or Boar, of which Maurice says, "Using the practical instinct of that animal, he began to smell around that he might discover the place where the earth was submerged. At length, having divided the water and arriving at the bottom, he saw the earth lying a mighty and barren stratum; then he took up the ponderous globe (freed from the water), and raised it high on his tusk-one would say it was a beautiful lotus blossoming on the tip of his tusk" *(Hist. of Hindostan,* 1, 575 sq.). There can be but little doubt that these three avatars are perversions of the Hindu traditions of the Deluge. The next incarnation burst forth from a pillar as a man-lion for the purpose of destroying a blaspheming monarch. The *Vamana,* or Dwarf, in the next avatar, rebuked the pride of Maha Bali, the great Bali. In human form the divine *Parasurama,* in twenty pitched battles, extirpated the Kettri tribe to prepare for the Brahmin the way to empire. The seventh was very like that of the preceding, and for similar objects. *Rama Chandra,* however, was a great reformer and legislator. The eighth, that of *Krishna,* represents the Deity in human form trampling on the head of a serpent, while the serpent is biting his heel-a corruption of the promise to Eve. One object of the ninth incarnation, that of *Buddha,* is generally admitted to have been the abolition of sanguinary sacrifices. Whatever be the cause, "Buddhism stands conspicuous in the midst of heathendom as a religion without sacrificial cultus." Upon the tenth, the *Kalki* avatar, which is yet to take place, the destruction of the universe will ensue (see Maurice, *History of Hindostan,* passim; Hardwick, 1, 278; *New Englander, 3:*183-185). For the astounding events connected with the birth and infancy of Gotama (q.v.), *SEE BUDDHA*. See also Hardy's *Annual of Buddhism,* p. 140 sq. *SEE AVATAR*; *SEE HINDUISIM*.

Lamaisn presents many features in common with Buddhism, so much so that it may be considered one of its outgrowths. It "differs fundamentally from Chinese Buddhism in the doctrine of hereditary incarnations. The great thought of some intelligence issuing from the Buddha world assuming the conditions of our frail humanity, and for a time presiding over some one favored group of Buddhist monasteries, had long been familiar to the natives of Tibet." In the latter half of the 15th century arose the idea of

perpetual incarnations. “Then it was that one chief abbot, the ‘perfect Lama.’ instead of passing, as he was entitled to do, to his ultimate condition, determined for the benefit of mankind to sojourn longer on the earth, and be continuously new-born. As soon as he was carried to his grave in 1473, a search was instituted for the personage who had been destined to succeed him. This was found to be an infant who established its title to the honor by appearing to remember various articles which had been the property of the lama just deceased, or, rather, were the infant’s own property in earlier stages of existence. So fascinating was the theory of perpetual incarnations that a fresh succession of rival lamas (also of the *yellow* order) afterwards took its rise in Teshu-lambu while the Dalai lamas were enthroned in Lhassa; and at present every convent of importance, not in Tibet only, but in distant parts of Tartary, is claiming for itself a like prerogative. .. The religion of Tibet is from day to day assuming all the characteristics of man-worship” (Hardwick, 2, 93 sq.). For the election of the successor of the lama, see also Huc’s *Travels in Tartary,* 2, ch. 6:p. 197 sq.

The notion that prevailed in Egypt was similar, “save only that the symbolical bull was substituted for the literal man, and as Buddha is still held to be successively born in each infant lama, so the god Osiris was equally thought to be successively born in each consecrated Mnevis. Nor was the doctrine of a *huntln* incarnation by any means lost in that country. Diodorus gives a curious account of *an infant* in whose person Osiris was thought to have been born into the world in order that he might thus exhibit himself to mortals; and what Herodotus says of the Egyptian Perseus, who was the same divinity with Osiris, necessarily requires us to suppose that at certain intervals *a* man was brought forward by the priests as an incarnation of their god” (Diod. Sic. lib. 1, p. 20; Herod. *Hist.* 2, ch. 91; G. S. Faber, *Eight Dissertations,* 1, 61 sq.; see Wilkinson’s note ad loc. cit. in Rawlinson’s *Herodotus).* On the general subject, see also Faber’s *Origin of Pagan Idolatry, 6:*ch. vi; *Eight Dissertations,* 1, 67 sq.

Under the head of classical metamorphoses it will be sufficient to refer to Baur in Baumgarten (on *Acts, 1,* 446, transl.); to Ovid, *Metanorphoses,* Baucis et Philemon; and the name that Jupiter bore of Ζεὺς καταβάτης (Biscoe, *On the Acts,* p. 205).

“Passing over to the American continent, whether by way of Iceland to Labrador, or eastward from Asia, we find the wilderness, from the frozen

shores of the Arctic Ocean to the Mexican Gulf, resounding with the deeds of a hero-god corresponding in character, history, and name with the Wodin and Buddha of the eastern continent..... His grandmother descended from the moon, which, in the symbolic language of the early traditions, always represents the Noachian ark. The only daughter of this Nokomis, in the bloom of her maidenhood, without the concurrence of mortal agency, and in a miraculous manner, gave birth to a son, who became conscious, as he advanced to manhood, that he was endowed with supernatural powers for the redemption of the world from evil. Al his stupendous exploits were directed to that end. His name in the Indian dialects was *Bosho, Bozho,* etc. *(Meth. Quart. Re.* 1859, p. 596; compare Schoolcraft's *Alic Res.* 1, 135; and Kingsborough's *Lex. Antiq. 6:*175). The remarkable story of the birth of Huitzilopochtli from a virgin mother is given by Squier, *American Archaeological Res.* p. 196. For the reputed incarnations of the highest god, Tezcatlipoca, thought by Mr. Squier to be analogous to Buddha, Zoroaster, Osiris, Taut in Phoenicia, Odin in Scandinavia, etc., see Hardwick, 2, 152, with his remarks. — Brinton (Daniel G.), *Myths of the New World* (N Y. 1868), 12mo), chap. 2 and 4.

II. *Definition of "Incarnation" in the Christian Scheme.* — In the evangelical sense, incarnation is that act of grace whereby Jesus Christ, the Son of God, took upon himself the nature of man. "By taking only the nature of man, he still continueth one person, and changeth but the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh" (Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* 5, § 52). In the assumption of our nature he became subject to the consequences of sin, except that he was without the *accident* of sin (see Ebrard, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. Jesus Christ). "-That Christ should have taken man's nature shows that corruption was not inherent in its existence in such wise that to assume the nature was to assume the sin" (Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation,* p. 74). The essential features of the incarnation are peculiar to Christianity, and when we speak of the incarnation, that of Christianity is at once understood; for the incarnation of Vishnu as found in Krishna, which is admitted to be the most perfect of all heathen incarnations, and the only one to be compared with that of Christ according to Hardwick *(Christ and other Masters,* 1, 291), "when purged from all the lewd and Bacchanalian adjuncts which disfigure and debase it, comes indefinitely short of Christianity." "Nothing can be more absurd than to compare the incarnations of this Indian deity with that of Christ. They

are by their multiplicity alone tinctured with the pantheistic idea. The human personality is destitute of reality, since it is taken- up and laid down as a veil or mask with which the divinity invested himself for a moment. Moreover, the degradation of the god is carried too far-he descended to evil; and participated in human corruption" (Pressense, *Rel. before Christ,* p. 61). Although, therefore, the idea of the union of the divine and human natures was not foreign to heathenism, yet that the divine Logos should become flesh belonged to Christianity alone. False religions teach an apotheosis of man rather than *a proper* incarnation of the Deity. Judaism itself had never risen to the conception of an incarnate God. The antagonism between the Creator and the creature was too sharply defined to admit such an interpretation of the first promise as the incarnation has given. See Martensen, *Christ. Doym. §* 128; Neander, *Church Hist.* (Clark), 2, 200 sq.; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illus.* 29th week, evening. The use of the term *incarnation* (later Latin) maybe traced back to Irenaeus, A.D. 180, as in the expression "Incarnatio pro nostra salute" *(Contra Haer.* 1, 10).

III. *Theory.* — The doctrine of the incarnation is fundamental to Christianity, and is the basis upon which the entire fabric of revealed religion rests. It is presented to our faith from the plane of the miraculous, and is to be considered as the one all-comprehensive miracle of Christianity. It contains within itself essentially the entire series of miracles as taught in the Gospels. These miracles are the fruit, after its kind, which this divine tree brings forth. Faith sees in the fallen estate of so noble a being as man, and his restoration to purity, immortality, and God, objects commensurate with the sacrifice and humiliation — that are implied in the incarnation, and accepts the doctrine as corresponding to the wants and necessities of human nature; but a divine revelation elevates our vision, and meets all objections founded upon the comparative insignificance of our race by indicating that in some mysterious manner the influences of the atonement may beneficially affect the entire universe. See Garbett; *Christ as Prophet, 1,* 12; Kurtz, *Astron. and the Bible,* transl. p. 95 sq.; Calvin on *Col.* 1, 20; Olshausen, Stier, and Harless on *Eph.* 2:20.

The blending together of two natures implied in an incarnation presupposes some element of nature common to both. As far as we can see, "things absolutely dissimilar in their nature cannot mingle: water cannot coalesce with fire; water cannot mix with oil" (F. W. Robertson on Matthew 5, 48). "Forasmuch as there is no union of God with man without that mean

between both which is both" (Hooker), we see in the incarnation, reflected as in a mirror, the true nobility of man's nature, and the secret of the fact that the incarnation took place in the seed of Abraham rather than in angels. "For verily he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold" (<scripRef passage="Hebrews 2:16" />Hebrews 2:16, marginal rend.). "The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the Logos assumed our fallen humanity. — But by this, we are told, is not to be understood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became *a* man, but that he assumed generic humanity so that he became *the* man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself outwardly as a body, and inwardly as a soul. The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Olshausen, in his comment on <scripRef passage="John 1:14" />John 1:14, says, 'It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redeemer was a man by the side of other men, whereas, being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personality.' To the same effect he says, in his remarks on <scripRef passage="Romans 5:15" />Romans 5:15, 'If Christ were *a* man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential influence on mankind: he could then only operate as an example; but he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature; as *the* man, i.e. as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally.' To this point archdeacon Wilberforce devotes the third chapter of his book on *The Incarnation*, and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied, he says, 'the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology.' In fine, Dr. Nevin, of America, in his *Mystical Presence*, p. 210, says, The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many, *but flesh*, or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such?" (Eadie). This fine distinction, however, savors too much of transcendentalism to be capable of clear apprehension or general reception. It is sufficient to say that the divine Logos actually assumed a human body and soul, not precisely such as fallen men have, but like that of the newly-created Adam, or rather became himself the archetypal man after whom, as a pattern originally in the mind of Deity, the human race was primevally fashioned. *SEE IMAGE OF GOD*.

The question whether there would or could have been an incarnation without the fall of man has especially engaged the speculative minds of German divines, most of whom maintain the affirmative. "If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and to humanity-if his person has not merely a historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance, sin alone cannot have been the ground of his revelation; for there was no metaphysical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer if it had been eternally involved in the idea that he should be our Mediator. Are we to suppose that what is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? that there would have been no room in the human race for the glory of the only-begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God, with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God, must we not necessarily ask, even if we for the moment suppose sin to have no existence, Where in this kingdom is the perfect Godman? No one of the individuals by himself expresses more than a relative union of the divine and human natures. No one participates more than partially in the "fullness of him that filleth all" (<4012301>Ephesians 1:23). All, therefore, point beyond themselves to a union of God and man, which is not partial and relative *(Ce leipoal*<4612701>1 Corinthians 12:27), but perfect and complete" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics. §* 131). See also Muller, *Deutsche Zeitschrift,* 1853, No. 43; Philippi, *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre,* Eifileitung; Ebrard, *Dogmnlinik,* 2, 95; *British and Foreign Ev. Rev. in Theol. Eclec.* 3. 267.

IV. *Objections* to the Bible doctrine of the incarnation worthy of consideration are more easily resolved, perhaps, than those against any other doctrine of Scripture, for they are mostly, if not altogether, to be comprehended under the head of its deep mysteriousness. Many writers, however, have adduced as parallel the mystery of creation, which is in itself the embodiment of thought in matter, and the existence of such a composite being as man, not to speak of mysteries with which our entire economy is crowded. *Apriori,* it is not more difficult to conceive of the union of the divine with the human, or the taking up of the human into the divine, than to comprehend the incarnation of an immaterial essence such as that of the mind in a material form like that of the body. "If even in our time the idea of the incarnation of God still appears so difficult, the principal reason is, that the fact itself is too much isolated. It is always the impulse of spirit to embody itself, for corporeity is the end of the work of

God; in every phenomenon an idea descends from the world of spirit and embodies itself here below. It may therefore be said that all the nobler among men are rays of that sun which in Christ rose on the firmament of humanity. In Abraham, Moses, and others, we already discover the coming Christ" (Olshausen on ◂BOOK▸John 1:14).

The strictures of archbishop Whately with respect to the substance of Deity, etc., may hold good of dogmatism upon the incarnation: "But as to the *substance* of the supreme Being and of the human soul, many men were (and still are) confident in their opinions, and dogmatical in maintaining them: the more, inasmuch as in these subjects they could not be refuted by an appeal to experiment. .. Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate are *confessedly* and by their *own* account beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly *revealed in Scripture;* but it *is* a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own," etc. *(Cyclop. Brit.* 1, 517, 8th ed.). On objections, consult Liddon, *Basmpton Lecture,* lect. 5; Sadler, *Emmanuel,* chaps. 2, 5; Frayssinous, *Def. of Christianity,* 2, ch. 25; Thos. Adams, *Meditations on. Creed, in Works, 3,* 235; Martensen, *Christ. Dogmat. §* 132.

V. *History of* Views. — The true theory of the nature of Christ was of gradual development in the history of the Church. Not unlike the best and most enduring growths of nature, it sprang up and matured amid the conflicts of doubt and the tempests of faction. (See § VIII, below.) The efforts to harmonize the divine and human natures of Christ gave rise to a series of fluctuations of doubt, which illustrate in a signal manner the tendencies of the human mind to recoil from one extreme to another. The close of the 4th century (A.D. 381) witnessed the maturing of correct views as to the twofold nature in the one person of Christ, and their embodiment in the creed, which, subjected to the test of centuries, is still the expression and symbol of the faith of the Church. *SEE CREED, NICENE* and *SEE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN*, vol. 2, p. 562.

"If we would correctly apprehend the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take QafimC in the abstract sense in which it was used. The divine nature consists in this, that Christ is God, the predicate *'God'* belongs to him; the human nature is this that the predicate *'man'* is assigned to it. His divine nature is the divine essence which *subsists* in the

Logos from eternity, and which in his becoming man he still *retained.* His human nature is the man's nature or mode of being and constitution, which for *itself does not subsist,* but which, as a *universal attribute,* exists in all other men, and, since his incarnation, also in him-the *natura hominum.* To have human feeling, will, and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature. We must, however, never think of human nature as a *concretum,* a *subsistens,* a son of Mary, with which the Son of God united himself, or mixed himself up" (Ebrard, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, s.v.* Jesus Christ).

With the explanation thus given, we proceed to remark that the earliest controversies of the Church revolved around the physical nature of Christ. The result of those contests established the essential oneness of Christ's body with ours. The pungency of the arguments employed may be illustrated in the words of Irenaeus (quoted by Hooker, *Eccl. Polity,* 5, sec. 53): "If Christ had not taken flesh from the very earth, he would not have coveted those earthly nourishments wherewith bodies taken from thence are fed. This was the nature which felt hunger after long fasting, was desirous of rest after travel, testified compassion and love by tears, groaned in heaviness, and with extremity of grief melted away itself into bloody sweats." The earliest fathers, with the exception of Justin Martyr, held the opinion that Christ assumed only a human body, or, if he had a soul, it was animal, or, which was more common, they quite ignored the question of his human soul. The views of Justin, however, were colored by the Platonic philosophy, which led him to attribute to Christ body, soul, and spirit, but in such a mode of union with the Logos as to furnish the germs of the future error of Apollinaris the younger. Tertullian, about the end of the 2nd century, first ascribed to Christ a proper human soul, and thus met and disposed of the difficulties which had arisen from the teaching that connected the Logos immediately with the body of Christ. The doctrine of the human soul of Christ was more fully developed and illustrated by Origen. But, in comparing the connection between the Logos and the human nature in Christ to the union of believers with Christ, he drew upon himself the objection that he made Christ a mere man. (See further, Knapp, *Lectures on Christian Theology,* sec. 102, note by the translator.) Ambrose *(De Incarnatione,* p. 76) may more properly serve as the connecting link between Tertullian and the Athanasian Creed, the latter setting forth the doctrine to which the Church was slowly attaining in the following words: "Perfectus Dels, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et

‘humana carne subsistens.” Thus Ambrose reasons: “Do we also infer division when we affirm that he took on him a reasonable sound, and one endowed with intellectual capacity? For God himself, the Word, was not to the flesh as the reasonable intellectual soul; but God the Word, taking upon him a reasonable intellectual soul, human, and of the same substance with our souls, the flesh also like our own, and of the same substance with that of which our flesh is formed, was also perfect *man,* but without any taint of sin. ... Wherefore his flesh and his soul were of the same substance with our souls and our flesh.” Questions in connection with the nature of the human soul of Christ came into greater prominence towards the close of the 4th century than ever before in the history of the Church. Apollinaris the younger revived the opinion which extensively prevailed in the primitive Church, that Christ connected himself only with a human body and an *animal* soul (Hase, *Ch. Hist.* sec. 104). “Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole. Out of the union of the *perfect* human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed; and, more particularly, the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form *one* person” (Neander, 4:119, Clarke’s edition). From an early part of the 9th century, when the Adoption tenets sank into oblivion, the Church enjoyed comparative rest. But, as might have been presumed, the era of scholastic theology, which was inaugurated at about the commencement of the 12th century, and continued into the 15th, although the attention of the schoolmen was more directed to other subjects, did not pass by one that so readily admitted the exercise of dialectic subtlety. The nominalism of Roscelinus, “which regarded the appellation *God,* that is common to the three persons, as a mere name, i.e. as the abstract idea of a genus” (Hagenbach), had perverted the true idea of Father, Son, and Spirit into that of three individuals or things, in contradistinction to one thing *(una res),* In response, Anselm argued that, as every universal is a mere abstraction, and particulars alone have reality, so “if only the essence of God in the Trinity was called *una res,* and the three persons not *tres res,* the latter could not be considered as anything real. Only the one God would be the *real;* all besides would become a mere nominal distinction, to which nothing real corresponded; and so, therefore, along with the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost would also have become man (Neander, 8:92). “The daring assertions of Roscelinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while those of Abelard exposed him to that of Sabellianism. The distinction which Gilbert of Poitiers drew between the *quo est* and the

quod est gave to his doctrine the semblance of Tetratheism" (see Hagenbach, *History of Doct.* 1, sec. 170). Though his starting-point was Realism, he arrived at the same goal as the Nominalist Roscelinus. "The Scholastics had much to say of the relation of number to the divine unity. Since Boethius had put forth the canon, 'Vere unum esse, in quo nullus sit numerus,' Peter the Lombard sought to avoid the difficulty by saying that number, in its application to God and divine things, had only a negative meaning; 'these are rather said to exclude what is not in God than to assert what is'" *(Theol. Lect.* by Dr. Twesten, transl. in *Bib. Sac. 3,* 770). "Considered as an act, according to Thomas Aquinas, the incarnation is the work of the whole Trinity; but in respect to its *terminus,* that is, the personal union of the divine and human nature, it belongs only to the Son; since, according to the doctrine of the Church, it is first and properly not the nature, but a person, and that the second person, which has assumed humanity." (For the accordance of this with the confession of faith of the. eleventh Council at Toledo, A.D. 675, see *Bib. Sac. 4:*50, note.) "Duns Scotus ascribed to the human nature of Christ's proper if not an independent existence. This fundamental view of the Middle Ages Luther also adopted, and designated the divinity and humanity as two parts;' and upon this he built his theory of the importation of the divine attribute to the human" (Herzog).

The age of the Reformation contributed nothing or but little new on the subject of the incarnation. The most that it did was to repeat some of the more pestilent errors of the past, and in the mean time, through the conflicts of mind, bring into bolder relief the lineaments of truth. "Thus Caspar Schwenkfield revived the docetico-monophysitic doctrine concerning the *'glorified* and *deified flesh'* of Christ. Menno Simonis, as well as other Anabaptists, supposed (like the Valentinians in the first period) that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom. Michael Servetus maintained that Christ was a mere man, filled with the divine nature, and rejected all further distinctions between his two natures as unscriptural, and founded upon scholastic definitions alone. Faustus Socinus went so far as to return to the view entertained by the Ebionites and Nazarenes" (Hagenbach, *History of Doct.* sec. 265). According to Dorner, "Servetus, resting on a pantheistic basis, could say that the flesh of Christ was consubstantial with God, but the same would hold true in reference to all flesh." Nevertheless, he did not say it in reference to all flesh. "In his opinion, Christ alone is the Son of God; nor is that name to be given to any

one else' (Hagenbach, sec. 265). The controversies between Calvin and Servetus, in which were comprehended the erroneous views of the latter on the subject of the incarnation, at last culminated in his death at the stake. Much, however, as Calvin was blamed for calling the Son, considered in his essence, αὐτόθεος, still he was right, and is supported by Lutheran theologians. In another point of view, that is, considered in his personal subsistence, the Son cannot be called αὐτόθεος, but only the Father, since he alone is ἀγέννητος; but the ἀγεννησία of the person is not to be confounded with the absoluteness of the essence." (See further, Twesten, in the *Bib. Sac. 4,* 39. For the differences, as respects the incarnation, between Luther and Zwingle, in which each failed to comprehend the standpoint of the other, see Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* art. Jesus Christ.)

VI. *Theophanies.* — It might have been expected, from a consideration of an event of such moment to our race as the incarnation, that. delayed so long in the history of the world,-it would not have been without its adumbrations, like types in nature, mute prophecies of archetypal existence. The first prophecy of the incarnation was coeval with the fall. In terms succinct and yet clear, the announcement was made that from the seed of the woman should rise the hope of man. In analogy with nature the typical form was thus given, from which the grand archetypal idea should be elaborated, until in the fullness of time that idea should be permanently embodied, and God become manifest in the flesh. "No sooner had the first Adam appeared and fallen than a new school of prophecy began, in which type and symbol were mingled with what had now its first existence on the. earth-verbal enunciations; and all pointed to the second Adam, 'the Lord from heaven.' In him creation and the Creator meet in reality and not- in semblance. On the very apex of the finished pyramid of being sits the adorable Monarch of all-as the Son of Mary, of David, of the first Adam, the created of God; as God and the Son of God, the eternal Creator of the universe; and these-the two Adams-form the main theme of all prophecy, natural and revealed. That type and symbol should have been employed with reference not only to the second, but, as held by men like Agassiz and Owen, to the first Adam also, exemplifies, we are disposed to think, the unity of the style of Deity, and serves to show that it was he who created the worlds that dictated the Scriptures" (Hugh Miller, in Fairbairn's *Typology,* vol. 1, append. 1). See also Hugh Miller, *Test. of Rocks,* Lect. 5; M'Cosh, *Typical Forms;* Agassiz, *Princ. of Zoology,* pt. 1.

During the course of the preparatory dispensations, the divine Being disclosed himself to the more pious and favored of our race in the form of man, and with the title of "the Angel of Jehovah"-- hwhy Ëalm. The first of these appearances was to Hagar in her distress. The angel addressed her in the person of God, and she, in return, attributed to him the name of "Thou, God, seest me." The foremost of the three angels with whom Abraham conversed with respect to the cities of the plain (Genesis 18) is called not fewer than eight times "Jehovah," and six times "Lord" (ynda). (See Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 1, 112, transl.) In the destruction of the cities of the plain an unmistakable distinction is made between two persons, each of whom bears the same divine name: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven" (<011924>Genesis 19:24). The full nature of the theophany to Jacob (<013224>Genesis 32:24-30) is made manifest in <281203>Hosea 12:3-5. The scene opens with the view of a man wrestling with Jacob, and closes with Jacob's calling the name of the place "Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." "The prophet Hosea puts it beyond a doubt that this was a divine person by styling him not only an angel and God (µyhla), but *Jehovah, God of hosts, Jehovah is his memorial.* Whilst, therefore, he was *a man* and *an angel,* or the *angel of the covenant,* he was also the *supreme Jehovah.* These titles and attributes belong to none other than the second person of the blessed Trinity, Christ the Savior" (Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics,* p. 281). The "Angel of Jehovah" appears to Moses in a flame of fire from the bush, and still takes to himself the names of Deity, Elohim, and Jehovah (<020302>Exodus 3:2-7); manifests himself to Manoah as man, and yet is recognized and worshipped as God, while he declares his name to be "Wonderful," the same as in <230906>Isaiah 9:6; and at the close of the Old-Testament canon (<390301>Malachi 3:1): he is announced as the angel or messenger who should suddenly come to his Temple. (See also <021419>Exodus 14:19; 18:20; 22:34; 23:23; <042016>Numbers 20:16; comp. <022321>Exodus 23:21; 33:2, 3, 14; <060602>Joshua 6:2; 5:13-15, 22; <070611>Judges 6:11-22; 13:6-22; <236309>Isaiah 63:9.)

As to the nature of this mysterious personage, there have been those who have held, with Augustine, that the theophanies were "not direct appearances of a person in the Godhead, but self-manifestations of God through a created being" (see Liddon, *Bampton Lect. 2.* 87, note), among the latest defenders of which view are Hoffman (in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung)* and Delitzsch (on *Genesis).* On the other hand, the fathers of

the Church prior to the Nicene Council were almost unanimous in the opinion that the "angel of Jehovah" is identical with *Jehovah* himself, not denoting an existence apart from himself, but only the mode of manifestation of the divine Logos, who subsequently became incarnate; and in this view the Church has generally acquiesced. (On the subject of theophanies, see Justin Martyr, *Apology;* Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 1, ch. 2; Kurtz, *Old Cov.* 1, 181-201, transl.; an able article in the *Stud. u. Krit.* of 1840 by Nitzsch; E. H. Stahl, *Die Erscheinungen Jehovas u. Seiner Engel im A. T.,* in Eichhorn's *Bib. Rep. 7:*156 sq.; Hnilein, *Ueber Theo. u. Christophanien,* in the N. *Theol. Journ.* 2, 1 sq., 93 sq., 277 sq.) *SEE THEOPHANY*.

VII. *The Logos.* — In the description of the incarnation given by the evangelist John there appears the term "Logos" in a sense new to the Scriptures, and among New-Testament writers peculiar to him. Mulch has been written on the origin of this word. The Targums, the best of which are generally attributed to the 1st century, may be regarded as embodying the sentiments of that age (Etheridge, *leb. Lit.* p. 191). In these, for the name of Deity, "Jehovah," there is employed the paraphrase "Word of the Lord." "On this circumstance much argument has been built. Some have maintained that it supplies an indubitable ascription of personal existence to the *Word,* in some sense distinct from the personal existence of the supreme Father; that this *Word* is the *Logos* of the New Testament; and, consequently, that the phrase is a proof of a belief among the ancient Jews in the pre-existence, the personal operations, and the deity of the Messiah, 'the Word who became flesh, and fixed his tabernacle among us' "(J. Pye Smith. *Messiah,* bk. 2, sec. 11; compare Bertholdt, *Christol. Jud.* p. 130 sq.). Others have referred the origin of the word to Philo; but, as has been abundantly shown, the Logos of Philo has but little in common with that of the Gospel (Tholuck, *Comm.* ad loc. p. 61), and is but a nucleus of divine ideas, which lacks the essential element of personality. "Blinding as the resemblance between many of his ideas and modes of expression and those of Christianity may be to the superficial reader, yet the essential principle is 'to its very foundation diverse. 'Even that which sounds like the expressions of John has in its entire connection a meaning altogether diverse. His system stalks by the cradle of Christianity only as a spectral counterpart. It appears like the floating, dissolving fata *Morgana* on the horizon, where Christianity is about to arise" (Dorner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi,* 2, 198, 342. Comp. Burton, *Bampton Lect.* note 93; Ritter, *Hist.*

of Philos. transl. 4, 407-478; Liddon, *Bampton Lecture,* p. 93-108; Dollinger, *Heid. u. Judenthum, 10:*3; *Bib. Sacra, 6:*173; 7:13, 696-732; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1851, p. 377; 1858, p. 110-129). *SEE LOGOS*.

VIII. *Heresies. — The* false theories that have gathered around the doctrine of the incarnation are manifold, and deny (1) that Christ was truly God, (2) that he was truly man, or (3) that he is God-man in one undivided and indivisible person. (See Wangemann, *Christliche Glaubenslehre,* p. 203; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions,* 2 vols. 8vo.) *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*, III.

1. *Ebionism.* — This, the first heresy of importance, took its rise during the lifetime of the apostles, and received its designation, according to Origen, from ˆyybAeu *poor,* thus signifying, perhaps, the meagerness of their religious system, or, more properly, the poverty of its followers. They denied the divinity of Christ, but ascribed to him a superior legal piety and the elevated wisdom of a prophet. Eusebius says *(Hist. Eccles. 3* 7), "The common Ebionites themselves suppose that a higher power had united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism." The Ebionites, whose views are represented by the *Clementine Homilies,* differed from the former by asserting that Jesus had from the beginning been pervaded with the same power; in their opinion he ranks with Adam, Enoch, and Moses (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 1, 180). This error, which has been called, not improperly, the Socinianism of the age, revived and embodied the sentiments concerning the Messiah current among the Jews during his life. The views of the *Nazarenes,* who are generally regarded as a species of Ebionites, while they more nearly approached the orthodox faith, agreed with them in regarding Christ as only a superior man.

2. *Gnosticism.* — The Ebionitish heresy that rose within the infant Church, from its necessary association with Judaism, was paralleled by another (Gnosticism), which sprang from a similar contact with the pagan philosophy of the age. The assumption of a superior capacity. for knowledge implied in the name the Gnostics bore *(*γνῶσις, <4601>1 Corinthians 8:1; <5460>1 Timothy 6:20; <5108>Colossians 2:8), probably self-assumed, indicated the transcendental speculations which they engrafted on the tender plant of Christianity. With respect to- the nature of Christ; they held that the Deity had existed from all eternity in a state of absolute quiescence, but finally he begat certain beings or *eons* after his own likeness, of whom Christ was one; and that he was allied to the lower

angels and the Δημιουργός, *Demiurge,* to whom this lower world was subject. Moreover, he had never in reality assumed a material body, but became united with the man Jesus at his baptism, and abode with him until the time of his death. (See Mosheim, *Commentaries on the first three Centuries,* sec. 62.) The tenets of Gnosticism can be traced even to the apostolical age. Simon Magus appears to have represented himself as an incarnation of the demiurgic power (<4010>Acts 8:10). The ancient fathers regarded him as the father of the Gnostics (Ireieus, *adv' Hor.* 1, 23). On the other hand, Tittmann *(Do vestigiis Gnosticorum,* etc.) holds that nothing was known of the Gnostics until the 2nd century. However the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel seems to be directed against Gnostical perversions of the doctrine of the incarnation, which is not impossible if we admit the well-known tradition that Cerinthus disputed with that evangelist. (See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History, 3,* ch. 28.)

3. *Docetism.* — This was one of the forms of Gnosticism denying the reality of Christ's human nature, and representing whatever appertained to his human appearance to be a mere phantasm-δόκησις. Jerome tells us that while the apostles were still living there were those who taught that his body was no more than a phantom. This particular form of Gnostical error was censured by Ignatius in his *Epistles,* and therefore unquestionably arose early in the Church. (See Lardner, 3:441.) '*If* the Son of God (said the Docetist) has been crucified for me merely in appearance, then am I bound down by the chains of sin in- appearance; but those who speak are themselves a mere show." For modern Docetism, as illustrated in the mythical treatment of the doctrines of sacred history by Schelling, and the Rationalists generally, see Martensen, *Dogmnatics,* p. 244.

4. *Monarchianism,* (about A.D. 170), μοναρχία, so called either from its regard to the doctrine of the divine unity, or from a regard to Christ's dignity. (See Hase, sec. 90.) According to its teachings, Christ was a mere man, but born of the Virgin by the power of the Holy Spirit, and exalted to be the Lord of the whole Church. A certain efflux from the divine essence dwelt in Christ, and this constituted his personality, while this personality originated in the hypothesis of a divine power. (See Neander, 2, 349, Clark's ed.)

5. *Sabellianism* (about 258) taught that the Father Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same-so many different *manifestations* of the same being-three denominations in one substance. (See Hagenbach, 1, 263.) Thus the

personality of the Son was denied. His personality in the flesh did not exist prior to the incarnation, nor does it exist now, as the divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ has returned to its source In the words of Burton, “If we seek for a difference between the theory of Sabellius and those of his predecessors, we are perhaps to say that Noetus supposed the whole divinity of the Father to be inherent in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part, which was put forth like an emanation, and was again absorbed in the Deity. Noetus acknowledged only one divine Person; Sabellius divided this one dignity into three; but he supposed the Son and the Holy Ghost to have no distinct personal existence, except when they were put forth for a time by the Father.” The views of Sabellius reappear in the dogmas of Schleiermacher (who regarded the eternal and absolute Monas as *unrevealed;* the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as God *revealed),* and in a modified form in the *Discourses on the Incarnation and Atonement* by Dr. Bushnell.

6. *Manichaeism* (circa A.D. 274). — Mani or Manes, who was probably educated in the religion of Zoroaster, upon’ his adoption of the Christian faith, transferred to his Christ the Oriental views of incarnation. In this system the dualistic principle was more fully developed than in Gnosticism. He brought together as in a kaleidoscope the fantasies of Parseeism, Buddhism, and Chaldeeism, bits of philosophy alike brilliant and alike worthless. “From Gnosticism, or, rather, from universal Orientalism, he drew the inseparable admixture of moral and physical notions, the eternal hostility between mind and matter, the rejection of Judaism. and the identification of the God of the Old Testament with the evil spirit, the distinction between Jesus and the Christ with the Docetism or unreal death of the incorporeal Christ.” For a further admirable summary of his views, see Milman’s *Latin Christ.* 2, 322 sq. The followers of Manes formed themselves into a Church A.D. 274, which possessed a hierarchical form of government, and consisted of two great classes, the perfect *(electi)* and catechumens *(auditores).* (See Hase, sec. 82.)

7. *Arianism* (about 318). — The 4th century witnessed the rise of the most formidable and persistent of all the forms of error as to the person of Christ. The teachings of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, that the Son was of the same essence with the Father, developed the latent doubts of one of his presbyters, Arius, who rushed to the other extreme. Charging his bishop with Sabellianism, he maintained that the Son was not the *same* in substance (ὁμοούσιος), but *similar (*ὁμοιούσιος*).* He did not hesitate to

accept the logical consequences of his dogma-that Christ, though the noblest of creatures, must, like all others, have been *created* from nothing. This deduction contains, as in a nut-shell, the entire heresy.

8. *Apollinarianisms* (about A.D. 378). — Apollinaris the younger rejected the proper humanity of Christ. He adopted many of the sentiments of Noetus the Monarchian. From the postulate that as the person of Christ was one, therefore his nature must be one, he reasoned that there could be no human intellect or will, but that the functions of soul and- body must be discharged by the Logos, which so commingled with the uncreated body of Christ that the two distinct natures formed one heterogeneous substance entirely *sui generis.* (See Harvey, *On the Creeds*, 2, 645.) "Both Noetus and Apollinaris denied that the Word was made man of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost; the earlier heretic teaching that there was no real hypostatic distinction in the Deity, the latter supposing that the flesh, as an eternally uncreated body, came down from heaven., Both denied, for the same reason, the 'inseparable union of two perfect natures in one person; both denied that Christ was perfect man; the Patripassian, no less than the Apollinarian, having considered that the divine nature supplied the place of a human soul" (Harvey, *Creeds, 2*, 649).

9. *Nestorianism* (about 428) furnished the knotted root from which sprang ultimately the antagonist heresies of the Monophysites and Monothelites. To the phrase θεοτόκος, *mother of God*, applied to the Virgin, Nestorius took exception, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ, and not to God. Thus arose the long-protracted controversy respecting the two natures of Christ (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. 7*, ch. 32). Nestorius maintained that a divine and human nature dwelt in Christ as separate entities, but in closest connection — συναφεία*;* to use the figure of Wangemann, "as boards are glued together." His own admission, "Divide naturas sed conjungo reverentiam," justified the allegation brought against his doctrines that Christ is really a double being. The humanity of Christ was the temple for the indwelling *(*ἐνοίκησις*)* of Deity upon the separate basis of personality in his human nature.

10. *Monophysitism* (about 446). — The doctrine of Nestorius, that there must be two natures if there be two persons in Christ, led Eutyches, by the law of contrarieties, to an exact counterpart, that there is but one person in Christ, and this one person admits of but one nature. The logic was the same in both heresies. Liddon has properly said, "The Monophysite

formula practically made Christ an unincarnate God;" for, according to Monophysitism, the human nature of Christ had been absorbed in the divine. "We get, as it were, a Christ with two heads: an image which produces the impression not merely of the superhuman, but of the monstrous, and which is incapable of producing any *moral* effect" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*. sec. 136). Soon after the condemnation of this error by the fourth General Council at Chalcedon, it branched out into ten leading sects, whence it has been called "the ten-horned."

11. *Monothelitism* (about 625). — The controversy over the heresy of Monophysitism was prolonged for centuries. In the midst of the contest, the idle curiosity of the emperor Heraclius led him to propound the question to his bishops "Whether Christ, of one person but two natures, was actuated by a single or double will" (Waddington, *Ch. History,* 1, 355). The question met with a ready response, but it was the response of error. It was said in reply that a multiplicity of wills must of necessity imply a multiplicity of willers. This is the postulate of Monothelitism. In maintenance of the unity of Christ's nature, they held that in him was only one will or energy, and that this was a divinely human will (ἐνεργεία θεανδρική). (For a statement of the orthodox view of the divine and human will of Christ, see Liddon's *Bampton Lect.* 5, 392.) The sixth General Council at Constantinople, A.D. 680, decided in favor of the Dyothelitic doctrine, while it anathematized the Monothelites and their views.

12. *Adoptianism* (about 787). — The incessant and fierce strife of the early Church with respect to the nature of Christ finally culminated in the *Adoptian* controversy. According to the views of this sect, in his divine nature, Christ is the true Son of God; but as respects his human nature, he is the Son of God only by *adoption* — 'his divinity according to the former was proper, but according to the latter nature nominal and titular" (Herzog, *Encyklop.).*

13. *Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism* present no new phase of heresy. They are simply resurrected forms of error that had again and again been refuted It may be questioned whether the inventive mind of German Neology has presented upon the incarnation any feature of error essentially new. The subtle minds of Arius, Sabellius, and other kindred philosophers of the early Church have explored every avenue of doubt, and left no now openings into which heretical error can possibly thrust itself. The most that

modern speculations have done has been to revivify dead theories of the past, and clothe them with “the empty abstractions of impersonal idea.” *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*, vol. 2, p. 282. As a fair illustration of the mystical speculations with which the metaphysical theology of modern Germany has overlaid the doctrine of the incarnation, we quote from Hegel *(religions philosophie,* 2, 261): “That which first existed was the idea in its simple universality, the *Father;* the second is the particular, the idea in its manifestation, the *Son--to* wit, the idea in its external existence, so that the external manifestation is changed into the first, and known as the divine idea, the identity of the divine with the human. The third is this consciousness, God as the *Holy Spirit* and this spirit in his existence is the Church.” According to Lessing, “This doctrine (of the Trinity) will lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be one by that reason to which all finite things are one; that his unity must also be a transcendental unity which does not exclude a kind of plurality.” To Schelling “it is clear that the idea of Trinity is absurd, unless it be considered on speculative grounds.... The incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation;” and by Fichte the Son is regarded as God attaining to a consciousness of himself in man. See, farther, Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 2, 384-420. Marheineke, who in theological obscurities was an apt disciple of his master Hegel, thus discourses of the incarnation *(Grundlehren d. Christlichen Dogmatik, §* 325, 326): “As spirit, by renouncing individuality, man is in truth elevated above himself, without having abandoned the human nature; as spirit renouncing absoluteness, God has lowered himself to human nature, without having abandoned his existence as divine Spirit. The unity of the divine and human nature is but the unity in that Spirit whose existence is the knowledge of the truth with which the doing of good is identical. This spirit, as God in the human nature, and man in the divine nature, is the God-man. The man wise in divine holiness, and holy in divine wisdom, is the God-man. As a historical fact, this union of God with man is manifest and real in the person of Jesus Christ; in him the divine manifestation has become perfectly human. The conception of the Godman, in the historical person of Jesus Christ, contains in itself two phases in one: First, that God is manifest only through man, and in this relation Christ is as yet placed on an equality with all other men; he is the Son of Man, and therein at first represents only the possibility of God becoming man; secondly, that in this man. Jesus Christ, God is manifest as in none other; this manifest man is the manifest God; but the manifest God is the Son of God, and in this relation Christ is God’s

Son; and this is the actual fulfillment of the possibility or promise; it is the reality of God becoming man." For farther quotations from German Rationalists, see Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought,* p. 154-163, 378-383.

While, as respects the question of antecedency, the propriety of introducing Swedenborg in the company of Rationalists might be questioned, we regard his views on the incarnation as entitling him to consideration in this connection. "He taught that, instead of a trinity *of persons* (set forth in the symbols of the Church), we must hold a trinity of the *person,* by which he understood that that t which is divine in the nature of Christ is the *Father,* that the divine which is united to the human is the *Son,* and the divine which proceeds from him is the *Holy Spirit,"* etc. (Hagenbach, *Hist of Doct.* 2, 419). For the literature of Rationalism and its polemics, consult Hagenbach, *Encyclop. der Theologischen Wissenciehften,* p. 90-93. We cannot but suggest that all speculations upon the incarnation, which on the one hand rob Christ of his divinity as the true God, or on the other of his humanity as truly man, subject themselves to the severe strictures of Coleridge *(Works,* Am. edit. 5. 552; comp. also 5, 447): "That Socinianism is not a religion, but a theory, and that, too, a very pernictous theory, or a very unsatisfactory theory-pernicious, for it excludes all our deep and awful ideas of the perfect holiness of God, his justice, and his mercy, and thereby makes the voice of conscience a delusion, as having no correspondent in the character of the legislator; unsatisfactory, for it promises forgiveness without any solution of the difficulty of the compatibility of this with the justice of God; in no way explains the fallen condition of man, nor offers any means for his regeneration. 'If you will be good, you will be happy,' it says. That may be, but my will is weak; I sink in the struggle."'We may even adduce the trenchant sarcasm of Hume, "To be a philosophical skeptic is the first step towards becoming a sound believing Christian," which, interpreted in plainer phrase, is, "He who comes to Christ must first believe he is NOT." (Consult Martensen, *Dogmatics, §* 137.)

IX. *Additional Texts illustrative of the Subject. —*

1. *Prophecies of Christ incarnate. —* <01035>*Genesis 3:*15, The seed of the woman 48:16, The angel; 49:10, Shiloh: <05818>Deuteronomy 18:18, 19, The prophet like unto Moses; <18923>Job 19:23-27, The Redeemer that liveth; <18323>Job 33:23, The Angel intercessor; <19106>Psalm 2:6, 7, The Sonship

declared; 16:10, 11, The Holy One free from corruption; 22 The sufferings of the Messiah; 24:7-10, Jehovah of glory, with <4601>1 Corinthians 2:8; 14, The perpetuity and glory of his kingdom; 72, 40:6-10, A body prepared for the Messiah; ex, Messiah the Lord, Priest, Conqueror; 110:1, with <4022>Matthew 22:42-45; <2008>Proverbs 8:9:hm;kjj ; Wisdom personified; <2601>Isaiah 6:1-3, As Lord of hosts, <4312>John 12:41; <2714>Isaiah 7:14; 8:10, The Virgin's child, named Immanuel; 9:5, 6. Attributes of Deity ascribed to the child to be born; 11:1-10, Messiah from the root of Jesse; 32:1-5, The blessings of Christ's kingdom; 40:3, As Jehovah, with <4003>Matthew 3:3; <1901>Psalm 42:1-5, The office of Christ; 44:6, As Jehovah the first and the last, with <6617>Revelation 1:17; 52:13-15; 53, The sufferings, death, and burial of Christ; <2435>Jeremiah 23:5, 6; 33:15, 16, The Lord our righteousness, with <4630>1 Corinthians 1:30; <2601>Ezekiel 1:26, The appearance of a man upon the throne; <2713>Daniel 7:13,14, The glory of the Son of Man; <2928>Joel 2:28-32, Christ the Savior, with <4417>Acts 2:17, 21; <3502>Micah 5:2-4, The birthplace of Christ foretold; <3706>Haggai 2:6-9, The desire of all nations; <3608>Zechariah 3:8; 6:12, 13, The Branch; 12:10; 13:1, The opening of a fountain for sin; 13:7, The shepherd to be smitten; <3901>Malachi 3:1, The Lord to come to his Temple, with <4027>Luke 2:27, etc.; <4018>Matthew 1:18-25; <4030>Luke 1:30-38; 2. Circumstances of Christ's birth; 22:43, David-calling Christ Lord; <4249>Luke 24:19, 44, Christ interpreting prophecy concerning himself.

2. *The divinity of Christ* in the New Test. — John 1; 3:13, 31; 5:17, 27, 31, 36; 6:33-63; 8:5, 6, 58; <4824>John 10:24-38; 12:41; 14:1, 6-14, 20; <4878>John 17:3; 19:36; 20:28; <4434>Acts 2:34; 7:59, 60; 10:36; 20:28; 13:33; <4504>Romans 1:4; 9:5; 11:36; 14:10-12; <4608>1 Corinthians 2:8; 8:6; 15:47; <4704>2 Corinthians 4:4; <4804>Galatians 4:4, 5; <4910>Ephesians 1:10, 23; 4:24; <5006>Philippians 2:6-8, 9-11; 3:21; <5103>Colossians 1:3, 15-19; 2:9, 10; 3:10, 11; <5416>1 Timothy 3:16; <5623>Titus 2:13, with <2807>Hosea 1:7; <5802>Hebrews 1:2-12; 2:14-18; 3:1-5; 4:16; 5:7-9; 9:11; 10:20; 13:8; <5907>James 2:7; <6038>1 Peter 3:18; 2 Peter 1, 1; <6001>1 John 1:1-3; 3:8; 4:2, 9, 14; 5:19, 20; <6004>Jude 1:4; <6604>Revelation 1:4-17; 2:8; 7:17; 22:1,16 34, etc.

3. *The humanity of Christ.* — <4018>Matthew 1:18; 2:2; 4:2; 8:20, 24; 16:13; 22:42; 26:67; 27:26, 59, 60; <4068>Mark 4:38; 10:47; 15:46; <4013>Luke 1:31; 2:7, 11,21, 52; 3:23; 22:64; 23:11; <4014>John 1:14; 4:2, 6, 7; 7:27; 11:33, 35; 12:27; 19:1, 28, 30; 20:27; <4422>Acts 2:22, 31; 3:15, 22; 13:23; <4503>Romans 1:3; <4806>Galatians 3:16; 4:4; <5007>Philippians 2:7, 8; <5508>2 Timothy 2:8; <5814>Hebrews 2:14, 17; 7:26, 28; 1 <4812>John 1:12; 3:5; 4:3; 2 John 7, etc.

X. *Literature.* — Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos,* in *Opp.* (ed. Patavii, 1777), 1, 695 sq.; Tertullian, *Opera* (1695, fol.), p. 307 sq.; Cyrill. Hierosol. *De Christo Incarnato, in Opera* (1763, fol.), p. 162 sq.; Cyrill. Alexandrinus, *De Incarnatione Uniqeniti,* in *Opera* (1638, fol.), 5, 1; Hilary, *De Trinitate* (Paris, 1631), bk. 2, p. 17 sq.; Chrysostom, *Homilia (*"In principio erat Verbum"), in *Opera, 12,* 571; Zanchius, *De Incarnatione Filii Dei, in Opera* (1619, folio), 8, 1; Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio in naticitaten Christi* (transl. by H. S. Boyd, in *The Fathers-not Papists,* 1834); G. F. Baur, *Die Chr. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit 1. Menschwerdung Gottes* (Tübingen, 1841); Johann Aug. Ernesti, *De Dignitate et Veritate Incarnationis Filii Dei,* in his *Opuscula Theologica* (1792); Gass, *Geschichte der Prot. Dogm.* 1, 111 sq.; A. Hahn, *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens* (1828), p. 448 sq.; Duguet, *Principes de la Foi Chretienne,* and responses to Renan's *Vie de Jesu,* by his countrymen Freppel, Bp. Plantier, and Poujoulat; J. A. Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesehichte ders Lehrefir die Person Christi,* 1, passim; 2, 51 sq., 432-442, 591 sq. (transl. also in Clark's *Lib.);* Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk* (Erlangen, 1857); J. P. Lange, *Leben Jesu,* 2, 66 sq.; Karl Werner, *Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie* (1861), 1, 387 sq., 566 sq.; 2, 175 sq.; M. F. Sadler, *Emmanuel, or the Incarnation of the Son of God the Foundation of immutable Truth* (1867); John Owen, Χριστολογία, *or a Declaration of the glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ God and Man* (Lond. 1826), 12:1-343; Pearson, *On the Creed;* Burnet, *On the* 39 *Articles,* Art. 2; Archbishop Usher, *Immanuel, or the Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God* (Lond. 1648, fol.),; Thos. Goodwin, *Christ the Mediator,* in *Works* (1681, fol.), 3:1-427; R. J.Wilberforce, *Doct. of the Incarn. of our Lord Jesus Christ in its Relation to Mankind and the Church;* Edward Irving, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation opened* (in *Sermons);* Robt. Turnbull, *Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ Jesus;* John Farrer, *Bamnpton Lecture* (1803), p. 59 sq.; Robert Fleming, *The Loganthropos, or a Discourse concerning Christ as the Logos* (Lond. 1705), vol. 2 of *Christology;* Thomas Bradbury, *Mystery of Godliness cosnsidered in* 61 *Sermons* (Edinb. 1795); Wm. Sherlock, *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God* (Lond. 1691); Marcus Dods, *On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word,* with rec. notice by Dr. Thomas Chalmers (2nd ed. 1849); *Bib. Rep.*

1832, p. 1; 1849, p. 636 sq.; Brownson's *Quart. Rev.* sec. series, 4:136; 5, 137 sq.; 6:287 sq.; *Church Rev. 4:*428 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra, 11,* 729; 12, 52; 24, 41 sq. (an able art. on the theory of Incarnation, April, 1854); *Methodist Quart. Rev.* 1851, p. 114; 1866, p. 290; Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature,* first series, 3:107-113; *Theological Eclectic,* 2, 184; Massillon, "Les caracteres de la grandeur de Jesus Christ," in *AEuvres Completes, 6:*107; on 1 Corinthians 2, 7, 8; 7:89; Bp. Stillingfleet, *Sermons* (1690), 3:336; Bossuet, three Sermons, *AEuvres, 7:*1; Bp. Atterbury, *Sermons, 4,* 61; Joseph Benson, *Sermons,* 2, 604; Archbp. Tillotson, (fol. ed.), 1, 431; Bp. Beveridge, *Works,* 2, 564; Bp. Horne, *Disc.* 1, 193; Bp. Van Mildert, *Works,* 5, 359; J. H. Newman, *Sermons,* 2, 29; C. Simeon, *Works, 19:*170; Richard Duke, *The Divinity and Humanity of Jesus Christ* (1730), p. 29; Thomas Arnold, *Sermons* on 1 Tim. 3:16, at Rugby (1833) p. 111; W. A. Butler, *The Mystery of the Holy Incarnation* (Amer. ed.), 1, 58; George Rawlinson, *Sermons* on John 1, 11, p. 1; Riggenbach, *Sermon* on the Person of Jesus Christ, transl. in *Foundations of our Faith.* p. 100. For other sermons on the incarnation, see Darling's *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, col.* 1059, 1063, 1064, 1546,1547,1595-1597; also Malcolm's *Theol. Index,* p. 234. Compare *Stanley, East. Ch.* p. 279, 352; *Baptist Quart.* 1870 (July); *Amer. Ch.. Rev.* 1870, p. 82; *An. Presb. Rev.* 1869, p. 324; *Bib. Sac.* 1870, p. 1; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1858, p. 419; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1861 (Jan., art. iv); 1866 (Jan.); 1868 (July) *Theol. Elect. 3:*167; *Bullet. Theol.* 1867- (Jan.), p. 23 sq. See also references to the subject, more or less extensive, in *Lives of Christ, by* Sepp, Kuhn, Baumgarten, Ewald, Van Osterzee, Neander, Jeremy Taylor, Ellicott, Pressense, Young, Andrews; Lichtenstein's *Jesus Christus, Abriss seines Lebens,* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 6; also Bibliography of Life of Jesus in Hase's *Leben Jesu* (Lpz. 1854); also Literature under *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*, vol, 2, p. 834 (J. K. B.)

Incartulti

a term for the certificates of liberation given to serfs or slaves of churches and monasteries who were liberated. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8,* 841.

Incastratura

(sepulcrun) is a name in the Roman Catholic Church for a small place in the altar-stones set apart for the storage of saints' relics. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8*, 841.

Incensarium

(or INCENSORIUM) is the name of the vessel used in the Romish and some of the Oriental churches for containing the incense to be burned. *SEE INCENSE*.

Incensation

is the lighting and burning of the incense. *SEE INCENSE*.

Incense

(הרטקה, *ketorah'*, Deuteronomy 33:10; usually תרטק, *keto'reth*, which is once applied likewise to *the fat* of rams, being the part always burned in sacrifice; once יתרטקמ, *kitter'*. Jeremiah 44:21; all forms of the verb יתרק; prop. to *smoke*, hence to cause an odor by burning, often itself applied to the act of burning incense; Greek, θυμίαμα and cognate terms; sometimes הנבל, *lebonah'*, Isaiah 43:23; 60:6; 66:3; Jeremiah 6:20; 17:26; 41:5, *frankincense*, as elsewhere rendered), a perfume which gives forth its fragrance by burning, and in particular, that perfume which was burned upon the Jewish altar of incense. (See Weimar, *De sufftu aromatum*, Jen. 1678.) *SEE ALTAR*. Indeed, the burning of incense seems to have been considered among the Hebrews so much of an act of worship or sacred offering that we read not of any other use of incense than this among them. Nor among the Egyptians do we discover any trace of burned perfume except in sacerdotal use; but in Persian sculptures we see incense burned before the king. The offering of 'incense has formed a part of the religious ceremonies of most ancient nations. The Egyptians burned resin in honor of the sun at its rising, myrrh when at its meridian, and a mixture called kuphi at its setting (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 5, 315). Plutarch *(De Is. et Os.* c. 52, 80) describes kuphi as a mixture of sixteen ingredients. "In the temple of Siva incense is offered to the Lingam six times in twenty-four hours" (Roberts, *Oriental Illust.* p. 368). It was also an element in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (Jeremiah 11:12, 17; 48:35; 2 Chronicles 34:25).

1. The incense employed in the service of the tabernacle was distinguished as µyMis=hi t r,fq] *(ketdoeth has-sammim;* Exodus 25:6, *incense of the aromnas;* Sept. ἡ σύνθεσις τοῦ θυμιάματος*;* Vulg. *thymiamata boni odores;* A.V. "sweet incense"). The ingredients of the sacred incense are enumerated with great precision in Exodus 30:34, 35: "Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte (ãf,n; *nataph),* and onycha (tl,j,v,] *shecheleth),* and galbanum (hn:B]l]j , *chelbenah);* these sweet spices with pure frankincense *(hn:bo*] *lebonah):* of each shall there be a like weight. And thou shalt make of it a perfume, a confection after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy." See each of these ingredients in its alphabetical place. All incense which was not made of these ingredients was called hr,z; hr,f,q] *(ketorah zarah),* "strange incense," Exodus 30:9, and was forbidden to be offered. According to Rashi on Exodus 30:34, the above-mentioned perfumes were mixed in equal proportions, seventy manehs being taken of each. They were compounded by the skill of the apothecary, to whose use, according to Rabbinical tradition, was devoted a portion of the Temple, called, from the name of the family whose especial duty it was to prepare the incense, "the house of Abtines." So in the large temples of India "is retained a man whose chief business it is to distil sweet waters from flowers, and to extract oil from wood, flowers, and other substances" (Roberts, *Oriental Illust.* p. 82). The priest or Levite to whose care the incense was intrusted was one of the fifteen µynwmm *(memunnim),* or prefects of the Temple. Constant watch was kept in the house of Abtines that the incense might always be in readiness (Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talmud. s.v.* µnyfba). In addition to the four ingredients already mentioned, Jarchi enumerates seven others, thus making eleven, which the Jewish doctors affirm were communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai. Josephus *(War,* 5, 5, 5) mentions thirteen. The proportions of the additional spices are given by Maimonides *(Cele hammnikddsh,* 2, 2, § 3) as follows: of myrrh, cassia, spikenard, and saffron, sixteen manehs each; of costus, twelve manehs; cinnamon, nine manehs; sweet bark, three manehs. The weight of the whole confection was 368 manehs. To these was added the fourth part of a cab of salt of Sodom, with amber of Jordan, and an herb called 'the smoke-raiser" (^v[hl[m, *maaleh aishan),* known only to the cunning in such matters, to whom the secret descended by tradition. In the ordinary daily service one maneh was used, half in the morning and half in the evening. Allowing, then, one maneh of incense for

each day of the solar year, the three manehs which remained were again pounded, and used by the high priest on the day of atonement (<scripRef passage="Leviticus 16:12" />). A store of it was constantly kept in the Temple (Joseph. *War, 6,* 8, 3). The further directions are that this precious compound should be made or broken up into minute particles, and that it should be deposited, as a very holy thing, in the tabernacle "before the testimony" (or ark). As the ingredients are so minutely specified, there was nothing to prevent wealthy persons from having a similar perfume for private use: this, therefore, was forbidden under pain of excommunication: "Ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people" (ver. 37, 38). So in some part of India, according to Michaelis *(Mosaische Recht,* art. 249), it was considered high treason for any person to make use of the best sort of *calcambak,* which was for the service of the king alone. The word which describes the various ingredients as being "tempered together" literally means *salted (*חלמ *memulnlach).* — The Chaldee and Greek versions, however, have set the example of rendering it by *mixed* or *tempered,* as if their idea was that the different ingredients were to be mixed together. just as salt is mixed with any substance over which it is sprinkled. Ainsworth contends for the literal meaning, inasmuch as the law (<scripRef passage="Leviticus 2:13" />) expressly says, "With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt." In support of this he cites Maimonides, who affirms that there was not anything offered on the altar without salt, except the wine of the drink offering, and the blood, and the wood; and of the incense he says, still more expressly, that "they added to it a cab of salt." In accordance with this, it is supposed, our Savior says. "Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (<scripRef passage="Mark 9:49" />). Ainsworth further remarks: "If our speech is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt, as the apostle teaches (<scripRef passage="Colossians 4:6" />), how much more should our incense, our prayers unto God, be therewith seasoned!" It is difficult, however, to see how so anomalous a substance as salt could well be combined in the preparation; and if it was used, as we incline to think that it was, it was probably added in the act of offering. *SEE SALT*. The expression דבבדבא *(bad bebad),* <scripRef passage="Exodus 30:34" />, is interpreted by the Chaldee "weight by weight," that is, an equal weight of each (comp. Jarchi, ad loc.); and this rendering is adopted by our version. Others, however, and among them Aben-Ezra and Maimonides, consider it as signifying that each of the spices was separately prepared, and that all were afterwards mixed.

2. Aaron, as high-priest, was originally appointed to offer incense, but in the daily service of the second Temple the office devolved upon the inferior priests, from among whom one was chosen by lot (Mishna, *oma, 2,* 4; <42109>Luke 1:9) each morning and evening (Abarbanel, *On* <23101>*Leviticus 10:*1). A peculiar blessing was supposed to be attached to this service, and in order that all might share in it, the lot was cast among those who were "new to the incense," if any remained (Mishna, *Yoma,* 1. c.; Bartenora, *On Tamid,* 5, 2). Uzziah was punished for his presumption in attempting to infringe the prerogatives of the descendants of Aaron, who were consecrated to burn incense (<14616>2 Chronicles 26:16-21; Joseph. *Ant. 9,* 10, 4). The officiating priest appointed another, whose office it was to take the fire from the brazen altar. According to Maimonides *(Tamid Unus,* 1', 8; 3:5), this fire was taken from the second pile, which was over against the S.E. corner of the altar of burnt offering, and was of fig-tree wood. A silver shovel (hT;j]mi*machtah)* was first filled with the live coals, and afterwards emptied into a golden one, smaller than the former, so that some of the coals were spilled (Mishna, *Tamid,* 5, 5; *Yoma; 4,* 4; comp. <66805>Revelation 8:5). Another priest cleared the golden altar from the cinders which had been left at the previous offering of incense (Mishna, *Tamid, 3,* 6, 9; 6:1).

The times of offering incense were specified in the instructions first given to Moses (<23007>Exodus 30:7, 8). The morning incense was offered when the lamps were trimmed in the holy place, and before the sacrifice, when the watchman set for the purpose announced the break of day (Mishna, Yoma, 3:1, 5). When the lamps were lighted "between the evenings," after the evening sacrifice and before the drink-offerings were offered, incense was again burnt on the golden altar which "belonged to the oracle" (<11622>1 Kings 6:22), and stood before the veil which separated the holy place from the Holy of Holies, the throne of God (Rev. 8:4; Philo, *De Anim. ison.* §3).

When the priest entered the holy place with the incense, all the people were removed from the Temple, and from between the porch and the altar (Maimonides, *Tamid Ulmus, 3,* 3; compare <42010>Luke 1:10. The incense was then brought from the house of' Atines in a large vessel of gold called ãKi *(caph),* in which was a phial (ÿzb, *bazik,* properly *"a salver")* containing the incense (Mishna, *Tamid,* 5, 4). The assistant priests who attended to the lamps, "he clearing of the golden altar from the cinders, and the fetching fire from the altar of burnt-offering, performed their offices singly,

bowed towards the ark of the covenant, and left the holy place before the priest, whose lot it was to offer incense, entered. Profound silence was observed among the congregation who were praying without (comp. <66801>Revelation 8:1), and at a signal from the prefect the priest cast the incense on the fire (Mishna, *Tamid, 6,* 3), and, bowing reverently towards the Holy of Holies, retired slowly backwards, not prolonging his prayer that he might not alarm the congregation, or cause them to fear that he had been struck dead for offering unworthily (<03163>Leviticus 16:13; <42121>Luke 1:21; Mishna, *Yoma,* 5, 1). When he came out he pronounced the blessing in <04624>Numbers 6:24-26, the "magrephah" sounded, and the Levites burst forth into song, accompanied by the full swell of the Temple music, the sound of which, say the Rabbins, could be heard as far as Jericho (Mishna, *Tamid, 3:*8). It is possible that this may be alluded to in <66805>Revelation 8:5. The priest then emptied the censer in a clean place, and hung it on one of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering. *SEE CENSER*.

On the day of atonement the service was different. The high-priest, after sacrificing the bullock as a sin-offering for himself and his family, took incense in his left hand, and a golden shovel filled with live coals from the west side of the brazen altar (Jarchi, *On <03162>Leviticus 16:*12) in his right, and went into the Holy of Holies. He then placed the shovel upon the ark between the two bars. In the second Temple, where there was no ark, a stone was substituted. Then, sprinkling the incense upon the coals, he stayed till the house was filled with smoke, and, walking slowly backwards, came without the veil, where he prayed for a short time (Maimonides, *Yom hakkippur,* quoted by Ainsworth, *On Leviticus* 16; Outram, *De Sacrificiis,* 1, 8, § 11). *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF*.

3. With regard to the symbolical meaning of incense, opinions have been many and widely different. While Maimonides regarded it merely as a perfume designed to counteract the effluvia arising from the beasts which were slaughtered for the daily sacrifice, other interpreters have allowed their imaginations to run riot, and vied with the wildest speculations of the Midrashim. Phile *(Quis rer. div. haer. sit. §* 41, p. 501) conceives the stacte and onycha to be symbolical of water and earth; galbanum and frankincense of air and fire. Josephus, following the traditions of his time, believed that the ingredients of the incense were chosen from the products of the. sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the earth, to indicate that all things are of God and for God *(War,* 5, 5, 5). As the Temple or tabernacle was the palace of Jehovah, the theocratic king of Israel, and the

ark of the, covenant his throne, so the incense, in the opinion of. some, corresponded to the perfumes in which the luxurious monarchs of the East delighted. It may mean all this, but it must mean much more. Grotius, on <scripRef passage="Exodus 30:1" />Exodus 30:1, says the mystical signification is “sursum habenda corda.” Cornelius a Lapide, on <scripRef passage="Exodus 30:34" />Exodus 30:34, considers it as an apt emblem of propitiation, and finds a symbolical meaning in the several ingredients. Fairbairn *(Typology of Scripture,* 2, 320), with many others, looks upon prayer as the reality of which incense is the symbol, founding his conclusion upon <scripRef passage="Psalm 141:2" />Psalm 141:2; <scripRef passage="Revelation 5:8; 8:3, 4" />Revelation 5:8; 8:3, 4. Bahr *(Sym. d. Mos. Cult.* vol. 1, c. 6:§ 4) opposes this view of the subject of the ground that the chief thing in offering incense is not the producing of the smoke, which presses like prayer towards: heaven, but the spreading of the fragrance. His own exposition may be summed up as fallows. Prayer, among all Oriental nations, signifies calling upon the name of God. The oldest prayers consisted in the mere enumeration of the several titles of God. The Scripture places incense in close relationship to prayer, so that offering incense is synonymous with worship. Hence incense itself is a symbol of the name of God. The ingredients of the incense correspond severally to the perfections of God, though it is impossible to decide to which of the four names of God each belongs. Perhaps stacte corresponds to hwhy *(Jehovah),* onycha to µyhla *(Elohimn),* galbanum to yji *(chai),* and frankincense to v/dq; *(kadosh).* Such is Bahr’s exposition of the symbolism of incense, rather ingenious than logical. Looking upon incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritual, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ. In <scripRef passage="Revelation 8:3, 4" />Revelation 8:3, 4, the incense is spoken of as something distinct from, though offered with, the prayers of all the saints (comp. <scripRef passage="Luke 1:10" />Luke 1:10); and in <scripRef passage="Revelation 5:3" />Revelation 5:3 it is the golden vials, and not the odors or incense, which are said to be the prayers of saints. <scripRef passage="Psalm 141:2" />Psalm 141:2, at first sight, appears to militate against this conclusion; but if it be argued from this passage that incense is an emblem of prayer, it must also be allowed that the evening sacrifice has the same symbolical meaning. *SEE PERFUME*.

Incense, Christian

The use of incense in worship was not carried over from the Jewish to the Christian Church; yet it is still employed, with other superstitious usages, in the Romish Church, and in some of the Oriental churches. The incense

used is either the resinous gum *olibanum*, brought from Arabia or the East Indies. or an imitation of it manufactured by the chemists. The latter is most common now.

1. It is certain that incense was not used in the-first three ages of the Christian Church. Indeed the use of it was a mark of paganism, as is fully evinced by the enactments of the Christian emperors against its use. “The very places or houses where it could be proved to have been done were, by a law of Theodosius, confiscated by the government” (comp. Gothof, *De Statu Pagan. sub. Christ. Imper.* leg. 12). A few grains of incense thrown by a devotee upon a pagan altar constituted an act of worship. The apologists for Christianity, Arnobius *(Contra Gent.* 2), Tertullian *(Apol.* 30), and Lactantius (1, 20), make distinct and separate statements that “Christians do not burn incense” like pagans. It appears likely that the use of incense was first begun in order to purify the air of the unwholesome chambers, caverns, etc., in which Christians were compelled to worship, just as candles were employed necessarily, even by day, in subterranean places. Even Romanist writers (e.g. Claude de Vert) assert this. Cardinal Bona, indeed *(Res Liturgic.* 1, 25), seeks to derive the use of incense in worship from apostolical times, but his argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Rev. 5, 8: “Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints;” as if anything could be argued, for practical worship, from the highly symbolical language of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that period it became common, in the Latin Church. Its *mystical representation* is, according to Roman Catholic authorities,

(1) contrition (Ecclesiastes 14);

(2) the preaching of the Gospel (2 Corinthians 2:14);

(3) the prayers of the faithful (Psalm 141:2; Revelation 5:8-24);

(4) the virtue of saints (Song of Solomon 3:6).

See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also, minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in

its use. Thus the Cistercians used incense only on festivals, while the Benedictines and Clugniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The *censer* (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When longer, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass. the incense is thrown over the altar and over the ‘sacrificing priests” by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the homage, typified by the incense, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to “incensing” the pope is, that “when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel.” No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this odd rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff’s nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed the censer is thrown in the direction of the other priests present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as “human vanity creeps in everywhere” (Bergier, s.v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before ‘he mass of the people. See Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie.* 2, 423; Migne, *Dict. de Liturgie,* p. 535 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book 8:ch. 6:§ 21; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity, 21:*12; Walcott. *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 325 sq.; Adolphus, *Compendium Theologicum*, p.74; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra*, 1, 527; Middleton, *Letter from Rome,* p. 15; Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* p. 599 sq.; Siegel, *Handb. der Christl. — Kirchl. Alterthümer*, 2, 441 sq. *SEE CENSER*.

Incest

(Lat. *in*, not; *castus*, chaste), the crime of sexual commerce with a person within the degrees forbidden by the (Levitical) law (see Trier, *De legibus Mo; saicis de incestu,* Frcft. a. Oder, 1726). *SEE AFFINITY CONSANGUINITY*. “An instinct almost innate and universal,” says Gibbon *(Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 4*, 351), “appears to prohibit the incestuous commerce of parents and children in the infinite series of ascending and descending generations. Concerning the oblique and collateral branches, nature is indifferent, reason mute, and custom various

and arbitrary. In Egypt, the marriage of brothers and sisters was admitted without scruple or exception; a Spartan might espouse the daughter of his father, an Athenian that of his mother; and the nuptials of an uncle with his niece were applauded at Athens as a happy union of the dearest relations. The profane lawgivers of Rome were never tempted by interest or superstition to multiply the forbidden degrees; but they inflexibly condemned the marriage of sisters and brothers, hesitated whether first cousins should be touched by the same interdict, revered the parental character of aunts and uncles, and treated affinity and adoption as a just imitation of the ties of blood. According to the proud maxims of the republic, a legal marriage could only be contracted by free citizens; an honorable, at least an ingenuous birth, was required for the spouse of a senator; but the blood of kings could never mingle in legitimate nuptials with the blood of a Roman; and the name of 'stranger' degraded Cleopatra and Berenice to live the *concubines* of Mark Antony and Titus." Vortigern, king of South Britain, equaled, or, rather, excelled the Egyptians and Persians in wickedness by marrying his own daughter. The queen of Portugal was married to her uncle and the prince of Brazil, the son of that incestuous marriage, wedded his aunt. But they had dispensations for these unnatural marriages from *his holiness.* "In order," says Paley, "to preserve chastity in families, and between persons of different sexes brought up and living together in a state of unreserved intimacy, it is necessary, by every method possible, to inculcate an abhorrence of incestuous conjunctions; which abhorrence can only be upheld by the absolute reprobation of *all* commerce of the sexes between near relations. Upon this principle the *marriage,* as well as other cohabitation of brothers and sisters of lineal kindred, and of all who usually live in the same family, may be said to be forbidden by the law of nature. Restrictions which extend to remoter degrees of kindred than what this reason makes it necessary to prohibit from intermarriage are founded in the authority of the positive law which ordains them, and can only be justified by their tendency to diffuse wealth, to connect families, or to promote some political advantage." The Roman law calls incestuous connection *Incestus juris gentiun,* while it designates as *Incestus juris civilis* the intercourse between other members of the families which it considers within the forbidden degrees. The principal law against incest, however, is the *Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* of Augustus. Children born of incest *(liberi incestuosi)* are by it bastardized. The canon law extended the forbidden degrees very far thus giving a more extended signification to the appellation of incest. By it a distinction was

made between the *Incestusjuris diviini*, relating to such degrees of relationship as were already condemned by the Mosaic law, and the *Incestus juris hunmani*, relating only to such degrees within which marriage is forbidden by ecclesiastical laws. But as in the latter case dispensations can, in the Romish Church, always be obtained, this form of incest is merely considered an offense against the laws of the Church. The penal statute of Charles V concerning incest is based on the Roman law, but includes also cohabitation with a daughter-in-law, a stepdaughter, and a mother-in-law. Consequently incest, properly so called, can only take place between ascendants and descendants, brothers and sisters, parents-in-law and children-in-law, stepparents and step-children. Prosecution for incest, however, is legal only in cases where persons have had sexual intercourse without marriage; it is inapplicable where marriage has been contracted in good faith, and only afterwards the contractors become aware of their connection being incestuous. Modern law, which in the main is based on the Levitical, and from which the rule of the Roman law differs very little, prohibits marriage between relations within *three* degrees of kindred; computing the generations not from, but through the common ancestor, and accounting affinity the same as consanguinity. The issue, however, of such marriages are not bastardized unless the parents be divorced during their lifetime. Penalties are enacted for incest and unchastity varying from simple imprisonment to hard labor for a term of five or six years. Sexual intercourse between parties in different degrees of the collateral lines is in many cases considered only as punishable by the police regulations. The ascendants are generally punished more severely than the descendants. The modern Jews permit the marriage of cousins, and even of the uncle by a niece. See Pierer, *Universal Lexikon, 8,* 841; Paley, *Moral Philosophy,* 1, 316 sq.; Buck, *Theological Dictionary, s.v.*

Incest, Spiritual

an ideal crime committed between two persons who have a spiritual alliance, by means of baptism or confirmation. This ridiculous fancy was made use of as an instrument of great tyranny in times when the power of the pope was unlimited, even queens being sometimes divorced upon this pretence. *Incest spiritual* is also understood of a vicar or other beneficiary who holds two benefices, one whereof depends upon the collation of the other. Such spiritual incest renders both the one and the other of these benefices vacant. — Henderson’s Buck.

Inchantment

SEE ENCHANTMENT.

Inchofer, Melchior

a German Jesuit, was born at Vienna or at GCim (Hungary) in 1584. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1607, and studied philosophy, mathematics, and theology at Messina, where he afterwards instructed. In 1636 he went to Rome, and became a member of the Congregation of the Index and of the Holy Office, but was called from thence to the college at Macerata in 1646. He died in 1648 at Milan. His principal works are *Epistolce B. Marice ad Messanenses veritas vizdicata (1629): — Historia sacrce Latiziitatis* (1636): — *Annales ecclesiastici regni Hungarice* (1644) (incomplete). Under the pseudonyme of Eugenius Lavande Ninevensis he defended his order and its educational system against the attacks of Scioppius (Schopp), in refutation of whom he wrote several pamphlets (16381641). He was also believed to be the author of the *Monarchia Solipsorumn* (Venice, 1652; French translation, Amst. 1722, 12mo); but Oudin proved, in an edition of Niceron, that this work is the production of count Scotti of Piacema, who entered the order in 1616, but became discontented, and retired from it in 1645. See Niceron, *Mem pour servir,* etc., 35, 322-346; 39, 165-280; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 648; Bayle, *Hist. Dict. 3:*563 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 405.

Incineratio

is a name in the Romish Church for the consecration of a certain quantity of ashes, and the sprinkling of them over the heads of the officiating clergy and the worshipping congregation, with the following admonition, pronounced by the officiating priest: ‘Memento quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris” (Remember that dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return). The custom is believed to have originated with Gregory the Great (towards the close of the 6th century), but it was not fully established till towards the end of the 12th century, when it received the sanction of pope Celestine III. Gregory the Great is in all probability also the founder of Ash-Wednesday, which is supposed to derive its name from the above ceremonial service generally performed on that day. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* p. 667; Siegel, *Handb. d. Christ. Kirchl. Alterth.* 1, 141; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 324. *SEE ASHES*; *SEE ASH-WEDNESDAY*.

Incipientes

(beginners) is one of the names by which the catechumens of the early Christian Church were called. *SEE CATECHUMENS*.

Inclination

is the propensity of the mind to any particular object or action; a kind of bias by which it is carried towards certain actions previous to the exercise of thought and reasoning about the nature and consequences of them. Inclinations are of two kinds, natural or acquired.

1. *Natural* are such as we often see in children, who from their earliest years differ in their tempers and dispositions. Of one we may say he is naturally revengeful; of another, that he is patient and forgiving.

2. *Acquired* inclinations are such as are super induced by custom, which are called habits, and these are either good or evil. *SEE HABIT*; *SEE WILL*.

Incluse

SEE ANACHORETS.

In Caena Domini

(Lat. *at the Lord's Supper*, the opening words of the document) is the name of a celebrated papal bull. "It is not, as other bulls, the work of a single pope, but, with additions and modifications at various times, dates back from the Middle Ages; some writers tracing it to Martin V, others to Clement V, and some to Boniface VIII. Its present form, however, it received from the popes Julius II and Paul III, and, finally, from Urban VIII, in 1627, from that time it continued for a century and a half to be published annually on Holy Thursday," whence its name; afterwards Easter Monday was substituted. The contents of this bull have been a fertile subject of controversy. It may be briefly described as a summary of ecclesiastical censures, especially against all heretical sects, which are cursed in it by their several designations, their excommunication renewed, and the same punishment threatened to all who should be guilty of schism, sacrilege, usurpation of the rights of the Church or of the pope, forcible and unlawful seizure of Church property, personal violence against ecclesiastics, unlawful interruption of the free intercourse of the faithful

with Rome, etc. The bull, however, although, as indicated, mainly dealing with offences against the Church, also denounces, under similar censures, the crimes of piracy, plunder of shipwrecked goods, forgery, etc. This bill, being regarded by most of the crowned heads of Europe as an infringement of their rights, was in the 17th century opposed by nearly all the courts, even the most Roman Catholic; and at length, in 1770, according to some authorities (e.g. Hase, *History of the Christian Church),* Clement XIV discontinued its publication. Janus *(Pope and Council,* p. 387), however, says that it is still treated in the Roman tribunals as having legal force, and, according to the accounts of some eminent travelers who have visited Rome, it appears that the sentence of excommunication is still read, though in a more simple form. Eliza von der Recke *(Tagebuch einer Reise durch einen Theil Dezutschlands u. d. Italien,* Berlin, 1817, 4:95), under date of April 6, 1806, relates that after the pope had blessed the people from the balcony of the church of St. Peter, "he read out a paper, then tore it, and threw the fragments down among the people. A great tumult then arose, every one 'striving to secure a piece of the paper, but I do not know for what purpose, for, as I was told, the paper contained nothing but the form of excommunication always pronounced on this occasion against all who are not Romanists. This concluded the festival." This is confirmed by what chancellor. Gottling, of Jena, relates as having seen in his journey; in 828 (in Rohr, *Kritische Predigerbibliothek, 11,* 379 sq.). It thus seems proved that the bull itself, whose § 21 says: "Volentes prasentes nostros processus ac omnia et quaecunque his literis contenta, quousque alii huiusmodi processus a Nobis ant Romano-Pontifice pro tempore existente fiant aut publicentur, durare suosque effectus omnino sortiri," is not completely abolished yet. No pope has so far substituted a new bull for the old, and its principles concerning the cases reserved for the pope are yet in full force. In the *Historisch-politische Blutter* of Phillips and Gorres (Munich, 1847, vol. 21) we find it stated that *"In foro conscientice,* the bull is only valid yet in so far as its stipulations have not in other acts been altered by the Church herself." Its efficiency *in foro externo,* so much desired by Rome, is everywhere opposed in self-defense by the civil powers. For the special history of this bull, and proofs of its present validity in the Romish Church, see Biber, *Bull in Comna Domini,* transl. (Lond. 1848); Biber, *Papal Diplomacy and the Bull in Ccena Dominsi* (Lond. 1848); Lebret, *Geschichte d. Bulle* (Lpz. 1768, 4 vols.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 8,* 843; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 530; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation, 3:*266, 387; Janus, *Pope and Council,* p. 384 sq.; cardinal Erskine to Sir

J.C. Hippisley, in *Rep. of Comm. of House of Commons on the Laws regarding-the Regulation of the Roman Cath. subjects* (1816, p. 218). (J. H. W.)

Incommunicableness of God

The divine attributes have been variously divided. One of the divisions sets the attributes of God forth as *communicable* and *incommunicable.* As the former are regarded such attributes as can be imparted from the Creator to the creature. e.g. goodness, holiness, wisdom, etc., and as the latter such are counted as cannot be imparted, as independence, immutability, immensity, and eternity. See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. 2, 1, 183 sq.; 2, 193 sq. See also the article GOD *SEE GOD* (Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of), vol. 3, p. 907 sq.

Incomprehensibility of God

This is a relative term, and indicates a relation between an object and a faculty; between God and a created understanding: so that the meaning of it is this, that no created understanding can comprehend God; that is, have a perfect and exact knowledge of him, such a knowledge as is adequate to the perfection of the object (1810Job 11:7; Isaiah 4o).

God is incomprehensible,

1. As to the nature of His essence;
2. The excellency of his attributes;
3. The depth of his counsels;
4. The works of his providence;
5. The dispensation of his grace

(4008Ephesians 3:8; 1870Job 37:25; Romans 11). The incomprehensibility of God follows,

1. From his being a spirit endued with perfections greatly superior to our own.

2. There may be (for anything we certainly know) attributes and perfections in God of which we have not the least idea.

3. In those perfections of the divine nature of which we have some idea, there are many things to us inexplicable, and with which, the more

deeply and attentively we think of them, the more we find our thoughts swallowed up, such as his self-existence, eternity, omnipresence, etc.

This should teach us, therefore,

1. To admire and reverence the divine Being (Zechariah 9:17; Nehemiah 9:5);

2. To be humble and modest (Psalm 8:1, 4; Ecclesiastes 5:2, 3; Job 37:19);

3. To be serious in our addresses, and sincere in our behavior towards him. (Caryl, *On* *Job 27:*25; Tillotson, *Sermons,* sermon 156; Abernethy, *Sermons,* vol. 2. nos. 6. 7: Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity,* lecture 59; Martensen, *Dogmatics,* p. 89; Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary, s.v.*) *SEE GOD.*

Incomprehensible

This word, as occurring in the English Prayer-book, is understood, at the present day, in a sense quite different from what was designed when it was first introduced into the formularies. Thus when, in the Athanasian Creed, it is said, “The Father incomprehensible,” etc., the meaning is, “the Father is *(imensus.* i.e.) infinite,” etc.: a Being not to be comprised *(comprehendendus)* within the limits of space.

Inconvertibility

the quality of both natures in Christ, which does not admit of a change of either into the other.

Incorpolitus

a title in monasteries of the priest who has the administration of the convent estates, the collection of interest and other moneys due the monastery, etc.

Incorporation

The *incorporation* of a church benefice consists in its being joined *quoad spiritualia et temporalia* with a spiritual corporation, such, for ‘instance, as a convent or a monastery. We find many instances of such incorporations in the 9th century, and they were most generally the result of efforts to

increase the revenues of the corporations. The modus operandi was to abolish the separate office connected with a benefice, and to give the temporal advantages to the corporation, which also added the spiritual offices connected therewith to its other duties, supplying them with ministerial services. For instance, a regular pastor *(parochus principalis)* was appointed, who committed the care of souls to a vicar appointed by himself, under sanction of the bishop. This vicar then filled the office of *cura animarunm ctualis,* whilst the convent or monastery had but a *cura habitualis.* The canon laws in such cases soon prescribed the appointment of permanent vicars *(vicarii peypetui),* although in many instances, especially in Germany, many convents appointed only temporary vicars, and even entrusted the care of souls to members of their order who did not reside in the parish. Essentially different from these *"pleno jure"* or *"utroque jure"* incorporations were exclusively temporal unions of the revenues of livings with spiritual corporations, which were also often designated as *incorporationes quoad temporalia.* In these cases the income only of the livings went to the convents, together with all the revenues accruing there from, they in exchange undertaking to give to the incumbent minister an adequate support *(portio cosngryua).* The spiritual office, *spiritualia,* remained unaffected by this arrangement, and was filled by the bishop, according to the wishes of the convent. The numerous abuses which were introduced in both these kinds of incorporations were denounced by the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, c. 7, *De reform.).* The council also forbade the union of parish churches with convents, monasteries, hospitals, etc. (Sess. 24, c. 13; Sess. 7, *De reform,.* c. 6). In consequence of the secularization of convents and monasteries, the whole organization has mostly fallen into disuse; the parish administrators are about the only remains of the incorporation system. See Neller, *De juribus parochi primitivi* (in Schmid, *Thesaur. jurs. eccl. 6,* 441 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, 6:*649.

Incorporeality of God

is his being without a body. That God is incorporeal is evident; for,

1. Materiality is incompatible with self-existence, and God, being self-existent, must be incorporeal.

2. If God were corporeal, he could not be present in any part of the world where body is; yet his presence is necessary for the support and motion of body.

3. A body cannot. be in two places at the same time; yet he is everywhere, and fills heaven and earth.

4. A body is to be seen and felt, but God is invisible and impalpable (John 1, 185. See Charnock, *Works,* 1, 117; Gill, *Body of Divinity,* 1, 45, 8vo; Diudiridge, *Lectures on Divinity,* lect. 47. *SEE GOD*).

Incorruptibiles

an extreme sect of Eutycllians (q.v.), who held that the body of Christ was incorruptible, i.e. "that from the time that his body was formed it was not susceptible of any change or alteration; that he was not even subject to innocent passions or appetites, such as hunger or thirst, but that he ate without any occasion both before his death and after his resurrection." *SEE APHTHARTODOCETE*; *SEE MOXOPHYSITES*.

Incorrupticolae

SEE INCORRUPTIBILES.

Incredulity

SEE INFIDELITY; *SEE UNBELIEF*.