

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Incumbent - Izri**

*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**

## Incumbent

a clergyman in the Church of England who is in *present* possession of (*incumbit, is close to, rests upon, as its immediate occupant*) a benefice (Eden). Sir E. Coke, however, says that the title means that the clergyman “in possession of a benefice ought diligently to bend all his study to the care of his church.”

## Indefectibility of the Church

This subject has already been alluded to in the article CHURCH, (3); but Mr. Blunt (*Theol. Cyclop* 1,340) has treated it so much at length that we insert his remarks on this subject, which he treats under the two heads of (1) *Perpetuity*, and (2) *Inerrancy* and *Infallibility*. The former, he argues, frees the Church from failure in succession of members; the latter two free it from failure in holding and declaring the truth. “Both these flow from the constitution and nature of the mystical body of Christ. The Scriptures which speak to this point are John 15; <4165>1 Corinthians 6:15, 19; 12:12; <4023>Ephesians 1:23; 4:12; 5:30; <5018>Colossians 1:18, and cannot be explained away into metaphor. As Christ’s natural body was incorruptible, and yet before the resurrection was liable to human infirmities (<4187>Matthew 8:17), so his mystical body, yet unglorified, is liable in each one of its many members to sin and falling from grace; but nothing can touch the life of the body itself. As also the fullness of the Spirit dwelt in Christ, and Christ was the Truth, so the Spirit, by virtue of whose indwelling the body is one, and one with its Head, guides the Church into all truth.”

**I. Perpetuity of the Church.** — “Plain promises of this are made in <2618>Isaiah 61:8, 9; <2724>Daniel 2:44; <4168>Matthew 16:18; 28; 20; <6146>John 14:16, 17. There are also arguments to be drawn for it from the consideration of God’s counsel and purpose. The consummation of all things is delayed only till God’s servants are sealed (<4658>1 Corinthians 15:28; <4109>Revelation 6:9-11). When faith fails in the earth, the end will be (<4218>Luke 18:8). This is as regards God, in whose work we cannot suppose an interruption. So, too, as regards man. God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. The Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, could not fail without a failure of God’s mercy. So long as there are men capable of salvation (and all men are capable of salvation, since Christ died for all), so long will the Church be

preserved, that to it may be added both οί σωζόμενοι and οί σωθησόμενοι. The promises of God are given to the Church as a whole. Each branch of the Church is on its probation, as is each individual member. And the law of probation, the law of their participation in the promise, is the same: 'He that hath, to him shall be given.' To argue that because each particular church may fail, therefore the whole may fail, is not only a fallacy in logic, but a denial of Christ's power to impart to the whole that which he does not impart to each particular member."

**II. Inerrancy and Infallibility of the Church.** — "The foregoing promises and arguments show that the Church will not fail either by dying out or by apostasy. As the work of the Spirit will not fail in bringing sons to God, so it will never fail in providing that there shall always be a body persevering in the faith according to the election of grace. This is to be considered more particularly as regards truth of doctrine. For this, also, there are promises, e.g. <sup><B163></sup>John 16:13; <sup><B177></sup>1 John 2:27. The spirit which dwells in the Church is likewise declared to be the spirit of knowledge and understanding (<sup><S100></sup>Colossians 1:9; 2:3; 3:10). Less cannot be implied in these words than that the Church shall always have a tenure of the truth sufficient for salvation. They show, further, that any doctrine which can be said to be the deliberately ascertained voice of the Church must be from God, whose Spirit is in the Church. But they cannot be pressed so far as to prove that the Church may not for a time hold such an error as does not directly deny the foundation of faith, or does not directly deny Christ. Even an error, which by logical consequence denies the foundation of faith, is not to be taken as such a denial. The consequence may not be perceived, and if perceived the premises would be at once rejected. The case is doubtless of great improbability, but its possibility must be conceded. When, then, can we say that the voice of the Church is sufficiently ascertained? This leads us on from the inerrancy, or *passive infallibility*, to the *active infallibility*, or declaration of the faith. No actual limits of time can be set for which, if a doctrine has been held, it must be considered as the ascertained decision of the Church. The circumstances of the Church may not be such as to lead to investigation. Ten years in one period may cause more sifting of the truth than a hundred years of another period. It is the condition of the Church militant to be always under trial, sometimes by persecution from the world, sometimes by blasts of contrary doctrine within itself. In different degrees these are blended, and with very different degrees of speed will the truth emerge. The degree of holiness also, and

above all, will regulate the discovery and reception of truth. For knowledge and understanding in spiritual things are the flower and fruit; the plant itself is holiness springing from the root of faith. The certainty, then, of a doctrine enunciated by the Church is a growing certainty, varying in amount with the time the doctrine has been held, the degree of investigation to which it has been subjected, and the degree of holiness in the Church. Thus the decrees of a council which we may believe to be ecumenical can only be known to be the genuine voice of the Church by their *acceptance*. We may agree to the abstract proposition that a truly ecumenical council cannot err; but the proposition is of little practical value at the time of holding a council, for none can prove that the council has not in some respects failed of ecumenicity. The authority of its decisions rests on their acceptance. For the Spirit of God is given to the whole body of the Church; and that can only be known to be the true voice of the Church which is expressed by sufficient deliberation of generation after generation. In this sense the infallibility of the Church is a reasonable doctrine, and one, in fact, which it would be unreasonable for any Christian to disbelieve.”

### Indefectible Grace

is, according to the Calvinists, grace which cannot be lost, or fail of its intended purpose, the salvation of those on whom it is bestowed, i.e. the elect, and is held to be irresistible by the person so elected, thus necessarily securing his salvation. *SEE CALVINISM; SEE ELECTION; SEE GRACE; SEE WILL.*

### Indelible Character

*SEE CHARACTER, INDELIBLE.*

### Indemnity

(Latin *indemnitas*, compensation) is in some churches a pension paid to the bishop in consideration of discharging or indemnifying churches, united or appropriated, from the payment of procurations or by way of recompense for the profits which the bishop would otherwise have received during the time of the vacation of such churches.

### Independence of Churches

“It is an admitted fact, as clearly settled as anything can be by human authority, that the primitive Christians, in the organization of their

assemblies, formed them after the model of the Jewish synagogue .. They disowned the hereditary aristocracy of the Levitical priesthood, and adopted the popular government of the synagogue... Their government was voluntary, elective, free, and administered by rulers or elders elected by the people. The ruler of the synagogue was the moderator of the college of elders, but only *primus inter pares*, holding no official rank above them. The people, as Vitranga (*De Synagoga*, lib. 3:pt. 1, c. 15, p. 828-863) has shown, appointed their own officers to rule over them. They exercised the natural right of freemen to enact and execute their own laws, to admit proselytes, and to exclude at pleasure unworthy members from their communion. Theirs was ‘a democratic form of government,’ and is so described by one of the most able expounders of the constitution of the primitive churches (se Rothe, *Anfange d. Christl. Kirche*, p. 14). Like their prototype, therefore, the primitive churches also embodied the principle of a popular government and of enlightened religious liberty” (Coleman, *Apostol. and Prisnit. Ch.* p. 43 sq.). The reason, however, why the primitive Christians had this peculiar organization, reintroduced in the modern Church by the Congregationalists, and in part also by the Presbyterians, is, that the members of the early Christian Church mostly came from the Jewish Church, and naturally adopted methods of worship, government, etc., to which they were accustomed. But this by no means goes to prove that it was the intention of the early Christians to perpetuate their mode of government, but rather that, engaged as Christ and his disciples had been in founding a Church, needing no other bond than his own person, the mode of government to which they had been accustomed was chosen for the time being, “the disciples not having yet attained to a clear understanding of that call which Christ had already given them by so many intimations to form a Church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy. We are disposed to believe that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a *higher* rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the Church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons” (Neander, *Apostol. Kirche*, 3rd edit. p. 31, 33; comp. p. 179,195; also Rothe, *Anfange*, p. 146 sq.; ~~400~~ Acts 6:1; 11:30). Christ also evidently did make some provision for a government of his Church on earth independent of

Jewish and pagan customs by constituting apostles, who should authoritatively command and teach. (See vol. 2, p. 328 sq.) The churches of the early Christians also, unlike the Jewish, were independent one of the other. History, sacred or profane, relating to this period, records not a single instance in which one church presumed to impose laws of its own upon another. The first traces of associations between several churches, from which councils can be said to have taken their origin, we find in the 2nd century (Coleman, *De Rebus Christ.* sec. 1, § 48). Indications of this original independence are distinctly manifested even after the rise of the episcopacy. Every bishop had the right to form his own liturgy and creed, and to settle at pleasure his own time and mode of celebrating the religious festivals (compare Greiling, *Apostolische Christengemeine*, p. 16). Cyprian strongly asserts the right of every bishop to make laws for his own church. Indeed, it is to this original independence of the churches from each other, to the want of proper authorities to govern them, that Socrates (*Eccles. Hist.* lib. 5, c. 22) ascribes the endless controversies which agitated the Church in the early ages with regard to the observance of certain festivals, especially Easter. See, besides the authorities already cited, Sack, *Comment. ad Theol. linsfit.* p. 141; Bunsen, *Hipolytus and his Age*, 3:246; Dr. Hitchcock, in the *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1867. **SEE EPISCOPACY**, vol. 3:p. 263, 264, 266 (4). (J. H. W.)

## Independency of God

is his existence in and of himself, without depending on any other being. “His being and perfections,” as Dr. Ridgey observes (*Body of Divinity*, p. 7), “are underived, and not communicated to him, as all finite perfections are by him to the creature. This attribute of independency belongs to all his perfections.

- 1.** He is independent as to his knowledge. He doth not receive ideas from any object out of himself, as intelligent creatures do. This is elegantly described by the prophet, <sup><24013></sup>Isaiah 40:13, 14.
- 2.** He is independent in power. As he receives strength from no one, so he doth not act dependently on the will of the creature (<sup><18323></sup>Job 36:23);
- 3.** He is independent as to his holiness, being sin necessarily, and not barely depending on some reasons out of himself inducing him thereto; for it is essential to the divine nature to be infinitely opposite to sin, and therefore to be independently holy.

**4.** He is independent as to his bounty and goodness.

He communicates blessings not by constraint, but according to his sovereign will. Thus he gave being to the world, and all things therein, which was the first instance of bounty and goodness; and this not by restraint, but by his free will: ‘for his pleasure they are and were created.’ In like manner, whatever instances of mercy he extends to miserable creatures, he acts independently and not by force. He shows mercy, because it is his pleasure to do so (<sup><4619></sup>Romans 9:18). That God is independent, let it be further considered,

**1.** That all things depend on his power which brought them into and preserves them in being. If, therefore, all things depend on God, then it would be absurd to say that God depends on anything, for this would be to suppose the cause and effect to be mutually dependent on and derived from each other, which involves a contradiction.

**2.** If God be infinitely above the highest creatures, he cannot depend on any of them, for dependence argues inferiority (<sup><23015></sup>Isaiah 40:15,17).

**3.** If God depend on any creature, he does not exist necessarily; and if so, then he might not have been; for ‘the, same will by which he is supposed to exist might have determined that he should not have existed, which is altogether inconsistent with the idea of a God.

From God’s being independent, we infer,

**1.** That we ought to conclude that the creature cannot lay any obligation on him, or do anything that may tend to make him more happy than he is in himself (<sup><6113></sup>Romans 11:35; <sup><18212></sup>Job 22:2, 3).

**2.** If independency be a divine perfection, then let it not in any instance, or by any consequence, be attributed to the creature: let us conclude that all our springs are in him, and that all we enjoy and hope for is from him, who is the author and finisher of our faith, and the fountain of all our blessedness.” *SEE GOD.*

## Independent Baptists

*SEE BAPTISTS.*

## Independents

a name given to certain bodies of Christians who assert that each Christian congregation is *independent* of all others, and from all ecclesiastical authority except its own. Some writers inaccurately use this name as synonymous with "Congregationalists," forgetting that the latter do not claim the absolute independence of individual character. "The churches of New England are *congregational*. They do not approve the name of 'Independent,' and are abhorrent of such principles of independency as would keep them from giving an account of their matters to neighboring churches regularly demanding it of them" (Mather). *SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS.*

**I.** *History.* — After the reformation of religion in England, the greater body of Protestants adopted the Episcopal form of Church polity, and this was finally, established as the religion of the nation. But the smaller body of Protestants opposed episcopacy on the ground that it too nearly resembled the Roman Catholic form of Church polity, and these so-called Nonconformists (q.v.) came to be stigmatized by the derisive name of *Puritans*, which the followers of Novatian had borne in the third century. To this class (i. c. Nonconformists) belong the Independents, who claim that their system is substantially the same as that of the apostolic churches, which had been corrupted by the tendencies that culminated in papacy, and that traces of dissent from the episcopal power may be found in every age back to the 4th century (see Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*). They are supposed to have originated in England about the year 1581, under the leadership of Robert Brown, bearing thence the name of Brownists (q.v.); but Richard Fitz is generally named as the first pastor of the first Independent church in England (compare Skeats, *History of the Free Churches*, p. 23). The persecution which they were obliged to endure from the Established Church soon necessitated the emigration of these first Independents, and they removed to the Netherlands. Deserted by Brown, who conformed, and became an adherent of the Church of England, they chose as their leader John Robinson, to whom belong the chief merit of a better organization of them. Brown, who, by the persecutions which, as a Nonconformist, he had to endure, had become greatly embittered, had, with hardly less bigotry than his persecutors, declared all other forms of Church government not only as inconsistent. but denounced them in the severest terms, even branding them as *antichristian*. Robinson, however,



while holding his own to be the most apostolical form, counseled recognition of all other forms and Christian fellowship, looking upon charity as the end of the commandments. The names also which they had hitherto borne were now exchanged for that of Independents. Robinson, in his Apology, having affirmed “Coetum quemlibet particularem, esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et *independentem* [quoad alias eccl.] sub ipso Christo.” In 1616, a friend and co-laborer of Robinson, Henry Jacob, returned to the mother country, and organized an Independent Church at London, which has oftentimes, though incorrectly, been termed “the first Independent Church in England” (compare vol. 2, p. 476). “From this, as a nucleus, Independency gradually spread through England, and, in spite of the harsh measures of Laud and the court, came, in the middle of the 17th century, to occupy a dominant place among the powers by which the destinies of England were swayed.”

A prominent place was occupied by the Independents at the Westminster Assembly, they taking an active part in the debates, especially on points of Church order; “debating all things,” says Baillie, “which came within twenty miles of their quarters,” and evidently astonishing the “churchmen” by their “great learning, quickness, and eloquence, together with their great courtesy and discretion in speaking.” Skeats (*History of the Free Churches*, p. 52) asserts that at this “Assembly” the representatives of the Independents, some five or six in number, “prayed to be inducted into the proposed National Church, the conditions being that the power of ordination should be reserved to their own congregations, and that they might be subject, in Church censures, to Parliament, but not to any Presbytery.” As they were unsuccessful in this attempt, however, it is believed that, though few in number, they yet prevented the Presbyterians from accomplishing at least their object, standing “in the breach against the advance of a new State Church, which, if better in many respects than the old (Episcopal); would have been worse in other respects.” But it was only after the accession of Oliver Cromwell (himself an Independent) to the protectorate that the Independents gained the ascendancy, and became “the most powerful and important religious body in England” (compare Murray, *Life of Samuel Rutherford*, chap. 8). The greatest statesmen of England were Independents; the army was Independent in the main; and Independent ministers held appointments as chaplains, or filled leading positions in the universities; among them, most prominently, John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Nye, etc. To strengthen the union among themselves,

an Assembly was decided to be held at the Savoy. Ministers and delegates of more than a hundred congregations thereupon convened, Sept. 29, 1658, and on Oct. 12 (a few weeks before Oliver Cromwell's death) they adopted and issued a confession of faith and discipline, which was named a "Declaration." Of this declaration the following were fundamental propositions: "A particular Church consists of officers and members: the Lord Christ having given to his called ones—united in Church order liberty and power to choose persons fitted by the Holy Ghost to be over them in the Lord. The officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church are pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person unto the office of pastor, teacher, or elder in a church is that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrage of the Church itself, and solemnly set apart by fasting and prayer, with the imposition of hands of the eldership of that Church, if there be any before constituted therein; and of a deacon, that he be chosen by the like suffrage, and set apart by prayer, and the like imposition; and those who are so chosen, though not set apart after that manner, are rightly constituted ministers of Jesus. The work of preaching is not so peculiarly confined to pastors and teachers but that others also, gifted and fitted by the Holy Ghost, and approved by the people, may publicly, ordinarily, and constantly perform it. Ordination alone, without election or consent of the Church, doth not constitute any person a church officer. A church furnished with officers, according to the mind of Christ, hath full power to administer all his ordinances; and where there is want of any one or more officers, those that are in the Church may administer all the ordinances proper to those officers whom they do not possess; but where there are no teaching officers at all, none may administer the seals, nor can the Church authorize any so to do. Whereas the Lord Jesus Christ hath appointed and instituted, as a means of edification, that those who walk not according to the rules and laws appointed by him be censured in his name and authority, every Church hath power in itself to exercise and execute all those censures appointed by him. The censures appointed by Christ are admonition and excommunication; and whereas some offences may be known only to some, those to whom they are so known must first admonish the offender in private; in public offences, and in case of non-amendment upon private admonition, the offence being related to the Church, the offender is to be duly admonished, in the name of Christ, by the whole Church through the elders; and if this censure prevail not for his repentance, then he is to be cast out by excommunication, with the consent of the members." These

particulars respecting a declaration of faith but little known indicate the opinions entertained by the Independents, not only at the time of the Restoration, but, with some modification, afterwards; and here it may be added that if, in the theory of Presbyterianism, the ministry, as to the order of existence, precedes the Church, in the theory of Congregationalism, the Church, in that same order, precedes the minister; and in this significant fact may be found a key to some important differences between the two systems. Besides those rules which had reference to the internal order of the churches, there were these three relative to their dimensions, their co-operation, and the catholicity of their fellowship. “For the avoiding of differences, for the greater solemnity in the celebration of ordinances, and for the larger usefulness of the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost, saints, living within such distances that they can conveniently assemble for divine worship, ought rather to join in one Church for their mutual strengthening and edification than to set up many distinct societies. In cases of difficulties or differences, it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches holding communion together do, by their managers, meet in a synod or council to consider and give advice; howbeit, these synods are not entrusted with ‘any Church power, properly so called, or with any jurisdiction over the churches. Such reforming churches as consist of persons sound in the faith, and of conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to refuse the communion of each other, so far as may consist with their own principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same rules of Church order.”

The conclusions at the Savoy meeting were not ecclesiastical canons, but simply united opinions. They had no binding force. They aspired to no higher character than that of counsel and advice. Lest this declaration should endanger their principles. the assembly took the precaution not to invest it with binding symbolical authority; and, to guard against the possibility of hierarchical schemes, they further enacted that no one should be ordained without having a call to some particular congregation. Similar precautions were also taken by them against all possible civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs, except cases in which Christian societies had laid themselves open to investigation by the civil authorities for the encouragement of civil disturbances (comp. art. *SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS*, vol. 2, p. 480, II, 2). After the restoration of Charles II in 1660, and the re-establishment of episcopacy, the Independents, like all other nonconforming “sects,” suffered from illiberal

enactments, especially from the “Act of Uniformity,” which was passed in 1662. “Independents retired into obscurity for a while after the Restoration. The doors of buildings where they had been wont to assemble were nailed up, the pastors were driven out, flocks were scattered, the administration of ordinances could not take place, and meetings could not be held, and communities which had been prosperous under the Commonwealth diminished in number” (Stoughton, *Eccles. History of England [Church of the Restoration]*, 2, 164). The Act of Uniformity, however, was the most severe of all enactments against dissenters. Some 2000 of the ablest and best of England’s clergy were forced to leave the Church. “They included Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and not a few whom it would be difficult to reduce entirely under any of those denominations; both Calvinists and Arminians, with other divines scarcely belonging to either of those schools. In point of learning, eloquence, reasoning, and imagination the men varied; but under all their peculiarities lay a common faith of no ordinary character, a faith of that rare kind which makes the confessor. They believed in God, in Christ, in truth, in heaven; and in the controversy which they carried on they regarded themselves as fighting for a divine cause... They believed that they were acting in the defense of the Gospel. A strong evangelical faith upheld their ecclesiastical opinions like the everlasting rocks which form the ribs and backbone of this grand old world. The Church of England suffered no small loss when she lost such men” (Stoughton). Yet, in spite of these persecutions, the Independents still continued to subsist until, in 1688, the Revolution, made in 1689 the “Act of Toleration,” finally restored to them the enjoyment of liberty of worship.

Shortly after the publication of the Act of Toleration, efforts were made to bring about a union between the Presbyterians and the Independents (who by this time generally styled themselves Congregationalists), and in 1691 heads of agreement were drawn up (compare Mosheim, *Eccl. list.* 5, 361-363). But “within a year from the formation of the union two discussions on points of doctrine and order arose. The first of these was excited by a Congregational minister holding high Calvinistic or rather Antinomian opinions, believing and preaching that repentance is not necessary to salvation, that the elect are always without sin and always without “spot before God.” The controversy which this course provoked “threw eleven counties into disorder, and before a year had passed away the Congregationalists had begun to be weaned from the union” (Skeats;

comp. also our article on *SEE HOWE, JOHN* ). From the position which the Independents assumed, it is curious to notice “that the Presbyterians, at this time, were more moderate Calvinists than the Congregationalists, and that the epithet of ‘Baxterians’ was not inappropriately applied to them; but as Baxterianism included the articles of the Church of England, and the confessions of Dort and Savoy, their moderation was certainly limited. What they did not believe was the doctrine of absolute reprobation, held in the sense that persons were condemned irrespective of their character and faith. They did not believe that sinners were pardoned without repentance. They did not believe that the Savior so stood in the sinner’s place that God ever looked upon him as a sinner. The last point was the point most vehemently debated in this controversy. The question was, Is there a change of persons, or only of person, in the redemption; and according as this was answered, and the sense in which the answer was understood, the controversialist was classed as an Arminian, or even Unitarian, on the one side, or as an Antinomian on the other. Mather went so far as to state that believers were as righteous as Christ himself, and the Congregational body supported Mather.”

After the Revolution the Independents greatly increased in numbers and influence, especially during the middle of the last century, under “the extraordinary revival of religious zeal” which the earnest labors of Wesley and Whitefield occasioned. Many converts of these eminent preachers joined the Independents, favoring their views on Church government. Since the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, by which all civil abilities were removed from the Independents, and their right to social equality with their fellow-subjects was legally acknowledged, they have especially prospered, and their accessions have been so great that they have become the largest dissenting body in England except the Wesleyan Methodists. In 1831 a “Congregational Union of England and Wales” was formed, and their “Declaration of Faith, Order, and Discipline” was adopted in 1833. According to the report of 1889 the number of their churches in England, Ireland, and Wales, is given at 4726, of which 294 were vacant. The sittings provide for 1,563,919 persons. The Independents, who have always evinced great interest in education, at present have under their control in England eleven training colleges, with a staff of twenty-six professors. These are,

	Date of Formation	No. of Students
Western College,		

Plymouth	1752	
Rotherhalm College	1756	16
Brecon College	1760	24
Cheshunt College	1768	32
Airedale College, Bradford	1784	39
Hackney College	1796	35
Lancashire College	1806	35
Spring Hill, Birmingham	1838	32
New College, London	1850	32
Cavendish Theological College, Manchester	1860	35
Cong. Institute, Nottingham	1861	22
		50

**II. Doctrines.** — ” In support of their scheme of Congregational churches, the Independents observe that the word **ἐκκλησία**, which we translate ‘*church*,’ is always used in Scripture to signify either a *single congregation*, or the *place* where a single congregation meets. Thus that unlawful assembly at Ephesus, brought together against Paul by the craftsmen, is called **ἐκκλησία**, a *church* (<sup><4492></sup>Acts 19:32, 39, 41). The word, however, is generally applied to a more sacred use, but still it signifies either the *body* assembling, or the *place* in which it assembles. The whole body of the disciples at Corinth is called *the Church*, and spoken of as coming together into *one place* (<sup><4423></sup>1 Corinthians 14:23). The place into which they came together we find likewise called *a church*: ‘When ye come together in the *church*-when ye come together into one place’ (<sup><4118></sup>1 Corinthians 11:18, 20). Wherever there were more congregations than one, there were likewise more *churches* than one. Thus, ‘Let your women keep silence in the *churches*, **ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις** (<sup><4134></sup>1 Corinthians 14:34).. The whole nation of Israel is indeed called a *church*, but it was no more than a single congregation, for it had but one place of public worship, namely, first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. The catholic Church of Christ, his holy nation and kingdom, is likewise a single congregation, having one place of worship, that is, heaven, where all the members assemble by faith and hold communion; and in which, when they shall all be fully gathered together, they will in fact be one glorious assembly.. Accordingly we find it called ‘the general assembly and church

of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.’ Besides these, the Independent can find no other description of a church in the New Testament; not a trace of a diocese or presbytery consisting of several congregations, all subject to one jurisdiction. The number of disciples in Jerusalem was certainly great before they were dispersed by the persecution in which Paul bore so active a part. Yet they are never mentioned as forming distinct assemblies, but as one assembly, meeting with its elders in one place — sometimes in the Temple, sometimes in Solomon’s porch, and sometimes in an upper room. After the dispensation, the disciples who fled from Jerusalem, as they could no longer assemble in one place, are never called a Church by themselves, -or one church, but the *churches* of Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee (<sup><408></sup>Acts 9:31; <sup><402></sup>Galatians 1:22). Hence the Independent concludes that in Jerusalem the words *church* and *congregation* were of the same import; and if such was the case there, where the Gospel was first preached, he thinks we may reasonably expect to find it so in other places. Thus, when Paul, on his journey, calls the elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, he speaks to them as the joint overseers of a single congregation: Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers’ (<sup><408></sup>Acts 20:28). Had the Church at Ephesus consisted of different congregations, united under such a jurisdiction as that of a modern presbytery, it would have been natural to say, Take heed to yourselves, and to the *flocks* over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers;’ but this is a way of speaking of which the Independent finds no in-stance in the whole of the New Testament. The sacred writers, when speaking of all the Christians in a nation or province, never call them the *Church* of such a nation or province, but ‘*the churches* of Galatia’ (<sup><400></sup>Galatians 1:2), ‘*the churches* of Macedonia’ (<sup><400></sup>2 Corinthians 8:1), ‘*the churches* of Asia’ (<sup><416></sup>1 Corinthians 16:19). On the other hand, when speaking of the disciples in a city or town who might ordinarily assemble in one place, they uniformly call them *a Church*; as, ‘the Church of Antioch,’ ‘the Church at Corinth,’ ‘the Church of Ephesus,’ and the like. “*In each of these churches or congregations there were bishops, sometimes called ‘elders,’ and deacons; and in every church there seems to have been more than one elder, and in some a great many, ‘who all labored in word and doctrine.’* Thus we read (<sup><442></sup>Acts 14:23) of Paul and Barnabas ordaining elders (to be bishops and deacons) in every church; and (<sup><407></sup>Acts 20:17) of a company of elders in the Church of Ephesus, who were exhorted to ‘feed the flock, and to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which

the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.’ But of such elders as are found in modern Presbyterian churches, who neither teach nor are fit to teach, the Independent finds no vestige in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest uninspired writers of the Christian Church. The rule or government of this presbytery or eldership in a church is not their own, but Christ’s. They are not lords over God’s heritage, nor can they pretend to more power over the disciples than the apostles possessed. But when the administration of the apostles in the Church of Jerusalem and other churches where they acted as elders, is inquired into by an Independent, it does not appear to him that they did anything of common concern to the Church without the consent of the multitude; nay, it seems they thought it necessary to judge and determine in discipline, in presence of the whole Church (~~401~~Acts 6:1-6; 15:22; ~~418~~1 Corinthians 5:3, 4, 5). Excommunication and absolution were in the power of the Church at Corinth and not of the elders as distinguished from the congregation (1 Corinthians 5; 2 Corinthians 11). The apostle, indeed, speaks of his delivering some unto Satan (~~542~~1 Timothy 1:20); but it is by no means clear that he did it by himself, and not after the manner pointed out in ~~418~~1 Corinthians 5:4, 5; even as it does not appear, from his saying, in one epistle, ‘that the gift was given unto Timothy by-putting on of *his* hands,’ that this was not done in the *presbytery* of a Church, as in the other epistle we find it actually was the trying and judging of false apostles was a matter of the first importance but it was done by the elders with the flock at Ephesus (~~418~~Revelation 2:2; ~~418~~Acts 20:28); and that whole flock did, in the days of Ignatius, all partake of the Lord’s Supper, and pray together in one place. Even the power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Savior conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the Church. ‘If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the *Church*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,’ etc. (~~418~~Matthew 18:15-48). It is not said, if he shall neglect to hear the one or two, tell it to the elders of the Church; far less can it be meant that the offended person shall tell the cause of his offence to all the disciples of a presbytery or diocese consisting of many congregations. But he is required to tell it to that particular Church or congregation to which they both



belong; and the sentence of that assembly, pronounced by its elders, is in a very solemn manner declared to be final, from which there lies no appeal to any jurisdiction on earth.

“With respect to the constituting of elders in any Church or congregation, the Independent reasons in the following manner: The officers of Christ’s appointment were either ordinary and permanent in the Church, or they were extraordinary, and peculiar to the planting of Christianity. The extraordinary were those who were employed in laying the plan of the Gospel churches, and in publishing the New-Testament revelation. Such were the apostles, the chosen witnesses of our Savior’s resurrection; such were the prophets, inspired by the Holy Ghost for explaining infallibly the Old Testament by the things written in the New; and such were the evangelists, the apostles’ ministers. These can be succeeded by none in what was peculiar to them, because their work was completed by themselves. But they are succeeded in all that was not peculiar to them by bishops and deacons, the only two ordinary and permanent orders of ministers in the Church. We have already seen that it belongs to the office of a bishop to feed the flock of Christ. The only question to be settled, then, is, How men are ordinarily called to that office? for about the office of the deacon there is little or no dispute. No man can now pretend to be so called of God to the ministry of the Word as were the apostles and other inspired elders, whom he chose to be the publishers of his revealed truth, and to whose mission he bore witness in an extraordinary manner. But what the apostles were to those who had the divine oracles from their mouths, that their writings are to us; and therefore, as no man can lawfully pretend to a call from God to make any addition to those writings, so neither can any man pretend to be lawfully called to the ministry of the Word already written, but in the manner which that word directs. Now there is nothing of which the New Testament speaks more clearly than of the characters of those who should exercise the office of bishop in the Church, and of the actual exercise of that office. The former are graphically drawn in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and the latter is minutely described in Paul’s discourse to the Ephesian elders, in Peter’s exhortation to elders, and our Lord’s commission to those ministers with whom he promised to be always present, even unto the end of the world. It is not competent for any man or body of men to add to or take from the description of a Gospel minister given in these places, so as to insist upon the necessity of any qualification which is not there mentioned, or to

dispense with any qualification as needless which is there required. Neither has Jesus Christ, the only legislator to the Church, given to any ministers or people any power or right whatever to call, send, elect, or ordain to that office any person who is not qualified according to the description given in his law; nor has he given any power or right to reject the least of them who are so qualified, and who desire the office of a bishop or elder. Let a man have hands laid upon him by such as could prove an uninterrupted descent by imposition of hands from the apostles, let him be set apart to that office by a company of ministers themselves the most conformable to the Scripture character, and let him be chosen by the most holy people on earth, yet, if he answer not the New Testament description of a minister, he is not called of God to that office, and is no minister of Christ, but is indeed running unsest. No form of ordination can pretend to such clear foundation in the New Testament as the description of the persons who should be elders of the Church; and the laying on of hands is of small importance in the mission of a minister of Christ; for now, when the power of miracles has ceased, it is obvious that such a rite, by whomsoever performed, can convey no powers, whether ordinary or extraordinary. Indeed, it appears to have been sometimes used, even in the apostolic age, without any such intention. When Paul and Barnabas were separated to the particular employment of going out to the Gentiles, the prophets and teachers at Antioch 'prayed, and laid their hands on them.' But did this ceremony confer upon the apostles any new power or authority to act as ministers of Christ? Did the imposition of hands make those shining lights of the Gospel one whit better qualified than they were before to convert and baptize the nations, to feed the flock of God, to teach, rebuke, or exhort, with all longsuffering and patience? It cannot be pretended that there was any special virtue in this ceremony. Paul and Barnabas had undoubtedly received the Holy Ghost before they came to Antioch; and, as they were apostles, they were of course authorized to discharge all the functions of the inferiors and ordinary ministers of the Gospel. As in this instance, however, the imposition of hands appears to have been a mark of recognition of the parties as qualified for the work to which they were appointed, so Independents usually impose the hands of the bishops with the same intent. In a word, whoever in his life and conversation is conformable to the character which the inspired writers give of a bishop, and is likewise qualified by his 'mightiness in the Scripture' to discharge the duties of that office, is fully authorized to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, to teach, and exhort, and rebuke, with all

long-suffering, and doctrine, and has all the call and mission which the Lord now gives to any man; while he who wants the qualifications mentioned has not God's call, whatever he may have, nor any authority to preach the Gospel of Christ, or to dispense the ordinances of his religion. From this view of the Independent principles, which is faithfully taken from their own writers, it appears that, according to them, even the election of a congregation confers upon the individual whom they may choose for their pastor no new powers, but only creates a new relation between him and a particular flock, giving him an exclusive right, either — by himself or in conjunction with other pastors constituted in the same manner, to exercise among them that authority which he derives immediately from Christ, and which, in a greater or less degree, is possessed by every sincere Christian according to his gifts and abilities" (*Encyclop. Britannica*, 12, 370-372).

**III. Scottish, or New Independents.** — In Scotland Independency originated with John Glas (q.v.). The Baptists there, as elsewhere, are Independents. The regular Congregationalists are also numerous. *SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS*. Apart from these, there is a body called "New Independents." "In December, 1797, Robert Haldane (q.v.) formed a 'Society for Propagating the Gospel at Rome.' The object of this society was to send forth men to preach the Gospel in those parts of Scotland where they conceived that this blessing was not enjoyed in its purity, or where it was not regularly dispensed. Adopting the opinion that it is the duty of every Christian who knows the Gospel, and is duly qualified, to preach it to his fellow-sinners, James Haldane, brother of Robert, Mr. Aikman, and others, traveled through the greater part of Scotland, and preached. In a short time the Messrs. Haldane separated from the Church of Scotland, and soon after two other ministers of the National Church, Innes and Ewing, resigned their charges, and united with the Haldanes and their associates. A distinct society was soon formed, at the head of which were the Haldanes; and hence its members have been also called *Haldanites*, or *Haldanite Independents*. Large places of public worship, denominated *Tabernacles*, were erected, at Robert Haldane's expense, in the principal towns, where the Word of God was declared to numerous assemblies, both by these ministers and others from various denominations in England. At the expense chiefly, if not solely, of Robert Haldane, academies were also formed at Edinburgh, Dundee, and Glasgow, for the education of young men for the work of the ministry, who, when deemed qualified for preaching the Gospel, were to be employed as itinerants,

under the inspection and countenance of the ‘*Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home.*’ Thus a succession of teachers was secured.

“The *doctrines* of the Scottish Independents are Calvinistic, and they reject all articles of faith or creeds of human composition. They say that the Scriptures are a divine and infallible standard, and that consistent Independents dare not adopt any other. They insist that the Scriptures contain a full and complete model and system of doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, and that in them we may find a universal rule for the direction of Christians in their associated state, as well as all necessary instructions for the faith and practice of individuals. They require Scripture for everything, even for such things as could not be contained in Scripture. Hence they reject the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, and receive the Scriptures, and nothing else, as binding in the worship of God. They conceive the Church of Christ, as exhibited in Scripture, to be an association which has no head on earth, and which, as a body, can receive no laws from any one, except from Christ alone. They consider a National Church as ‘the very essence of Antichrist.’ They lay it down as a fundamental principle that a Christian Church ought to consist of believers, or of those who give evidence of their knowing and believing the Gospel, united together on the profession of its truths, and walking agreeably to them. They differ from the more early Independents in admitting Christians of all religious denominations to communicate with them in the Lord’s Supper, provided they have reason to think them real Christians, and in considering all association of ministers, for giving council and advice to the churches in matters of doubt, as unnecessary and unscriptural.

“As to *Church government*, they believe that the apostolical churches, according to the model of which it is their great and professed object to conform, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers, and by no other laws than those written in the Word of God. They say that a true Church of Christ is a society formed for the same purpose as the churches planted by the apostles, and whose constitution is the same as theirs. A deviation in these particulars renders it unworthy of the name. According to them, when the word Church in Scripture, in its religious sense, does not denote a single congregation of saints, it always refers to the whole body or kingdom of Christ, part of which is in heaven and part on earth; which body does not constitute two churches, a visible and an invisible, but one church or family, consisting of different parts. They admit that all churches,

that is, congregations, are connected together as being Christ's subjects, but they insist that they are dependent only on their King, in whose hands the supreme authority rests. While they teach that independent churches have no authority over each other, they allow that they may receive the advantage of each other's opinion on any matter of importance. They conceive that bishop and elder were, in apostolic times, synonymous terms; that the stated officers in all the churches then were elders and deacons, and, of course, that they are the only offices essential to a Church of Christ, and that there is no difference, in any respect, between elder and deacon, except in the offices to which they are appointed. They insist that ordination is not represented in Scripture as *conveying* an office, or giving any person a right to discharge that office; it is only the manner of setting him apart to discharge the duties of his office. It gives him no jurisdiction in any church except in that which appointed him; and as soon as he lays down, or is removed from his office in that church, his ordination is at an end. They contend that there is a distinction of departments in the pastoral office, and that teaching and ruling are different branches of that office. Both elders and deacons are ordained by imposition of hands; and though ordination is part of the elder's province, yet, when churches are newly formed or in other cases of necessity, they allow that the members, who have always the right of election, may ordain church officers for themselves, or, at least, set them apart to their respective offices.

“In *worship*, the New Independents do not differ much from other non-liturgical churches. They read a large but indefinite portion of the Scriptures at each meeting; in many of their chapels they use Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms; and in most of them they stand while singing. They adopt weekly communions; and, as they make no real distinction between clergy and laity, the want or absence of elders and deacons, on any occasion, in any of their chapels, is not thought a sufficient reason for preventing the administration of the Holy Communion on the first day of the week. They contend that, by the approved practice of apostolic churches, it is demonstrated to be the appointment of Christ that his churches *must* observe the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. A division has taken place among these Independents, chiefly in consequence of the adoption of *Baptist principles*, and the introduction of Church discipline, and of mutual exhortation and prayer by the brethren, into the public service on Sunday mornings.” The New Independents increased rapidly, and possessed, as early as the opening of our century, some 86

churches. There are at present some 114 churches in connection with the New Independents. See Haldane, *View of Social Worship*; Adams, *Religious World*, 3:260 sq.; Robinson, *Theological Dictionary*, s. V.; Kinniburgh, *Historical Survey of Congregationalism in Scotland*; and the articles *SEE HALDANE*; *SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS*. Some of the Scotch Independents have embraced the Morisonian doctrine. *SEE MORISONIANS*. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Fletcher, *History of Independency* (Lond. 1847, 4 vols. 12mo); Vaughan, *Hist. of English Nonconformity* (Lond. 1862); Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans* (see Index); Milner, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 444; Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times* (see Index); Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*, vol. 1, 2; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, 1, 171 sq.; 2, 251, 546; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 653 sq.; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *Cyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v.

## Index

the name given to certain catalogues of books and authors either wholly prohibited, or censured and corrected, by the Romish Church. An Index of the former kind is called *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*; of the latter, *Index Expurgatorius*. An *Index Prohibitorum* exists also in the Russo Greek Church, to which, no doubt, is due the weakness of the Russian literary productions on theological subjects.

### 1. INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM. —

**1. Before the Reformation.** — Prohibitions of heretical or dangerous books are as old as the attempts of the popes to usurp universal supremacy. In fact, such prohibitions flow naturally from the theory that “out of the Church there is no salvation.” It was Cyprian (q.v.) who first fully stated this theory; and even in his hands it logically led to the conclusion that all heretical opinions (i.e. such as differ from those announced by the Church authorities) must be punished and suppressed, if possible. As the claims of the hierarchy grew in magnitude, It became necessary to put down all doctrines that might diminish the power of the priesthood. To do this was a proof of zeal. This zeal was at first directed against heathen and Jewish writings, as it was feared that the reading of such might even endanger Christianity. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 400) forbade in *Can.* 16 the reading of heathen books. The Church, however, did not remain satisfied with forbidding heretical books, it commanded them to be burned. This

was first attempted in connection with the writings of Arius, and became afterwards one of the practices of the Church. As heretical books, however, were sometimes published under ecclesiastical titles, such proceeding was in the 5th and 6th centuries declared by the Apostolic Canons (*Can.* 60) to be punishable by suppression of the work. The Synod of Elvira (813) decided in the same sense that all who circulated forbidden books should be *anathema (libelli famosi)*. It even came to be held that any one who had read a forbidden book was guilty of all the heresies therein contained, and incapacitated for readmission into the Church until the performance of such penance as the Church enjoined. Especially did the hierarchy consider the reading of *translations of the Bible* as dangerous for the laity. Thus Gregory VII (1080) denounced the practice of reading the Bible in the vernacular in his letter to the King Wratisslaw of Bohemia (in Mansi *SS. Conciliorum nova et ampliss. Collectio*, 20, 296). Innocent III it is true, said (see his *Epistolarum libri* 19, in lib. 1, ep. 141, p. 1199) that the searching of the Scripture is to be commended not forbidden; but added: “Tanta est divinge Scripturas profunditas ut non solum simplices et illiterati, sed etiam prudentes et docti non plene sufficient ad ipsius intelligentiam indagandam. Unde recte fuit olim in lege divina statutum, ut bestia, quæ montem tetigerit, lapidetur; ne videlicet simplex aliquis et indoctus proesumat ad sublimitatem Scripturæ sacræ pertingere vel etiam aliis prædicare.” But the opposition to the papacy and to the Romish Church which immediately followed a more general reading of the Bible, soon led to placing the latter among the forbidden books, on a level with those condemned as heretical. The Concil. Tolosanum (1229) forbade the laity (c. 14) to even possess the O.T. or N.T. (see Hegelmaier, *Gesch. des Bibelverbots*, Ulm, 1783). When the Inquisition became established and prosperous, the enforcing of the rules relating to forbidden books was entrusted to it, and in the Cone. Biterrense (1246) we find (c. 36) a number of theological works mentioned which both the laity and clergy are forbidden to read. But the more the Church strove to render its position secure by such means, the more did influences quite to the contrary exert themselves to secure its overthrow, particularly the precursors of the Reformation, whose doctrines and writings struck at the most vital parts of the Romish organization. A Synod of London (1408) forbade the reading of Wycliffe’s works when not previously approved, while the works of Huss were condemned as thoroughly heretical. The discovery of the art of printing gave a new impulse to the publication of dangerous books, and Alexander VI complained in his *Decretum de libris non sine censure*:

*imprimendis* (Raynald, *Annal.* ad a. 1501, no. 36) that heretical dogmas were extensively promulgated, especially in the provinces of Mayence, Cologne, Trieste, and Magdeburg. He recommended the bishops and vicars to carefully watch the appearance of any heretical works, and to enforce the fines and excommunications against the authors. As to the printers, he says: “*Debentipsi merito compesci opportunis remediis, ut ab eorum impressione desistant, que fidei catholicae contraria fore noscuntur vel adversa, ant in mentibus fidelium possunt verisimiliter scandalum generare.*” Pope Leo X, in the tenth session of the Lateran Council (May 4, 1515), stated in the decree *Inter sollicitudines* that no book should be published without the authorization of either the bishop, his legate, or the Inquisition, under penalty of excommunication. Any book issued in contravention of this regulation was to be sequestered and burnt. ‘

**2.** *At and after the Reformation- and the Council of Trent.* — The Reformation gave rise to innumerable writings highly dangerous to the Romish Church, and, in spite of all orders to the contrary, they were widely circulated and eagerly read. In 1546 the University of Louvain, by order of Charles V, published a list (*Index*) of all such books as were considered dangerous to read and consequently forbidden; a new edition of the list appeared in 1550, after the papal legate at Venice, John della Casa, had published one on his own account in 1549 (see Schelhorn, *Ergotzlichkeiten*, 2, 3). During the suspension of the Council of Trent, pope Paul IV had another list of forbidden works prepared in 1557 by a particular congregation, and this formed the first actual *Index librorum prohibitorum* of the Romish Church. It was republished, with additions, by Bergerius in 1559, under the title *Index auctorum et librorum, qui tanqua haeretici aut suspecti aut perversi ab Officio S. R. Inquisitionis reprobantur et in universa Christiana republica interdunfur* (Romae, 1557). In 1558, pope Paul forbade also to the clergy and students the reading of such heretical works as had been tolerated for their exclusive use by his predecessors or by the Inquisition. These orders, however, did not prove very successful in Italy, and utterly failed in other countries, though many of the works named in the Index were burnt. The writings especially condemned by Paul’s Index were such as defended the civil governments against the encroachments of the Church, such as asserted the superiority of the authority of councils over that of popes and bishops, or such as attacked the theory and practice of the Romish Church in general. The Index divided the authors of forbidden books into three classes:



- 1, those of whom all the works were absolutely condemned;
- 2, those among whose works some only were condemned;
- 3, the authors of anonymous works, such as had appeared since 1519. At the end was appended a list of sixty-two printers of heretical works. The reading of books named in the Index was punishable by excommunication and by degrading penances.

The Council of Trent, in its 18th session, appointed a committee to prepare a new Index. This committee reported at the twenty-fifth session that they could not agree on account of the number and diversity of the books to be included in the Index, and recommended that the drawing up and enforcing of it should be left to the pope, which was agreed to. Pius IV then prepared a new Index, an enlarged edition of Paul IV's. The publication of this Index (which has often, but erroneously, been called *Index Tridentinus*) was accompanied by the bull *Dominici gregis custodice* (March 24, 1564), and by *ten rules*, which have been prefixed to all official Indexes published since that period. As these rules illustrate fully the whole spirit and tendency of the Romish system, in its relation to the freedom of literary and scientific progress, we give them here in full.

“(1.) All books condemned by the supreme pontiffs or General Councils before the year 1515, and not comprised in the present index, are nevertheless to be considered as condemned.

(II.) The books of heresiarchs, whether of those who broached or disseminated their heresies prior to the year above mentioned, or of those who have been, or are, the heads or leaders of heretics, as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Balthazar Pacimontanus, Swenchfeld, and other similar ones, are altogether forbidden, whatever may be their names, titles, or subjects. And the books of other heretics, which treat professedly upon religion, are totally condemned; but those which do not treat upon religion are allowed to be read, after having been examined and approved by Catholic divines, by order of the bishops and inquisitors. Those Catholic books are also permitted to be read which have been composed by authors who have afterwards fallen into heresy, or who, after their fall, have returned into the bosom of the Church, provided they have been approved by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisition.

**(III.)** Translations of ecclesiastical writers, which have been hitherto published by-condemned authors, are permitted to be read, if they contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine. Translations of the *Old Testament* may also be allowed, but only to learned and pious men, at the discretion of the bishop; provided they use them merely as elucidations of the Vulgate version, in order to understand the Holy Scriptures, and not as the sacred text itself. But translations of the *New Testament*, made by author of the first class of this index, are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger, generally arises from reading them. If notes accompany the versions which are allowed to be read, or are joined to the Vulgate edition, they may be permitted to be read by the same persons as the versions, after the suspected places have been expunged by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisitor. On the same conditions, also, pious and learned men may be permitted to have what is called ‘Vatablus’s Bible,’ or any part of it. But the preface and Prologomena of the Bibles published by Isidore Clarius are, however, excepted; and the text of his editions is not to be considered as the text of the Vulgate edition.

**(IV.)** Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors.

**(V.)** Books of which heretics are the editors, but which contain little or nothing of their own, being mere compilations from others, as lexicons,

concordances (collections of), apothegms, or similes, indexes, and others of a similar kind, may be allowed by the bishops and inquisitors, after having made, with the advice of divines, such corrections and emendations as may be deemed requisite.

**(VI.)** Books of controversy between the Catholics and heretics of the present time, written in the vulgar tongue, are not to be indiscriminately allowed, but are to be subject to the same regulations as Bibles in the vulgar tongue. As to those works in the vulgar tongue which treat of morality, contemplation, confession, and similar subjects, and which contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine, there is no reason why they should be prohibited; the same may be said also of sermons in the vulgar tongue, designed for the people. And if in any kingdom or province any books have been hitherto prohibited, as containing things not proper to be indiscriminately read by all sorts of persons, they may be allowed by the bishop and inquisitor, after having corrected them, if written by Catholic authors.

**(VII.)** Books professedly treating of lascivious or obscene subjects, or narrating or teaching them, are utterly prohibited, as readily corrupting both the faith and manners of those who peruse them; and those who possess them shall be severely punished by the bishop. But the works of antiquity, written by the heathens, are permitted to be read, because of the elegance and propriety of the language; though on no account shall they be suffered to be read by young persons.

**(VIII.)** Books, the principal subject of which is good, but in which some things are occasionally introduced tending to heresy and impiety, divination, or superstition, may be allowed, after they have been corrected by Catholic divines, by the authority of the general inquisition. The same judgment is also formed of prefaces, summaries, or notes taken from condemned authors, and inserted in the works of authors not condemned; but such works must not be printed in future, until they have been amended.

**(IX.)** All books and writings of geomancy, hydromancy, aïromancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy, and necromancy, or which treat of sorceries, poisons, auguri auspices, or magical incantations, are utterly rejected. The bishops shall also diligently guard against any persons reading or keeping any books, treatises, or indexes which treat of judicial astrology, or contain presumptuous predictions of the events of

future contingencies and fortuitous occurrences, or of those actions which depend upon the will of man. But they shall permit such opinions and observations of natural things as are written in aid of navigation, agriculture, and medicine.

**(X.)** In the printing of books and other writings, the rules shall be observed which were ordained in the tenth session of the Council of Lateran, under Leo X. Therefore, if any book is to be printed in the city of Rome, it shall first be examined by the pope's vicar and the master of the sacred palace, or other persons chosen by our most holy father for that purpose. In other places, the examination of any book or manuscript intended to be printed shall be referred to the bishop, or some skilful person whom he shall nominate, and the inquisitor of the city or diocese in which the impression is executed, who shall gratuitously, and without delay, affix their approbation to the work, in their own handwriting subject, nevertheless, to the pains and censures contained in the said decree; this law and condition being added, that an authentic copy of the book to be printed, signed by the author himself, shall remain in the hands of the examiner: and it is the judgment of the fathers of the present deputation, that those persons who publish works in manuscript, before they have been examined and approved, should be subject to the same penalties as those who print them; and that those who read or possess them should be considered as the authors, if the real authors of such writings do not avow themselves. The approbation given in writing shall be placed at the head of the books, whether printed or in manuscript, that they may appear to be duly authorized; and this examination and approbation, etc., shall be granted gratuitously. Moreover, in every city and diocese, the house or place where the art of printing is exercised, and also the shops of booksellers, shall be frequently visited by persons deputed by the bishop or his vicar, conjointly with the inquisitor, so that nothing that is prohibited may be printed, kept, or sold. Booksellers of every description shall keep a catalogue of the books which they have on sale, signed by the said deputies; nor shall they keep, or sell, nor in any way dispose of any other books without permission from the deputies, under pain of forfeiting the books, and being liable to such other penalties as shall be judged proper by the bishop or inquisitor, who shall also punish the buyers, readers, or printers of such works. If any person import foreign books into any city, they shall be obliged to

announce them to the deputies; or if this kind of merchandise he exposed to sale in any public place, the public officers of the place shall signify to the said deputies that such books have been brought; and no one shall presume to give, to read, or lend, or sell any book which he or any other person has brought into the city, until he has shown it to the deputies, and obtained their permission, unless it be a work well known to be universally allowed, Heirs and testamentary executors shall make no use of the books of the deceased, nor in any way transfer them to others, until they have presented a catalogue of them to the deputies, and obtained their license, under pain of confiscation of the books, or the infliction of such other punishment as the bishop or inquisitor shall deem proper, according to the contumacy or quality of the delinquent. With regard to those books which the fathers of the present deputation shall examine, or correct, or deliver to be corrected, or permit to be reprinted on certain conditions, booksellers and others shall be bound to observe whatever is ordained respecting them. The bishops and general inquisitors shall, nevertheless, be at liberty, according to the power they possess, to prohibit such books as may seem to be permitted by these rules, if they deem it necessary for the good of the kingdom, or province, or diocese. And let the secretary of these fathers according to the command of our holy father; transmit to the notary of the general inquisitor the names of the books that have been corrected, as well as of the persons to whom the fathers have granted the power of examination. Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one presume to keep or read any- books contrary to these rules, or prohibited by this index. But if any one read or keep any books composed by heretics, or the writings of any author suspected of heresy or false doctrine he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on another account, besides the mortal sin committed, shall be severely punished at the will of the bishops” (Labbei SS. *Concilia*, 14, 952-956).

This Index of Pius IV was published at Rome by Aldus Manutius (1564), and afterwards revised and enlarged by Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Clement VIII (1595).

**2. INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.** — Pope Sixtus V introduced a series of works which, after expunging certain obnoxious passages, could be allowed to be read. This list received the name of *Index libroruns*

*expurgandoruin* or *expurgatorius*. It was first published by order of the duke Alba, under the style *Index expurgatorius librorum, qui hoc sceculo prodierunt* (Antwerp, 1751, and republished since). Other lists of prohibited books, on the model of that of Rome, were, however, published in other countries, especially in Spain (most of them under Philip II in Madrid, in 1577 and 1584) and in Italy. ‘John Maria Brasichellen or Brasichelli (proparly Wenzel of Brisigella) prepared, with the aid of the Dominican Tomas Malvenda, an Index styled *Index expurgatorius cura J. A. Brasichellani*, Mag. Palat. Romae (1607), but this, far from being approved of at head-quarters, was itself put in the Romish *Index libr. prohib.* The Spanish inquisitor general, Antonio a Sotomajor, published a *Novissimus librorum prohibitoruns et expurgandorum Index* (Madrid, 1648), which is highly praised for its completeness. The Romish Index was republished in 1818, but has since received, and is constantly receiving, numerous additions.

*The Congregation of the Index* was originally established by pope Pius V. It holds its sittings at Rome, and has the right of examining generally all books which concern faith, morals, ecclesiastical discipline, or civil society; on which it passes judgment, for suppressing them absolutely, or directing them to be corrected, or allowing them to be read with precaution, and by certain persons. Persons specially deputed by it may give permission to Romanists throughout the world to read prohibited books; and the penalty denounced against those who read or keep any books suspected of heresy or false doctrine is the greater excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on any other account, besides the mortal sin committed, are to be severely punished at the will of the bishops. It is remarkable, however, that the Index is hardly in force at the present day, even in the most Romish-inclined countries. In Austria even, the faithful daughter of Rome, Maria Theresa forbade the publication, and it is not to be expected that either her liberal successors or the princes of other Roman Catholic countries, forced by the liberal spirit of the people to disobedient acts towards Rome, should permit the publication in their dominions. It can, therefore, hardly be said to be any longer virtually in force, though in some countries its publication is permitted by *special grant* from the government. Baudri, in an article on this subject in Aschbach (*Kirchen-Lex.* 3:444, a Roman Catholic work), concedes this, and says that even the countries bound by a concordat to an enforcement of the decisions of the Congregation of the Index fail to do their duty, and that books are

constantly published without regard and consideration of the agreement entered into with Rome (comp. Eckardt, *Modern Russia*, p.246 sq.). See Mendham, *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome* (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Cramp, *Text-book of Popery* (London, 1851, 8vo), p. 419-428; Elliott, *Delineation of Popery*, bk. i; Gibbings, *Index Vaticanus, an exact Reprint of the Roman Index Expurgatorius* (London, 1837, 8vo); Peignot, *Dictionnaire critique litteraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condammes aufeu, supprimes ou censures* (Paris, 1806); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6:651; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia*, s.v.; Buckley, *Canons and Decrees of Trent*, p. 284. **SEE BIBLE, USE OF; SEE CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.**

### In'dia

(Heb. *Hoddu'*, **WDh** for **WDn** **h** **pi**. i.e. *Hindu*, of Sanscrit origin; see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 366; Sept. **Ἰνδική**, Vulg. *India*), occurs in the Bible only in ~~700B~~ Esther 1:1; 8:9, where the Persian king is described as reigning “from India unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven and twenty provinces;” the names of the two countries are similarly connected by Herodotus (7:9). It is found again, however, in the Apocrypha (compare Esther 13:1), where India is mentioned among the countries which the Romans took from Antiochus and gave to Eumenes (1 Macc. 8:8). It is also with some reason conceived that in the list of foreign Jews present at the Pentecost (~~400B~~ Acts 2:9) we should read **Ἰνδίαν**, *India*, and not **Ἰουδαίαν**, *Judaea*; but the still more probable reading is **Ἰδουμαίαν**, *Idumaea*, if indeed the common reading ought to be changed at all (see Kuinol, *Comment.* ad loc.). The Hebrew form “*Hoddu*” is an abbreviation of *Honadu*, which is identical with the indigenous names of the river Indus, “*Hindu*,” or “*Sindhu*,” and again with the ancient name of the country as it appears in the *Vendidad*, “*Hapta Hendu*.” The native form “*Sindus*” is noticed by Pliny (vi, 23). The India of the book of Esther is not the peninsula of Hindostan, but the country surrounding the Indus--the *Punjab*, and perhaps *Scinde* — the India which Herodotus describes (3, 98) as forming part of the Persian empire under Darius, and the India which at a later period was conquered by Alexander the Great. The name occurs in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Nakhsh-Rustam, but not in those of Behistufn (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 485). In 1 Macc. 8:8, it is clear that India proper cannot be understood, inasmuch as this never belonged either to Antiochus or Eumenes. At the same time, none of the explanations offered by commentators are

satisfactory: the Eneti of Paphlagonia have been suggested, but these people had disappeared long before (Strabo, 12:534): the India of Xenophon (*Cyrop.* 1, 5, 3; 3:2, 25), which may have been above the Carian stream named Indus (Pliny, 5, 29; probably the Calbis), is more likely; but the emendation “Mysia and Ionia” for *ilfedia and India* offers the best solution of the difficulty. **SEE IONIA**. A more authentic notice of the country occurs in 1 Macc. 6:37; where Indians are noticed as the drivers of the war-elephants introduced into the army of the Syrian king (see also 1 Esdras 3:2; Esther 16:1). **SEE ELEPHANT**.

But, though the *name* of India occurs so seldom, the people and productions of that country must have been tolerably well known to the Jews. There is undoubted evidence that an active trade was carried on between India and Western Asia: the Tyrians established their depots on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and procured “horns of ivory and ebony,” “brodered work and rich apparel” (<sup><32715></sup>Ezekiel 27:15, 24), by a route which crossed the Arabian desert by land, and then followed the coasts of the Indian Ocean by sea. The trade opened by Solomon with Ophir through the Red Sea chiefly consisted of Indian articles, and some of the names even of the articles, *Algummim*, “sandal wood,” *kophims*, “apes,” *tukiims*, “peacocks,” are of Indian origin (Humboldt, *Kosmos*, 2, 133); to which we may add the Hebrew name of the “topaz,” *pitdah*, derived from the Sanscrit *pita*. There is a strong probability that productions of yet greater utility were furnished by India through Syria to the shores of Europe, and that the Greeks derived both the term **κασσίτερος** (compare the Sanscrit *kastira*), and the article it represents, “tin,” from the coasts of India. The connection thus established with India led to the opinion that the Indians were included under the ethnological title of Cush (<sup><0106></sup>Genesis 10:6), and hence the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic versions frequently render that term by India or Indians, as in <sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16; <sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 11:11; 18:1; <sup><2423></sup>Jeremiah 13:23; <sup><3130></sup>Zephaniah 3:10. For the connection which some have sought to establish between India and Paradise, **SEE EDEN**.

The above intimations, and indeed, all ancient history, refer not to the whole of Hindostan, but chiefly to the northern parts of it, or the countries between the Indus and the Ganges; although it is not necessary to assert that the rest of that peninsula, particularly its western coast, was then altogether unknown. It was from this quarter that the Persians and Greeks (to whom we are indebted for the earliest accounts of India) invaded the country; and this was consequently the region which first became generally



known. The countries bordering on the Ganges continued to be involved in obscurity, the great kingdom of the Prasians excepted, which, situated nearly above the modern Bengal, was dimly discernible. The “nearer we approach the Indus, the more clear becomes our knowledge of the ancient geography of the country; and it follows that the districts of which at the present day we know the least, were anciently best known. Besides, the western and northern boundaries were not the same as at present. To the west, India was not then bounded by the river Indus, but by a chain of mountains which, under the name of Koh (whence the Grecian appellation of the Indian Caucasus), extended from Bactria to Makran, or Gedrosia, inclosing the kingdoms of Candahar and Cabul, the modern kingdom of Eastern Persia, or Afghanistan. These districts anciently formed part of India, as well as, further to the south, the less perfectly known countries of the Arabi and Hauri (the Arabitæ and Oritæ of Arrian, 6:21), bordering on Gedrosia. This western boundary continued at all times the same, and was removed to the Indus only in consequence of the victories of Nadir Shah. Towards the north, ancient India over passed not less its present limit. It comprehended the whole of the mountainous region above Cashmir, Badakshan, Belur Land, the western boundary mountains of Little Bucharia, or Little Thibet, and even the desert of Cobi, so far as it was known. (See Heeren’s *Historical Researches*, 1, c. 1, § 3, on Persian India; and Rennell’s *Geography of Herodotus*. For other conjectures respecting the location of the Scriptural India, see Winer’s *Realwörterbuch*, s.v. Indien. For the history of ancient India, see Anthon’s *Class. Diet s.v.*) — Smith; Kitto.

### India, Modern

The name is sometimes used of the two peninsulas west and east of the Ganges combined, to which even occasionally the Indian Archipelago is added; but, more commonly, it is applied either to the peninsula west of the Ganges (*East Indies*), or to the aggregate possessions of the British crown (the *Viceroyalty of India*, or the *Indian Empire*). The present form of government of the Indian Empire is established by the Act 21 and 22 Victoria, cap. 106, called an Act for the better Government of India, sanctioned Aug. 2, 1858. By the terms of this act, all the territories heretofore under the government of the East India Company are vested in the queen; and all its powers are exercised in her name; all territorial and other revenues, and all tributes and other payments, are likewise received in her name, and disposed of for the purposes of the government of India

alone, subject to the provisions of this act. One of the queens principal secretaries of state, called the Secretary of State for India, is invested with all the powers hitherto exercised by the company or by the Board of Control. The executive authority in India is vested in a governor general or viceroy, appointed by the crown, and acting under the orders of the Secretary of State for India. The governor general has power to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, within the Indian territories under the dominion of the queen, and for all servants of the government of India within the dominions of princes and states in alliance with the queen. The Secretary of State for India is aided in the administration by a council of fifteen members, of whom seven are elected by the Court of Directors from their own body, and eight are nominated by the crown. The duties of the council of state are, under the direction of the secretary of state, to conduct the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of and the correspondence with India.

The total area and population of British India were, according to official returns of the year 1876, as follows:

Presidencies and Provinces under the Administration of	Population	Area in Sq. Miles
Governor-General of India:		
Ajmeer	316,032	2,661
Berar	2,231,565	17,500
Mysore	5,055,412	27,077
Coorg	168,312	2,000
Governor of		
Madras	31,672,613	138,856
Bombay	13,835,073	123,142
Lieutenant-Governor of		
Bengal	62,231,470	156,200
North-west Provinces	42,001,436	105,395
Punjab	17,611,498	1044,975
Chief commissioner of		
Central Provinces	8,201,519	84,048
British Burmah	2,747,148	88,556
Assam	4,132,019	55,384
Total	190,2044,097	905,794

Feudatory States under	Population	Area in Sq. Miles
Governor-General of India	28,748,403	308,677
Governor of Madras	3,289,392	9,815
Governor of Bombay	9,298,612	67,370
Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal	2,212,909	38,217
Lieut.-Gov. of the N.W. Provinces	907,013	5,445
Lieutenant_Governor of Punjab	5,410,389	114,739
Chief Comm. Of Central Provinces	1,049,710	29,749
Total	50,916,428	574,012
Total for British India	241,120,525	1,479,806

There has never been a regular census of the whole of India under British administration, but enumerations, more or less trustworthy, were made in the north-western and in the central provinces in the years 1865 and 1866. The census of the north-west provinces, taken Jan. 10, 1865, showed that this division of India had increased in prosperity within the decennial period 1856-1865, as reckoned by the number of houses and extension of cultivation. There were found to be 4.71 persons to a house or hut, and 7.06 to an enclosure, or family dwelling. The census further showed that there were 41 millions of Mussulmans in the north-west provinces, or about one seventh of the total population, the other six sevenths being Hindus of the four chief castes; namely, Brahmins, 70 subdivisions; Kshatryas, 175 subdivisions; Vaisyas, 65 subdivisions; Sudras, 230 subdivisions. The Sudras were found to form the great bulk of the Hindus, being 18,304,309 in number; the Vaisyas numbered 1,091,250; the Kshatryas, 2,827,768; and the Brahmins, 3,451,692. The census of the central provinces, taken in 1866, showed that their population consisted of 6,864,770 Hindus, 1,995,663 Gonds and aboriginal tribes, 237,962 Mussulmans, 6026 Europeans and Eurasians, and 90 Parsees. The number of Mussulmans was much lower than had been expected. All the enumerations showed a high proportion of children to adults. Thus, while the percentage of children under 12 years of age was 29 in England, it was in many parts of India as high as 55. Among the reasons to account for such a result are mentioned the custom of polygamy, and, in particular, the desire of the Hindus to have male issue, which induces them to marry as

many wives as they can afford to keep until a son is born. The religious statistics of the four largest cities were, according to the enumeration of 1881: Calcutta, total population, exclusive of Howrah, 684,658; of whom 62 percent were Hindus, 32.2 Mohammedans, 4.4 Christians. About 20,000 were Europeans, and 20,000 Eurasians. In Madras the population was 405,848. Bombay had a population of 773,196, of whom less than 13,000 were British born. Lichnow had a population of 284,779. There is also a considerable admixture of Parsees and Indo Europeans, or, as they are now usually styled, Eurasians, i.e. of mixed blood. Leaving out of account the native states, the following is given as the relative proportion of creeds and races in India: Hindus, 110,000,000; Mussulmans, 25,000,000; aborigines or non-Aryans, 12,000,000; Buddhists, 3,000,000; Asiatic Christians, 1,100,000. The English population amounted, according to the census of 1861, to 125,945 persons.

Christianity became known in India at an early period. There is an old tradition that one of the twelve apostles, St. Thomas, preached the Gospel to the people of India, but the tradition is not supported by any proofs. Cosmas Indicopleustes, who visited the country in the 6th century, found a large number of Christian congregations, with a bishop who was ordained in Persia. In consequence of this connection with Persia, the Christians of India, who, after the reputed founder of the Indian Church, were called Christians of St. Thomas, were drawn into the Nestorian movement, and subsequently received their bishop from the head of the Nestorian Church. Their territory extended from the southern point of the peninsula of Malabar as far as a few miles south of Calicut, and from the defiles of the Ghats as far as the sea. An Armenian or Syrian merchant, Thomas Canna, rearranged in the 9th century the ecclesiastical and political affairs of these Christians. Through his efforts they obtained from the kings of Malabar important privileges; in particular, an exempt jurisdiction in all except criminal cases. Their rank was equal to that of the nobility of Malabar, and they were in great demand for the armies of the Hindu princes. This finally induced them to attempt the establishment of a kingdom of their own, which was, however, of but short duration. After that their position was less favorable, and the Portuguese, who in 1498 landed, under Vasco de Gama, in the port of Calicut, were consequently regarded by them as their liberators. The first Portuguese missionaries were Franciscan monks, who were introduced in 1500 by Cabral. Dominican monks landed in 1503 with the two Albuquerque, but they confined themselves to a few convents,

while the Franciscans were for about forty years the only Christian missionaries. It was, in particular, P. Antonio de Porto who in 1535 established on the island of Salsette a number of colleges, churches, and convents. In 1534 the first Roman Catholic bishopric for India was established at Goa; the first bishop, Albuquerque, was a Franciscan monk. But, although the convents of the Franciscans were so numerous that they constituted two provinces of the order, they soon ceased to make notable efforts for the propagation of Christianity, leaving the missionary field wholly to the new order of the Jesuits, who made their first appearance in India in 1542. Their number increased very rapidly, and soon they had in all the Portuguese colonies of India houses and colleges, which were divided into the two provinces of Goa and Cochin. Their success at first was very slow, but when the Portuguese viceroy Constantine de Bragama banished some of the most prominent Brahmans, the Jesuits in 1560 succeeded in baptizing nearly 13,000 persons in that city. In 1579 several Jesuits were called to the court of the great mogul, Akbar, who for a time showed an inclination to accept Christianity. Subsequently, however, he conceived the plan of founding a new religion himself, and the Jesuit mission, which at first promised grand results, was confined to the establishment of a few congregations in the empire of the great mogul. The Jesuits were more successful in their endeavors to unite the Christians of St. Thomas with the Roman Catholic Church. This union was accomplished in 1599, at the Synod of Dramper, by the archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menezes. The bishopric of Goa had in 1557 been made an archbishopric, with two suffragan sees at Cochin and Malacca, to which, in 1606, Meliapur was added. The Christians of St. Thomas received, in 1601, an episcopal see at Angamala, which in 1601 was raised to the archbishopric of Cranganor. The right of patronage over the ecclesiastical benefices was left to the king of Portugal, as he had to defray most of the expenses for the support of the churches and missionaries. A new impulse was given to the missions when, in 1606, the Jesuit P. Robert de Nobili, at Madura, conceived the novel plan of introducing Christianity by accommodating his mode of life entirely to the Indian customs. He called himself a Roman *sannyasi* (i.e. one who resigns everything), lived after the manner of the Brahmans, clothed his preaching of the Gospel in Indian figures of speech, and even retained among the new converts the difference of caste, allowing the converts to wear certain badges indicative of their caste. But he encountered a strong opposition, even among the members of his order, and a violent controversy began, which, after thirteen years, was decided by pope

Gregory XV in favor of P. de Nobili, and the converts were permitted to wear the badges. After this the Roman Catholic Church made numerous converts. According to statements of the Indian Christians, P. de Nobili is said to have baptized about 100,000 persons belonging to all castes. The separation was carried through even with regard to churches and missionaries; the missionaries of the Brahmans being called Sannyasi, those of the Pariahs, Pandarams. The successors of Nobili, who were supported by the French missionaries of Pondichery, enlarged the missions and developed the system, but became consequently involved in new controversies, especially with the Capuchins (controversy of accommodation), which in 1704, by cardinal Tournon, who had been commissioned to examine the subject, and again by pope Benedict XIV in 1744, by the bull "*Onnium sollicitudinum*," was decided against the Jesuits. These decisions not only put an end to the conversions, but the majority of the Indians who had been gained by the accommodation theories of the Jesuits again returned to their native religion. The suppression of the order of the Jesuits still more injured the Roman Catholic missions, which, moreover, suffered severely from the wars of Tippf Sahib. Long before this time the Jesuits had lost their missions among the Christians of St. Thomas, who in 1653 left the communion of Rome, and those in the vicinity of Cochin, as the Dutch from 1660 to 1663 had conquered nearly all the Portuguese possessions on the coast of Malabar. The Christians of St. Thomas were, however, a second time prevailed upon to unite with Rome by Italian Carmelites; and in 1698, through the mediation of the emperor Leopold I, one bishop and twelve missionaries of this order received permission to settle on the coast of Malabar. But this protection afforded to the Italian missionaries led to a serious quarrel between the Portuguese government, bishop, and missionaries and the Italians, as Portugal declined to forego its right of patronage, although it was neither able nor willing to exercise it. In 1838, Gregory XVI, by the bull "*Mallta praeclare*," abolished the former papal constitutions for the Church of India, and assigned to the several vicars apostolic their dioceses. The sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapur (St. Thomas) were suppressed. The diocese of Meliapur was transferred to the vicariate apostolic of Madras; the territory of the two other bishoprics to the vicariate of Malabar, which had been erected in 1659 for the Incalceate Carmelites, and the see of which is now at Verapoly. To it were also assigned the United Christians of St. Thomas, a population of about 200,000, with 330 priests and 160 ministers. The Portuguese of Goa now

tried to make a schism. The archbishop of Goa, Jose da Silva y Torres, who had been consecrated in 1843, ordained, immediately after his arrival in Goa in 1844, no less than 800 priests, chiefly men without any education, and sent them into the territories of the vicars apostolic. They succeeded in obtaining control of a majority of the churches, and jurisdiction over a population of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect. In 1848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishop from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicars apostolic, denounced the latter, defied the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 536 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained of the attitude of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio was on the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846 namely, Mysore, Coimbatr, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1836 had reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizigapatam was established in 1848 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.

Protestant missions began at the commencement of the 18th century, when the Lutheran missionary Ziegenbaly was sent to the Danish coast of Tranquebar. Amidst the greatest difficulties which the foreign languages and the officers of the colony placed in his way, he founded schools, translated the Bible and the Catechism into the Tamil language, collected a congregation which rapidly increased, and laid the foundation of the Evangelical Church of India. A large portion of the councils either belonged to the lowest castes or were pariahs. In the course of the 18th century, the missionary work was carried on by the Missionary Society of Halle; at first with great zeal, which, however, gradually slackened under the influence of Rationalism. The last great missionary who was sent out from Halle was the apostolical Fr. Schwarz (q.v.), the results of whose

work can still be traced. Gradually the Halle Society leaned on the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which at last took entire charge of these missions. With regard to the differences of castes, the first missionaries had been earnestly opposed to their continuance in the Christian churches; but this policy was subsequently changed, and the differences permitted to remain, on the ground that they were merely of a social character. In 1841 the Lutheran Missionary Society of Dresden began to gather up again the scattered remnants of the old missionary societies in Tranquebar, but in the prosecution of the work became involved in many difficulties with the other missionary societies which had taken charge of the Halle missions. This society is the only one among the missionary societies now laboring in India which undertakes to vindicate the social, though not the religious standing, of the caste. The recent mission in India begins with the arrival of the Baptist missionary, W. Carey, at Calcutta (Nov. 1793). He encountered from the start the formidable and entirely unexpected opposition of the East India Company, which hoped for larger commercial profits if it spared the religious belief and practice of the Hindus and Mohammedans, and therefore not only discouraged the establishment of Christian missions, but supported and defended the religious institutions of the native religions. The few chaplains who were sent out to attend the spiritual needs of the English in India were like the European residents in general, drunkards, servants of the mammon, and worldlings; when, therefore, the Rev. Henry Martyn, one of the most zealous missionaries of that time, arrived in 1806 in Calcutta, and endeavored to kindle a missionary spirit, he provoked thereby such a storm of indignation that he had to confine himself for some time to the reading of the homilies of the Church of England. When Carey landed in India, permission was refused to him to stay within the territory of the British dominions, and he was compelled to seek refuge in the small Danish possession of Serampoor (a few miles from Calcutta). Here he was hospitably received by the governor, who himself was a pupil of Schwarz, and under his auspices he began the Baptist mission, which has become of so great importance for all India. Carey, who himself had mastered more than thirty Oriental languages, and the missionaries Marshman and Ward, caused the translation of the Bible into more than twenty languages of India, the compilation of grammars, dictionaries, school-books, and many learned works on the history, religions, and customs of India, new editions of the chief works of the native literatures, and thus, even where they did not succeed in forming new congregations, they smoothed the way for



subsequent missionary labors. In 1803, the indefatigable Carey, who in 1800 had been appointed professor of Sanskrit and other Oriental languages at Fort William (Calcutta), was allowed to begin a mission in Calcutta, which was at first intended only for English, Portuguese, and Armenian Christians, but was soon joined by several converted Hindus and Mohammedans. Soon a converted Hindu, Krishna, appeared in public as a preacher, and by his impressive sermons organized the first native congregation in Bengal. This success of the Baptist mission encouraged a number of the chaplains of the government to labor for the removal of the obstacles which the East India Company placed in the way of Christianity. David Brown, Henry Martyn, Thomas Thomason, Daniel Corrie, and Claudius Buchanan, and many others, distinguished themselves by establishing schools and seminaries, by literary labors, by appointing native preachers and teachers, and, in general, by their great zeal on the missionary field. The translation of the Bible by H. Martyn, and the labors of the Mohammedan Abdul Messih, who was converted by him, were especially productive of great results. But more than all his predecessors, it was the Rev. CL. Buchanan who succeeded in overcoming those hindrances which had prevented the free propagation of Christianity throughout India. After having traveled through a large portion of the country, and acquired a minute knowledge of the people, he returned in 1807 to England, and by a number of works endeavored to gain public opinion for a radical change in the administration of India. His writings produced a great effect, and when, in 1813, the charter of the East India Company was renewed, the English Parliament passed resolutions which granted to all British subjects the right to establish schools and minions in India, and compelled the company to provide itself schools and seminaries for the instruction of the natives. This was followed by a number of other reforms, as the prohibition of burning of widows (1829), and of a further payment of temple and pilgrim taxes (1833 and 1840), and the admission of native Christians to the lower offices of administration. Full liberty for missionary operations was finally given in 1833, when a resolution of the British Parliament allowed all foreigners to settle in British India. and thus opened the field to all non-British missionary societies of the world.

The first bishopric of the English Church in India was established at Calcutta in 1814. The first bishop, Dr. Middleton, a rigid High-Churchman, was more noted for his quarrels with the ministers of other denominations than for missionary zeal. His successor, Heber (q.v.), on the contrary,

though likewise a High-Churchman, was indefatigable in his devotion to the missionary cause, and sternly opposed the toleration of caste differences among the converts. His work was continued in the same way by his successor, Wilson (died 1858). In 1835 other bishoprics were established at Bombay and Madras, and the bishop of Calcutta received the title of Metropolitan of India.

In 1867 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland sent Dr. Norman M'Leod and Dr. Watson to inquire into the working of the missions there. The following facts are gleaned from later reports. The missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel are distributed among 84 principal stations, assisted by 70 unordained European agents, and 111 ordained and 3040 unordained native agents. 24,578 communicants, and 14,094 catechumens are connected with the churches, while there is a total of 75,152 baptized adherents. There are 718 schools, with 28,021 pupils. St. Thomas's College, in Ceylon, has recently been endowed by the society to the amount of £25,000.

The London Missionary Society has its most successful mission in Travancore, where 269 stations are filled. There are 45,176 adherents, of whom 5,192 are communicants. 285 day schools are maintained, with 13,295 pupils. The native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1029. In South India there are 208 stations and outstations supplied by 24 foreign and 14 native ordained pastors, assisted by 4 foreign and 104 native unordained workers. The adherents number 7619, of whom 1105 are communicants; 110 day schools are maintained with 5726 pupils in attendance. Native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1220. In North India 24 ordained and 43 unordained workers supply 26 stations and outstations. The number of communicants is 535; adherents 1872; day schools 75, with 5266 pupils. £1234 were contributed by the natives in 1888. Benares has a mission college; Almora a college; Calcutta, Bangalore, Nagarkoil have higher institutions of learning. There is a medical mission at Nevoor.

The Church Missionary Society has in Madras large Tamil congregations, served by native pastors. It has also a mission to the Mohammedan population of that city. In 1820 Tinnevely was entered by the society, and now there are more than 1000 villages in which there are Christians. Successful work is done in Travancore, Cochin, and among the Pelegus. There are 88,000 Christians in all of South India.. North India is also a field

of the society. Divinity colleges are supported at Calcutta and Allahabad. A medical mission: was started in the valley of the Kashmir in 1865, which is very successful. A divinity school was started at Poona, in Western India, in 1886. Ceylon, as the result of the society's work, has 6508 adherents; Trinity College, at Kandy, and important schools at Cotta and Jaffra. It has 92 stations, with 6548 members. It is now more liberal than formerly in regard to India, and is entering upon all kinds of aggressive work. Among the latest is a medical mission. Its work is now in a critical condition, owing to the great number professing conversion. Many of the churches and schools are self-supporting, and are themselves animated by a missionary spirit. This district is in juxtaposition with: the South Travancore missions of the London Society, and with the Tinnevely missions of the Propagation Society. Add the converts reported by these, and the 6000 of the American Board, and we have 8000 Tamil Christians within 150 miles of Cape Comorin. The Wesleyan Missionary Society devotes but a twelfth of its income to the Indian missions, which are, of course, among its smallest. It has stations at Madras and six other points in the Tamil country, seven or eight stations in the Canenere districts, 465 Church members in all, 5 native ministers, besides several candidates, and 3500 pupils in the schools.

The following are extracts from the late (1888) re-ports of some of the American societies. The *American Board*-has the Marathi Mission, established in 1813, the Madttra, established in 1834, and the Ceylon, established in 1816. The Marathi Mission has 7 stations, 102 outstations, 12 preachers, 2 medical catechists, and with Bible readers and teachers, 255 native helpers.' The native contributions amounted to \$4779. The Theological Seminary, suspended in 1866, was reopened in. 1888. There is a mission high-school and college at Admednagar, which had 311 pupils in 1887. The Madura Mission has 12 stations, 234 out-stations, 3233 church members, 11,881 adherents, 10 missionaries, 20 native pastors, 399 native workers of all classes, 13 common schools, with 3215 pupils, a collegiate theological institute, with 334 pupils; in all the mission 5680 pupils. A new feature is the employment of native evangelists by the native churches themselves for the outlying districts. The native contributions amounted to \$6545. The Ceylon Mission has 7 stations, with 25 out-stations, 389 members, 8455 under instruction. Native contributions, \$5752. This mission has had a wonderful educational work; the report claims that one in thirteen of the population are in school. Nearly all of the schools are

managed by the missionaries; 329 have been educated at Jaffra College. The Presbyterian Church sustains the Lodiana and Furrukhabad Mission, with 17 stations, 28 American and 11 native missionaries, 30 American and 120 native teachers, 456 communicants, and 6194 scholars in the schools. Out-stations are increasing in numbers. Tours into different districts have been made as in former years. Various melas have been attended, among which was Hardwar. The number of people present at this place, according to government officials, was almost 3,000,000. For days some twenty preachers, native and foreign, preached to many thousands. Frequently many remained after the service to discuss some of the points set forth in the discourse. Cases of self-torture were fewer than usual. "The more revolting rites of Hindiism are evidently becoming obsolete." At this festival the brethren were 'particularly struck with the marked increase in the knowledge of Christianity manifested by the pilgrims.' The Sabbath-school and prayer meeting are established at most of the stations, and in the Lodiana Mission the native Christians have contributed for religious and charitable objects during the year, 670 rupees. Nearly 11,000,000 pages of publications of various kinds have been issued. A "medical mission" is connected with these missions, at which 1311 patients have been treated.:

The (Dutch) Reformed Church has the Arcot Mission, organized in 1854. The mission occupies North and South Arcot, the united area of which is 19,925 square miles, with a population of 3,770,192; churches, 23; out-stations, 86; communicants, 1755; contributions of the native churches, \$756 50. Besides the boarding schools for girls at Vellore and Madavaalle, with 98 pupils, there are 8 caste girls' schools, with 586 scholars. The school formerly known as the Arcot Seminary will hereafter be called the Arcot Academy. It had 71 pupils in 1887. The Theological Seminary in the Arcot Mission, for which an endowment of \$65,000 has been secured by Dr. Chamberlain, was opened in March, 1888, with 13 students. It has 7 scholarships provided by churches, and 9 provided by individuals. In addition to the regular services at-stations and out-stations, the Gospel was preached during the year 1888 in 8978 places, to heathen audiences numbering 395,979; more than 14,000 tracts, books, etc., were distributed. In the hospital and dispensary at Arcot 5883 outpatients, and 475 in-patients were treated. The Rev. Dr. Scudder notes the change that has taken place in the attitude of the natives in the following terms: "As to the results, I have to mention that the temper of the people has been greatly

mollified. This is, perhaps, one of the most wicked districts in Southern India. Its inhabitants used to hear the preached Word with souls full of rage — rage gleaming in their eyes and disfiguring their countenances. It does seem to us that there has been a marked change within the year. Earnest, anxious, sometimes longing looks are cast upon us now as we repeat the sweet story of the cross. Tracts, Gospel portions, the smallest leaves, are eagerly received, where formerly volumes, or books of poetry, or English publications were sought for. There are now no refusals, where before friendly offers were fairly spurned. There are quiet, calm inquiries, where before were angry oppositions, or worse, sullen silence.”

The mission of the *Methodist Episcopal Church* in India was begun in 1856. The work is now in the form of three Annual Conferences, viz., the North India, the South India, and the Bengal, which have 71 foreign missionaries, 58 assistant missionaries, 535 other agents, 6517 members, 5770 probationers, 2 theological schools, with 57 students, 16 high-schools, with 134 teachers and 1973 scholars, 617 other day-schools with 18,505 scholars, and church property to the amount of 1,701,200 rupees. In the district of Bareilly there is a successful medical mission, one of the missionaries having charge of three government hospitals in the province of Kusmaon, and a medical class of native Christian women having been established at Nynee Tal. The hospitals, schools, and orphanages under the care of the missionaries are disposing large numbers of the inhabitants in favor of Christianity.

“It is easy to see,” says Bishop Kingsley, in a letter to the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, “that both Hindu idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindus with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rites, who nevertheless told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the Sacred Ganges will lose its virtue.

In 1868 the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church in British, Portuguese, and French India were as follows:

## Picture for India 1

The statistics of Protestantism in India (inclusive of Burmah, Siam, and Ceylon), compiled from the latest reports, give the following results:

## Picture for India 2

### Indian Caste

The social distinctions indicated by this term are much more numerous, fixed, and exclusive in India than anywhere else. The ancient Egyptians had similar ranks, but they were not so strictly hereditary, nor did they form such impassable barriers in ordinary intercourse. *SEE EGYPT*. The Hindus, indeed, regard these as absolute, original, and permanent demarcations of *race* rather than of mere position or occupation.

**1. Origin.** — From a very early period the Hindu writers have propounded a great variety of speculations regarding the origin of mankind, and of the classes or castes into which their community is divided. The most commonly received of these explanations is that contained in the ancient story, of which Mr. Muir thinks no trace is found in the Rig Veda (excepting one in Purusha Sukta), but which is found in the Santi Parva of the *Mahabharata*, where a conversation occurs between Pururavas, the son of Ila, and Matariswan, or Vayu, the wind god. Pururavas asks, “Whence was the Brahman, and whence were the other three castes produced, and whence is the superiority of the first’?” and Vayu answers, “The Brahman was created from the mouth of Brahm, the Kshatriya from his arms, Vaisya from his thighs, and to serve these three castes the fourth caste was fashioned, and so the Sudra sprung from his feet.” The sacred books of the Hindus, however, contain no uniform or consistent account of the origin of castes, but offer “mystical, mythical, and rationalistic” explanations of it, or fanciful conjecture concerning it. In the *Harivansa* (sec. 211, 5. 11808 sq.). Janamijaya says, “I have heard the description of the Brahma Yug, the first of the ages; I desire now to be accurately informed about the Kshatriya Age,” and he receives the following answer: “Vishnu, sprung from Brahm, exalted above the power of sense, and absorbed in devotion, becomes the patriarch Daksha, and creates numerous human beings. The beautiful Brahmans were formed from all unchangeable

element (*akshara*), the Kshatriyas from a changeable substance (*kshara*), the Vaisyas from alteration (*vicara*), and the Sudras from a modification of smoke." Another account makes the Brahmans to have been fashioned with white, red, yellow, and blue colors. Thence creatures attained in the world the state of fourfold caste, being of one type, but with different duties. Still another account (Santi Parvati of the *Mahabharata*, sec. 188, 189), after giving a statement of the creation of men, etc., propounds the following: "Desire, anger, fear, cupidity, grief, anxiety, hunger, fatigue, prevail in all; all have bodily secretions, with phlegm, bile, and blood; and the bodies of all decay-by what, then, is caste distinguished? ... There is no distinction of caste; the whole world is formed of Brahma; for, having been formerly created by him, it became separated into castes by means of works." In the *Bhagavat Purana* we read that there was formerly only one Veda, one God, one caste. Sometimes the different castes are said to have sprung from the words Bhuh, etc.; from different Vedas; from different sets of prayers- from the gods; from nonentity; from the imperishable, the perishable, and other principles. They are sometimes made to be coeval with the creation, and as having different attributes involving different moral qualities, while in other places, as in the Epic poems, the creation of mankind is described without the least allusion to the separate production of the progenitors of the four castes. Sometimes all men are the offspring of Manu. Thus it is clear that the separate origin of the four castes could not have been an object of belief among the older Hindus, while the variety and inconsistency of these accounts help us not at all in determining its origin.

Many writers have claimed for caste a trans-Himalayan origin, while others have supposed that it originated with the successive waves of emigration within the plains of India. Professor Roth thus states this view: "When the Vedic people, driven by some political shock, advanced from their abodes in the Punjab further and further south, and drove the aborigines into the hills, and took possession of the country lying between the Ganges, the Jumna, and the Vindhya Mountains, circumstances required and favored such an organization of society as was therein developed." On the other hand, Dr. Haug says: "From all we know, the real origin of caste appears to go back to a time anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns though its development into a regular system with insurmountable barriers can be referred only to the latest period of the Vedic times."

**2. Extent.** — But, whatever may have been its origin, it is now a complex and highly artificial system, multiform in shape, and often so blended with the ordinary usages of society and the minute division of labor to which the older civilizations tend, that it is very difficult to make a complete or satisfactory analysis of it. A close inspection of the census returns to the British government in the northwest provinces of India in 1866 shows that it is very much more variable than was formerly supposed. Sometimes the minute divisions into classes seems to follow no other than the lines of the occupations of the people, and they are accordingly returned as belonging to the caste of tailors, or shop men, etc., without other discrimination. This “Blue book” thus enrolled more than *three hundred* distinct castes within that political division. There is, however, after a general fashion, a maintenance of the general classifications, as

- (1) *Brahmans*,
- (2) *Kshattriyas*,
- (3) *Vaishyas*, and
- (4) *Sudra*; below which is a yet more debased class,
- (5) known as *Pariahs*, or outcasts, to be found in all portions of the country.

The four greater castes above named answer to priestly, warrior, agricultural, and artisan, or servant classes. We note in this census return hereditary priests, rope-dancers, sweepers, elephant-drivers, turban-winders, ear-piercers and cleaners, charmers, makers of crowns for idols, and even hereditary beggars and common blackguards.

**3. Rules.** — These castes are all hereditary, the son always following the occupation of the father, however overburdened some departments of occupation may become by the accidents of birth. No classes except the highest two are assumed to intermarry, and all eschew contact with a lower class. They do not eat together, nor cook for nor serve food to each other. This dislike of contact extends to their vessels and other utensils. The usages, however, seem often arbitrary. Smoking from the bowl of another’s pipe may not be an offence if one can make a stem of his fist, but the stem or snake of the pipe must not be touched, or it is rendered worthless to all parties. It is in accordance with caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be transported to another locality. Loads may be carried on the head by some castes, on



the back by some, and not at all by others. The poorest Hindu family do not wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touched by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

The accumulation of motive for the preservation of caste purity is astounding. The slightest variation from custom is at once visited with punishment or fines, while the graver offences become the ground of expulsion literally from all human society, and of disabilities in business and disinheritance; and, believing in ancestor worship as the Hindu does, and that the happiness of his departed relatives is dependent on his performing the *manes*, the additional curse comes upon him of being disabled from performing these ceremonies because of caste impurity.

**4. Effects.** — The caste policy of India checks genius, yet as from the first the individual knows what his life business is to be, he pursues it, and attains a skill in handicraft unequalled. The Indian system tends likewise to give permanence to institutions, but it unfortunately perpetuates evils also. It has been the great hindrance to all progress, civil; political, religious, or, social, and has presented the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christianity. The railroads and other European conveniences have by some been looked upon as likely to make great innovations on caste-usage. There is already a large and well-organized portion of the population known as Brahmins who wholly ignore castes. *SEE HINDUS, MODERN.* There is much less of caste observance among what is considered to be an older population than the Hindu, such as the people inhabiting the Himalaya Mountains, and the “wild tribes” of Central India. See Muir’s *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. 1 (Loud. 1868); Colebrook’s *Miscellaneous Essays*; Wilson’s *Transl. Vishnu Purana*; Muller, *Chips*, 2, 295 sq. (J. T. G.)

### Indians, American

Under this title may be included all the semi-civilized and wild tribes of North and South America, since the most thorough investigation shows that they were substantially the same people. In collating information concerning the Indian thought, it is important to distinguish between the forms it assumed before and after contact with Europeans.

**1. Sources of Knowledge.** — Notwithstanding the proverbial taciturnity of the North-American Indians, some information has been elicited by oral communication. Many of the tribes, also, have a species of records for their traditions. In some instances these seem to be little more than mnemonic signs, made on their skins, tents, clothing, mats, and rocks; but in others, as in Mexico, we find a series of symbols which are a species of idiographic writing, wherein signs stand for ideas, as the Arabic numerals do with us. Besides these there must have existed in some localities a phonetic alphabet prior to the coming of the white man. The only one *known*, however, is found with the Mayas, resident in the peninsula of Yucatan. It had “a well-understood alphabet of twenty-seven elementary sounds, the letters of which are totally different from those of any other nation, and evidently original with themselves.”

**2. Origins.** — Much has been written on the origin of the Indian tribes, and their probable connection with the people of the Old World. Hardwick says, “If no ray of light whatever could be thrown upon the questions which concern the primitive populations of America; if no analogy to the case had existed in the spread:of the Malayo-Polynesian tribes across the islands of the Eastern Archipelago and the Pacific Ocean; if the speech of the Americans had absolutely no affinities with other human dialects; if their traditions, meager as these are, hinted nothing of a distant home and of a perilous migration; if insoluble enigmas were presented by the physical structure of the Americans, or if their moral powers and mental capacities were such as to exclude them from a place in the great brotherhood of:men; if, lastly, no resemblance were found, I will not say in primary articles of belief, but in the memory of specific incidents, and in those minor forms of human thought and culture which will hardly bear to be explained on the hypothesis of ‘natural evolution’ we might then, perhaps, have cause to hesitate in our decision (*Christ and other Masters*, 2, 120 sq.). There is literally nothing, according to our ablest writers, either in the bodily structure or psychology of the American tribes to prove an independent origin, or even to beget suspicions touching a plurality of races; while, according to Mr. Squier, of the words known to have been in use in America one hundred and four coincide with words found in the languages of Asia and Australia, forty-three with those of Europe, and forty with those of Africa. In addition, however, to the migration suggested by the above quotations, two circumstances seem to point most clearly to a collection of our aboriginal Indians with the Malay, Mongol, or Tartar

race: 1. The monosyllabic character of their languages; and, 2. The obvious similarity in complexion and general physical constitution. The case of the Aztecs, moreover, to say nothing of the Mexicans and Peruvians, indicates a degeneracy from an earlier civilization, like that of the Chinese and Japanese.

**3. *Legends.*** — The Indian myths of the creation, the deluge, the epochs of nature, and the last day, are numerous and clear, although it seems more difficult to ascertain here what does and what does not antedate European influence. — Before the creation,” said the Muscogeese, “a great body of water was alone visible. Two pigeons flew to and fro over its waves, and at last spied a blade of grass rising above the surface. Dry land gradually followed, and the islands and continents took their present shapes.” Many of the tribes trace their descent from a raven, “a mighty bird, whose eyes were fire, whose glances were lightning, and the clapping of whose wings was thunder. On his descent to the ocean the earth instantly rose, and remained on the surface of the water. This omnipotent bird then called forth all the variety of animals.” The early Algonquin legends do not speak of any family who escaped the deluge, nor did the Dakotas, who firmly believed the world had been destroyed by water. Generally, however, the legends made some to have escaped by ascending some mountain, on a raft or canoe, in a cave, or by climbing a tree. The pyramids of Cholula, the mounds of the Mississippi Valley, the vast and elaborate edifices in the artificial hills of Yucatan, would seem to have direct reference to the hill on which the ancestors of these people escaped in past deluges, or from the realm of rains, called the Hill of Heaven. They mostly make the last destruction of the world to have been by water, though some few represent it to have been by fire.

**4. *Religious beliefs.*** — It is generally believed that all approximations to monotheism observed among the tribes of the New World are little more than verbal. Their “Great Spirit,” as the phrase stands among Europeans, is at best the highest member of a group of spirits. He may be a personification of the mightiest of all natural energies, but not a personality distinct from nature, and controlling all things by his sovereign will. He is devoid of almost everything which constitutes the glory of the God of revelation. In spite of whatever grandeur, goodness, or ubiquity he may be endowed with, he exercises no control over the lives of individuals or the government of the world. “There is no attempt,” says Mr. Schoolcraft, “by the hunter-priesthood, jugglers, or powwows, which can be gathered from

their oral tradition, to impute to the great, merciful Spirit the attribute of justice, or to make man accountable to him here or hereafter for aberrations from virtue, good-will, truth, or any moral right" (*Red Races*). Their ideas of God have been almost exclusively found to be connected with some natural phenomena, and the almost poetic way in which they look at it suggests that much of their religious thought received complexion from their hunter-life. For the most part, their conceptions of deity seem to have been connected with the phenomena of the meteorological or atmospheric world, and with their observations concerning light and fire. The highest good is generally symbolized as the storm-god or the sun god, these being sometimes blended and sometimes distinct. We may see an illustration of them as united in their adoration of the four cardinal points of the compass, and in their notions of the sacred four birds, four mothers, or four primitive brothers, the progenitors of the human family. Their highest deity is always their highest ideal of civilization and of the arts of peace, and to him they always accord the better attributes of mankind. The god of light is often spoken of as the founder of the nation, sometimes as its progenitor or introducing arts, sciences, and laws, and as having led them in their earliest wanderings. The sun-god is the dispenser of all radiance and fertility, the being by whose light and heat all creatures were generated and sustained, the highest pitch of excellence; and even when transformed into a god of battle, and worshipped with horrid and incongruous rites, or fed by human hecatombs, he never ceased to occupy the foremost rank among the good divinities. He was ever the "father," "sustainer," "revivifier." Muller maintains that there were numerous subordinate hostile deities, who created discord, sickness, death, and every possible form of evil, and that in many cases these were reputed to be under the leadership of the moon, which was the parent of misfortune with some, and yet was the chief divinity of other of the-warlike races, such as the Caribs.

The *Manito* or *Manedo* is alleged to have no personal meaning, but to be equivalent to "spirit," or "a spirit," perhaps somewhat akin to our thought of a guardian spirit. Schoolcraft thinks that, so far as a meaning distinct from an invisible existence attaches to it at all, the tendency is to a bad meaning, and that a bad meaning is distinctly conveyed in the inflection *osh* or *ish* (*Red Races*, p. 214). In considering this belief in *manitos* it is necessary to remember that the Indian conceives every department of the universe to be filled with invisible spirits, holding the same relation to

matter that the soul does to the body, and in accordance with which, not only every man, but every animal, has a soul, and is endowed with a reasoning faculty. Dreams are a means of direct communication with the spiritual world, and are generally regarded as the friendly warnings of their personal *manitos*. No labor or enterprise is undertaken against their indications, whole armies being sometimes turned back by dreams of the officiating priest. Under the guidance of a particular spirit, names are commonly supposed to be bestowed. These personal spirits are invoked to give success in hunting. These manitos are, however, of varied ability, and there is a constant fear lest the manito of a neighbor may prove more powerful than one's own.

The mythological personages who are the heroes of Indian tales, and who are in some way associated with the highest good, as set forth above, may be represented by *Michabo* or Manibozho of the Algonquins, and *Quetzalcoatl*, the god of the air, the highest deity of the Toltecs. The same deity appears with more or less of modification among all the tribes, though under various names. It is *Isokeha* among the Iroquois, *Wasi* among the Cherokees, *Tamoi* with the Caribs, *Zama* with the Mayas, *Nemqueteba* with the Muyscas, *Miracocha* among the Aymaras, etc. Among them all he appears as the one who taught them agriculture, the art of picture writing, the properties of plants, and the secrets of magic; who founded their institutions, established their religions, and taught them government.

There were presentiments of a better time to come connected with the return of these heroes of their tales, which it is thought had much to do with the sudden collapse of the great empires of Mexico and Peru, of the Natchez and the Mayas before the Spaniards. Associated in their legends with the return of their gods and the better time was, in most cases, the notion of the coming of a white man of superior strength from the father of the sun.

**5. *The Soul and a future Life.*** — The immortality of the human soul is universally believed by the North American Indians.

Among all the tribes *soul* is equivalent to breath, or the wind. The same person may have more than one soul; some say four, and others even more than this number. Generally, however, there is some distinction made in these souls. One may remain with the body, being attached to its earthly functions, and is absorbed in the elements, while another soul may pass

away to the "Happy Hunting-grounds;" or, in other cases, one may watch the body, one wander about the world, one hover about the village, and another go to the spirit land. According to an author quoted by Mr. Brinton, certain Oregon tribes located a spirit "“whenever they could detect a pulsation,” the supreme one being in the heart and which alone would go to the skies at death.

Among all the tribes, from the Arctic region to the tropics, the abode of the departed soul is declared to be where the highest good, i.e. where light comes from, or, in other words, in the sun-realm. Hence the soul is variously said to go at death towards the east, or towards the west, the place of the coming or departure of the light, or among some northern tribes, to whom the sun lay in a southern direction, the soul is said to go towards the south. It is in this realm of light or sphere of the sun god that this permanent soul finds its ultimate home. "“Spirituality is clogged with earthly accidents even in the future world. The soul hungers, and food must be deposited at the grave to supply its need. It suffers from cold, and the body must be wrapped about with clothes. It is in darkness, and a light must be kindled at the head of the grave. It wanders through plains and across streams, subject to the vicissitudes of this life, in quest of a place of enjoyment. Among some northern tribes a dog was slain on the grave, and there are indications of a like practice having obtained in Mexico and Peru.” In other localities, and where the government was despotic, not only animals, but men, women, and children were often sacrificed at the tomb of the "cacique." There are traces of this on the Lower Mississippi. Among the Natchez Indians, when a chief died, "one or several of his wives and his highest officers were knocked on the head, and buried with him." There is the belief among many of them that the soul needs light, particularly for four nights or days after death, as it is either confined in the body, or "wandering over a gloomy marsh," or in some other perplexity which prevents its ascending to the skies. The natives of the extreme south, of the Pampas and the Patagonians, suppose the stars to be the souls of the departed.

According to some, there is but little trace, if any, of a clear conception of a system of rewards and punishments, as there certainly do not seem to have been very clear distinctions between vice and virtue, as in anywise related to a future world. The difference between the soul's comfort and discomfort in a future life, in so far as it is made a matter of degree at all, was made to depend, as in the Mexican mythology, on the mode of death.

Women dying in childbirth were associated in the category of worth and merited happiness with warriors dying in battle. In Guatemala a violent death in any shape was sufficient to banish, in after-life, from the felicitous regions. The Brazilian natives divided the dead into classes, making those drowned, or killed by violence, or yielding to disease, to go into separate regions; but there seems to be no reason founded in morals connected with this. It is but just to say that others take a different view of this part of the subject from that here set forth. The abbé Em. Domenech, who spent seven years among these tribes, gives traditions which favor the doctrine of future rewards and punishments for the good or bad deeds of this life (p. 283). Other tribes, however, seem to know nothing *of punishments*. The Master of Life, or Merciful Spirit, will be alike merciful to all, irrespective of the acts of this life, or of any degree of moral turpitude. They see nowhere clear conceptions of virtue and vice even in this world. Sin, they say, is only represented at worst as a metaphorical going astray, as of one who loses his path in the woods, though this may suggest much more than this class of persons admit. That there is a moral sentiment is admitted in connection with their civil and social life, but not as connected with their future state. Their prayers are almost wholly for temporal, and not for moral blessings; but there may be found an assumption of moral qualities or ethical character in connection with their gods, as in the case of Quetzalcoatl above alluded to, who is the founder of their civil code, and who instituted the household, instilled patriotism, etc. The Mexicans had another place for the souls of those dying by lightning-stroke, dropsies, leprosy, etc., who could not go to the home of the sun, but who must go to the realm of the god of the rains and waters, called Tlalocan.

There are indications of the doctrine of *metempsychosis*, and also of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The vast tumuli, though they were not all connected with funeral rites, are summoned in testimony of this doctrine. The custom of collecting and cleansing the bones—usually once in eight or ten years—of those who had died in the tribe, and then burying them in a common Sepulcher “lined with choice furs, and marked with a mound of wood, stone, or earth,” was common east of the Mississippi. This has been supposed to be connected with the theory that a part of the soul, or one of the souls, dwelt in the bones, and that these seed-souls, so to speak, would one day germinate into living human beings. Parts of their mythology afford support to such a supposition. An Aztec legend is to the effect that when the human species had been destroyed from off the face of

the world, it was restored by one of the gods descending to the realm of the dead, and bringing thence a bone of the perished race, which they sprinkled with blood, and on the fourth day it became a youth, the father of the present race.

**6. Funeral Rites.** — The mounds used for funeral services are found, for the most part, within walls of entrenched camps and fortified towns. On the top of these tumuli are altars of baked clay or stone, varying in length from a few inches to many yards. The mounds are found in very large numbers, and have an average height of eight or ten yards, being usually in the form of a simple cone, or of a pear or egg. The dead were frequently burned before they were buried, funeral urns having often been discovered, as also beds of charcoal. With the dead were generally interred the ornaments, arms, and other objects belonging to them during life. The mounds sometimes contain silver, brass, stone, or bone, beads, shells, pieces of silex, quartz, garnet, points of arrows, fossil teeth of sharks, sculptures of human heads, pottery, etc. The customs observed in the burial of their dead differ in the different tribes. They all, however, paint the corpse black. The feet of the corpses are turned to the rising sun. The Omahas swathe the bodies with bandages made of skins, and place them on the branches of a tree, with a wooden vase filled with dried meat by their side, which is renewed from time to time. The Sioux bury their dead on the summit of a hill or mountain, and plant on the tomb a cedar-tree, which may be seen from a distance. The Chinooks wrap the bodies of their dead in skins, bind their eyes, put little shells in their nostrils, and dress them in most beautiful clothes, and then place them in a canoe, which is allowed to drift on a lake, or river, or the Pacific Ocean. The Shoshones burn their dead, with everything belonging to them. Among other tribes of the West the warriors are buried on horseback, with bow, and buckler, and quiver, and pipe, and medicine-bag, tobacco, and dried meats. The Assiniboins suspend their dead by thongs of leather between the branches of great trees, or place them on high scaffoldings, to keep them from wild animals. The Ottawas sacrifice a horse on the tomb of the dead, strangling the animal by a noose. When a tribe emigrate, they carry with them, if possible, the bones of their dead which have been preserved, or bury them in a cave, or hill, or wood.

**7. Religious Usages.** — The Indians are alleged by Domenech to have had a few customs not wholly unlike some which obtained among the Jews. They have some feasts at which they are obliged to eat all that has been prepared for the banquet. They observe a feast of first fruits, and have



some forbidden meats, regarding some animals as impure. They observe the custom of sacrificing the first animal killed on the opening of great hunts, the animal being entirely eaten. They carry amulets under the name of medicine-bags, and accord a subordinate species of worship to idols of stone, wood, or baked clay. The amulets, lucky stones, and charms existed everywhere, and were a chief object of barter. In Yucatan and Peru pilgrimages to sacred shrines were so common as that, in some instances, "roads paved with cut stones" were constructed to facilitate the attendance on certain temples, and houses of entertainment constructed along the way.

The priesthood of the country has been considered by those long familiar with the subject to have done more than any other agency to keep these tribes from becoming civilized. They are often spoken of as medicine men, and are variously styled by the Algonquins and Dakotas "those knowing divine things," "dreamers of the gods;" in Mexico, "masters or guardians of the divine things;" in Cherokee their title means "possessed of the divine fire;" in Iroquois, "keepers of the faith;" in Quichua, "the learned;" in Maya, "the listeners." As medicine-men, they tried to frighten the daemon that possessed the patient; sucked and blew upon the diseased organ, sprinkled it with water, rubbed the parts with their hands, and made an image representative of the spirit of sickness, and knocked it to pieces. They were much skilled in tricks of legerdemain, setting fire to articles of clothing and instantly extinguishing the flames by magic. They summoned spirits to answer questions about the future, and possessed clairvoyant powers; and they were reputed to be even able to raise the dead. They consecrated amulets, interpreted dreams, cast horoscopes, rehearsed legends, performed sacrifices, and, in short, constituted the chief center of the intellectual force of the people. They are thus a kind of priests, doctors, and charlatans, who perform penance, and submit to mutilation, fasting, and self mortification. They observe with minute attention the shape and color of the clouds, their volume and direction, and their position relatively to the sun and horizon. Carnivorous birds are considered precursors of war; their flight indicates the time and place at which future battles will be fought; they go to and fro carrying messages for the spirit of battle. The priest is particularly important in the ceremony which is necessary to secure rain. The medicine lodge is used for nearly all ceremonies. *SEE NORTH AMERICA, RELIGIONS OF.*

**8. Present Location and Numbers.** — The large proportion of the Indians of the United States are now gathered within the Indian Territory, on

“Reservations” assigned them by the United-States government. There are others, however, in Oregon, Alaska, New Mexico, etc. Within the Indian Territory they do not “live by fishing, hunting, and trapping, but cultivate the soil, are settled, and have attained a considerable degree and shown a susceptibility of genuine civilization.”

According to the census of 1880 there were within the Indian territory, Cherokees, 19,720; Muscogees or Creeks, 15,000; Seminoles, 2667; Choctaws, 15,800; Chicasaws, 6000; Cheyennes, 4197; Arapahoes, 2258; Pawnee, 1241; Osage. 1896; Comanche, 1396; and 16,000 Navajo and 9060 Pueblo Indians in New Mexico. There were 4059. Chippewas and 1506 Oneidas in Wisconsin, and 9500 Chippewas in Michigan. Much of the land formerly assigned to the Indians has lately been purchased by the government and opened to settlers, and some of it has been occupied, so that there is a demand for the removal or condensation of the natives. *SEE MISSIONS.*

**9. Literature.** — Brinton, *Myths of New World* (N. Y. 1868); Waitz, *Anthropologie der Natutr- Volker* (Leipzig, 1862-66); Catlin, *V. Am. Indians* (Lond. 1841); Muller, *Gesch. der Amerikanischen Ur-religionen* (Basel, 1855); Squier, *The Serpent Symbol of America* (N. York, 1851); Hawking, *Sketch of the Creek Country* (Georgia Hist. Soc. 1848); Schoolcraft, *Red Races of America* (N. Y. 1847); *Notes on the Iroquois* (Albany, 1848); *Hist. and Statist. Information prepared for the Indian Bureau of the U. S. Government* (Philad. 1851); Domenech, *Seven Years' Residence in the great Deserts of North America* (London, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Brainard, *A Journal among the Indians* (Philadel.); Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico*; Copway, *Traditional. Hist. of the Ojibway Nation* (Lond. 1850); M'Coy, *Hist. of the Bapt. Indian Missions*; Mrs. Eastman, *Legends of the Sioux*; *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indians Tribes from 1529 to 1824* (N. Y. 1855); *Trans. Am. Ethn. Soc.* (1848); *Relations de la nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1858); Mr. Duponceaux's *Report to Amer. Philos. Soc.* (1819, 8vo). (J T. G.)

## Indictio Pestorum Mobilium

*SEE INDICTIO PASCHALIS.*

## Indiction

(Latin *indictio*, a declaring) is a term which designates “a chronological system, including a circle of fifteen years:

- (1) the *Caesarean*, used long in France and Germany, beginning on Sept. 24;
- (2) the *Constantinopolitan*, used in the East from the time of Anastasius, and beginning Sept. 1; and
- (3) the *Papal*, reckoned from Jan. 1, 313. The Council of Antioch, 341, first gives a documentary date, the 14th indiction. The computation prevailed in Syria in the fifth century, and is mentioned by Ambrose as existing at Rome. It is, however, asserted that in the West, the East, and Egypt, with the exception of Africa, the indictions, until the 16th century, were reckoned from Sept. 1, 312, and that they commenced in Egypt in the time of Constantine.” — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 327; see also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 2, 141. *SEE CYCLE*.

## Indictio Paschalis

It was an old custom in the Christian Church of the early ages to announce on Epiphany (q.v.) the days on which Easter would fall, and this announcement was called the *Indictio paschalis*; but as on the appointment of the days on which Easter should be observed depended the appointment of the movable feasts, this announcement was called the *Indictio festorum mobilium*. The first practices of this kind we find in the Alexandrian Church, but it soon became general throughout the Christian Church, even by ecclesiastical enactments. Thus the fourth Synod at Orleans (*Concil. Aurelian.* 4, c. 1) ordered its observance, and even the fifth Synod at Carthage (A.D. 401, *Concil. Carthag.* 5, can. 7) ordered a written announcement, which was called *Epistola paschalis et heortastica*. See Bingham, *Antiquit. Ecclesiast.* 9:85 sq.; Augusti, *Handbuch der Christl. Archäol.* 1, 544; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 687. (J. H. W.)

## Indifference, Liberty of

a name sometimes given, by metaphysical and theological writers, to the power in the human mind of choosing between opposing motives, or of resisting or yielding to a given motive. The upholders of fatalism consider this “liberty of indifference” as a chimera. If we were

indifferent, say they, to the motives which determine our actions, we should either not act at all, or we should act without motive, at hazard, and our actions would be effects without cause. But this is intentionally confounding indifference and insensibility. — We are necessarily sensible to a motive when that motive induces us to act, but the question at issue is whether there is a necessary connection between such a motive and such volition; that is, whether, when such a motive induces us to will anything, we can or cannot will the contrary in spite of that motive, or whether we cannot prefer another motive to that by which we determine to act. As soon as it is supposed that we act from a motive, it cannot be supposed that this motive does not determine us to act, for the two suppositions would contradict each other: but it may be asked whether, before any supposition, our will was connected with the motive in such a manner as to render a contrary volition impossible. The advocates of moral liberty maintain that there is no physical or necessary connection between motives and volition, but only a moral connection, which does not prevent our resisting; in other words, that motives are the moral, not the physical causes of our actions. Because we are said to be *determined* by a motive, it does not follow that that motive acts, and we remain passive; it is absurd to suppose that an active faculty like volition could become passive under the influence of a motive, or that this motive, which after all is but an idea, a thought, could act upon us as we act upon a body we put in motion. This metaphysical question is intimately connected with another long discussed by theologians, namely, the mode of action of grace on us, and in what sense grace is to be understood as being the *cause* of our actions. Those who consider it as their *physical cause* must, to be consistent, suppose the same relation between grace and the action to which it led as between any physical cause and its effect. As, according to natural philosophy, the relation in the latter case is a necessary one, we cannot perceive how the action produced under the influence of grace can be free. For this reason, other theologians look upon grace only as the *moral cause* of our actions, and admit between this cause and its effects only a moral connection, such as exists between all free action and its motive. It is, indeed, God who acts in us through grace, but his operation is so similar to that of nature that we are often unable to distinguish between them. When we perform a good action under the influence of grace—a supernatural motive—we feel as active, as free, as well masters of our actions as when doing it from a

natural motive, from temperament or interest. Why should we try to believe that God deceives our consciousness, acting upon us as though he left us free, while in reality he does not? Consciousness testifies to us that we can resist grace as readily as we resist our natural tastes and inclinations. Thus the testimony of conscience, that we are entirely free under the influence of grace, is complete. Let us not forget the saying of St. Augustine, that grace was given us, not to destroy, but to restore our free agency. The Pelagians erred in defining free agency to be *indifference* towards good and evil; they understood by this an equal inclination to either, an equal facility for choosing right or wrong (St. Augustine, *Op. imp. l. 3*, n. 109, 110, 117; *Letter of S. Prosper*, n. 4). They concluded from this that if grace destroyed this *indifference*, it would thereby destroy free agency. St. Augustine correctly affirms, in opposition, that in consequence of Adam's sin man is more inclined to evil than to good, and that he needs grace to restore the equilibrium. Those who accused St. Augustine of disregarding free will in maintaining the necessity of grace, misunderstood his doctrine as much as the Pelagians. Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie*, 3, 394 sq. (Comp. Barrow, *Works*, 2, 47; Palmer, *Church of Christ*, 1, 252-58, 321 sq.)  
**SEE WILL.**

## Indifferentism

(*indifferentismus*), a word much used

**I.** By the theologians of Germany to denote

**(1.)** that state of mind which looks upon all religions (e.g. Christianity and Mohammedanism) as alike valuable or valueless in proportion as they agree with natural religion;

**(2.)** that state of mind which, carelessly admitting the truth of Christianity, holds that all discussion as to its doctrines is unimportant. An astonishing number of books have been written upon this subject. See Buddeus, *Institut. Theol. Dogmat.* p. 60; Bretschneider, *System. Entwicklung*, p. 13; Schubert, *Institt. Theol. Polemn.* 1, 569; Sack, *Christliche Polemik*, p. 65; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 6, 657; and a full list of books on the subject in Danz, *Universal- Worterbuch.* p. 449 sq. **SEE INTOLERANCE; SEE LATITUDINARIANISM; SEE TOLERATION.**

**II.** The term is used also to denote that form of infidelity, or semi-infidelity, which holds that man is not responsible for his beliefs. "Gibbon, speaking of the paganism of ancient Rome, says, The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as equally useful.' The comment of some one is, 'After eighteen centuries of the Gospel, we seem unhappily to be coming back to the same point.' A very weakened sense of responsibility, or an actual denial of it, lies at the bottom of that indifferentism which is so extensively prevalent in the present age. On the Continent, especially in Germany and France, not only are opinions destructive of the sense of responsibility widely diffused among the masses, but in the case of vast multitudes, who would not wish to be counted the foes of Christianity, there is an utter absence of anything like the religious obligation of belief. There is also a great deal of this kind of infidelity in England and America. It is stated, or implied, in much of our current popular literature, that a man's creed does not depend upon himself. This dogma pervades the writings of Mr. Emerson. Napoleon, one of his 'representative men,' of whom he tells 'horrible anecdotes,' must not, in his view,' be set down as cruel, but only as one who knew no impediment to his will.' He depicts him as an exorbitant egotist, who narrowed, impoverished, and absorbed the power and existence of those who served him; and concludes by saying, 'it was not Bonaparte's fault.' He thus condemns and acquits in the same breath, sends forth from the same fountain sweet water and bitter. Mr. Theodore Parker makes each-form of religion that has figured in the history of the world 'natural and indispensable.' 'It could not have been but as it was.' And, therefore, he finds truth, or the 'absolute religion,' in all forms; 'all tending towards one great and beautiful end' (*Discourse of Religion*, p. 81). Of course, the idea of the religious obligation of belief resting upon the individual conscience is here quite out of question. Mr. F. W. Newman, who is so fond of parting off things that most men connect together, would persuade us that there may be a true faith without a true belief, as if the emotional part of our nature was independent of the intellectual. 'Belief,' says he, 'is one thing, and faith another.' And he complains of those who, on religious grounds, are alienated from him because he has adopted 'intellectual conclusions' different from theirs' the difference between them and him' turning merely 'on questions of learning, history, criticism, and abstract thought' (*Phases of Faith*, Preface). The philosophy is as bad here as the theology. In the view of common sense and Scripture, a living faith is as the doctrine

believed. But Mr. Newman, in common with Mr. Parker and others, can lay down his offensive weapons when he wills, and take up a position on the low ground of indifference as to religious belief. *Then*, creeds become matters of mere moonshine, and responsibility is regarded as a fiction invented by priests. This is part of the bad theology of Mr. Bailey's 'Festus.' The hero of the poem is made to say,

“Yet merit or demerit none I see  
 In nature, human or material,  
 In passions or affections good or bad.  
 We only know that God's best purposes  
 Are oftenest brought about by dreadest sins.  
 Is thunder evil, or is dew divine?  
 Does virtue lie in sunshine, sin in storm?  
 Is not each natural, each needful, best?”

The theory of this infidelity appears to be that man has no control over his belief, that he is no more responsible for his opinions than he is for his color or his height, and that an infidel or an atheist is to be pitied but not blamed. This, we are persuaded; is a piece of flimsy sophistry which no man should utter, and which would not be listened to for a moment in connection with any other subject than that of religion. It would be condemned in the senate and at the bar, it would be drowned in the tumult of the exchange and the market-place. Common sense, and a regard to worldly interests, would rise up and hoot down the traitor. Unfortunately, however, in the province of religion, the natural indisposition of the mind to things unseen and spiritual allies itself with the pleadings of the sophist, and receives his doctrine of irresponsibility with something like flattering unction. Nothing more than this is requisite to undermine the foundation of all religious belief and morals to let open the floodgates of immorality, and to make the restraints of religion like the brittle flax or the yielding sand. In opposition to such latitudinarianism, we maintain that man is responsible for the dispositions which he cherishes, for the opinions which he holds and avows, and for his habitual conduct. This is going the whole length of Scripture, but no farther, which affirms that every one of us must give an account of himself unto God. And this meets with a response from amid the elements of man's moral nature, which sets its seal that the thing is true” (Pearson, *Prize Es. say on Infidelity*, ch. 5). (Comp. Baumgarten, *Gesch. der Religions-Partheien*, p. 102 sq.) **SEE RESPONSIBILITY.**

## Indifferent things

(Comp. Harless, *System of Christian Ethics*, transl. by Morison and Findlay, Edinburgh,. 1868, 8vo.) *SEE ADIAPHORA*.

## Indigetes

(sc. DII), an epithet given by the Romans to the particular gods of each country, who, having been natives of those countries, were deified by their countrymen after death. Thus Romulus was one of the gods *Indigetes* of the Romans, and was worshipped under the name Quirinus. AENEAS, though not a native of Italy, yet, as founder of the Roman name, was ranked among the gods *Indigetes*. — *Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* 1, 530.

## Indignation

a strong disapprobation of mind, excited by something flagitious in the conduct of another. It does not, as Mr. Cogan observes, always suppose that excess of depravity which alone is capable of committing deeds of horror. Indignation always refers to culpability of conduct, and cannot, like the passion of horror, be extended to distress either of body or mind. It is produced by acts of treachery, abuse of confidence, base ingratitude, etc., which we cannot contemplate without being provoked to anger, and feeling a generous resentment. — Cogan, *On the Passions*; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE ANGER*.

## Indra

one of the Hindu deities of the Vedic period of the Hindu religion, who also enjoyed a great legendary popularity in the Epic and Puranic periods. *SEE HINDUISM*. He is, so to speak, the Hindi Jupiter. He is quite frequently styled “Lord of heaven” (divaspati *diespiter*). The name itself is of doubtful origin, meaning either (1) “blue” (as epithet of the firmament), or (2) “the illuminator,” or (3) “the giver of rain” (compare Wuttke, *Gesch. des leidenthueßs*, 2, 242). Max Muller (*Science of Language*: 2nd series, p. 449) says the name “admits of but one etymology; i.e. it must be derived from the same root, whatever that may be, which in Sanskrit yielded *indu*, drop, sap. It meant originally the giver of rain, the *Jupiter pluvius*, a deity in India more often present to the mind of the worshipper than any other” (comp. Benfey, *Orient and Occident*, 1. 49). “In that class



of Rig-Veda hymns which there is reason to look upon as the oldest portion of Vedic poetry, the character of Indra is that of a mighty ruler of the bright firmament, and his principal feat is that of conquering the daemon *Vritra*, a symbolical personification of the cloud which obstructs the clearness of the sky, and withholds the fructifying rain from the earth. In his battles with *Vritra* he is therefore described as 'opening the receptacles of the waters,' as 'cleaving the cloud' with his 'far-whirling thunderbolt,' as 'casting the waters down to the earth,' and 'restoring the sun to the sky.' he is, in consequence, 'the upholder of heaven, earth, and firmament,' and the god 'who has engendered the sun and the dawn.' And since the atmospherical phenomena personified in this conception are ever and ever recurring, he is 'undecaying' and 'ever youthful.' All the wonderful deeds of Indra, however, are performed by him merely for the benefit of the good, which, in the language of the Veda, means the pious men who worship him in their songs, and invigorate him with the offerings of the juice of the soma plant. *SEE HINDUISM*. He is, therefore, the 'lord of the virtuous,' and the 'discomfiter of those who neglect religious rites.' Many other epithets, which we have not space to enumerate, illustrate the same conception. It is on account of the paramount influence which the deeds of Indra exercise on the material happiness of man that this deity occupies a foremost rank in the Vedic worship, and that a greater number of invocations are addressed to him than to any other of the gods (comp. Max Muller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, 1, 30-32, et al.). But to understand the gradual expansion of his mythical character, and his ultimate degradation to an inferior position in the Hindu pantheon of a later period, it is necessary to bear in mind that, however much the Vedic poets call Indra the protector of the pious and virtuous, he is in their songs essentially a warlike god, and gradually endowed by imagination not only with the qualities of a mighty, but also of a self-willed king. The legends which represent him in this light seem, it is true, to belong to a later class of the Rig-Veda hymns, but they show that the original conception of Indra excluded from his nature those ethical considerations which in time changed the pantheon of elementary gods into one of a different stamp. Whether the idea of an incarnation (q.v.) of the deity, which, at the Epic and Puranic periods, played so important a part in the history of Vishnu, did not exercise its influence as early as the composition of some of the Vedic hymns in honor of Indra, may at least be matter of doubt. He is, for instance, frequently invoked as the destroyer of cities-of seven, of ninety-nine, even of a hundred cities and he is not only repeatedly called the slayer

of the hostile tribes which surrounded the Aryan Hindus, but some of the chiefs slain by him are enumerated by name. The commentators, of course, turn those 'robbers' and their 'chiefs' into daemons, and their cities into celestial abodes; but as it is improbable that all these names should be nothing but personifications of clouds destroyed by the thunder-bolt of Indra, it is, to say the least, questionable whether events in the early history of India may not have been associated with the deeds of Indra himself, in like manner as, at the Epic period, mortal heroes were looked upon as incarnations of Vishnu, and mortal deeds transformed into exploits of this god.

“The purely kingly character of Indra assumes its typical shape in the *Aitareya Brahmana*, where his installation as lord of the inferior gods is described with much mystical detail; and from that time he continues to be the supreme lord of the minor gods, and the type of a mortal king. During the Epic and Puranic periods, where ethical conceptions of the divine powers prevail over ideas based on elementary impressions, Indra ceases to enjoy the worship he had acquired at the 'Vedic time, and his existence is chiefly upheld by the poets, who, in their turn, however, work it out in the most fantastical detail. Of the eight guardians of the world. he is, then, the one who presides over the east, and he is still the god who sends rain and wields the thunderbolt; but poetry is more engrossed by the beauty of his paradise, *Swarga*, the happy abode of the- inferior gods, and of those pious men who attain it after death in consequence of having, during life, properly discharged their religious duties; by the charms of his heavenly nymphs, the *Apsarasas*, who now and then descend to earth to disturb the equanimity of austere penitents; by the musical performances of his choristers, the *Gandharvas*; by the splendor of his capital, *Amaravati*; by the fabulous beauty of his garden, *Nandana*, etc. A remarkable trait in this legendary life of Indra is the series of his conflicts with Krishna (q.v.), an incarnation of Vishnu, which end, however, in his becoming reconciled with the more important god. As the god who is emphatically called the god of the hundred sacrifices (*Satakratu*), Indra is jealous of every mortal who may have the presumption of aiming at the performance of that number of sacrifices, for the accomplishment of such an intention would raise the sacrificer to a rank equal to that which he occupies. He is, therefore, ever at hand to disturb sacrificial acts which may expose him to the danger of having his power shared by another Indra. According to the Puranas, the reign of this god Indra, who is frequently called also *Sakra*, or

the mighty, does not last longer than the ‘first *Manwantara*, or mundane epoch. After each successive destruction of the world, a new Indra was created, together with other gods, saints, and mortal beings. Thus the Indra of the second *Manwantara* is *Vipaschit*; of the third, *Susdnti*; of the fourth, *Sivi*; of the fifth, *Vibhu*; of the sixth, *Manojava*; and the Indra of the present age is *Purandara*” (Chambers, s.v.). In works of art, Indra is generally represented as riding on an elephant. In paintings, his eyes are veiled. See also Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 1, 173.

## Induction

(Lat. *inductio*, from *duco*, I lead) is a term in ecclesiastical law for the act by which a clergyman in the Church of England, having been presented to a benefice by its patron is *brought in* to the possession of the freehold of the church and glebe. This is usually done by a mandate, under the seal of the bishop, addressed to the archdeacon, who either in person inducts the minister, or commissions some clergyman in his archdeaconry to perform that office. The archdeacon, or his deputy, inducts the incumbent, by laying his hand on the key of the church as it lies in the lock, and using this form: “I induct you into the real and actual possession of the rectory or vicarage of M., with all its profits and appurtenances.” The church door is then opened; the incumbent enters, and generally tolls a bell, in token of having entered on his spiritual duties. In Scotland the Presbytery induct the minister.

## Indulgence

(Lat. *indulgentia*), in English history, is the title applied to a proclamation of Charles II (A.D. 1662), and especially to one of James II, April 4, 1687, announcing religious toleration to all classes of his subjects, suspending all penal laws against nonconformists, and abolishing religious tests as qualifications for civil office. The king’s object was simply to favor Roman Catholics, and therefore neither the English Church nor the great body of the dissenters received the illegal stretch of prerogative with favor, and refused to believe that a “dispensing power” exercised by the king independently of Parliament could be of any lasting advantage. Howe and Baxter maintained this opinion. The same instrument was extended to Scotland, and divided the Covenanters into two parties. At first the king, asked toleration for Papists only, but the Scottish Parliament, usually very obsequious would not listen. He finally declared, as if Popery were already

in the ascendant, that he would never use “force or invincible necessity against any man on account of his Protestant faith,” and all this he did “-by his sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power.” — Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, 1, 213; 3:44 sq.; Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches of England*, p. 77 sq.; Stoughton, *Eccl. Hist. of England since the Restoration*, 2, 296, et al.

## Indulgences

(Lat. *indulgentiæ*), the name of a peculiar institution in the Roman Church. The doctrine of indulgence, in its most plausible form, is stated by a Romanist writer as follows: “It is a releasing, by the power of the keys committed to the Church, the debt of temporal punishment which may remain due upon account of our sins, after the sins themselves, as to the guilt and eternal punishment, have been already remitted by repentance and confession” (*Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, chap. 10, quest. 1). The doctrine and practice of indulgence constitutes the very center of the hierarchical theory of Romanism, and was, probably for that very reason, the first object of attack on the part of Luther in the beginning of the Reformation.

**I. Origin of the System.** — The early Church knew nothing of indulgences. The system seems to have originated in that of *penance* (q.v.), which, in the hands of the episcopacy, began to assume a corrupt form in the 3rd century. The immediate object of penance was to restore an offender, not to communion with God, but to the communion of the Church. When an excommunicated person sought readmission, the bishop assigned him a penitential discipline (q.v.) of abstinence, mortification, and good works, after which he was taken back into fellowship by certain regular modes of procedure. The bishop had the power to abridge the period of probation, or to mitigate the severity of the penance, and in this power lies the germ of the doctrine of Malgence (see *Canons of Council of Ancyra*, c. v). In course of time penitential discipline came to be applied, not merely to excommunicated persons, but to all delinquents within the pale of the Church; and penance came at last, in the hands of the schoolmen, to be a *sacrament*, with its systematic theory nicely fitting into the hierarchical system, of which, in fact, it became the very keystone. Nothing could so surely augment the power of the priesthood as the right of fixing penalties for sin, and making terms of forgiveness. “Just as, in early times, the penances of the excommunicated were frequently mitigated, so, in the

course of the Middle Ages, an analogous mitigation was introduced with reference to the works of penance to which delinquents were subjected. Permission was given to exchange a more severe for a gentler kind of penance. Sometimes, in place of doing penance himself, the party was allowed to employ a substitute. And sometimes, in fine, instead of the actual penance prescribed, some service conducive to the interest of the Church and the glory of God was accepted. This last was the real basis of indulgence. Even here, however, the process was gradual. At first only personal acts performed for the Church were admitted. Then pecuniary gifts became more and more common, until at last the matter assumed the shape of a mere money speculation. Initiatively the abuse grew up in practice. Then came Scholasticism, and furnished it with a theoretical substratum; and not until the institution had thus received an ecclesiastical and scientific basis was a method of practice introduced which overstepped all limits. The first powerful impulse to the introduction of indulgences, properly so called, was given by the Crusades at the great Synod of Clermont in 1096. Urban II there promised to all who took part in the Crusade, which he proposed as a highly meritorious ecclesiastical work, plenary indulgence (*indulgentia plenarias*); and from that date for a period of two hundred years, this grace of the Church continued one of the most powerful means for renewing and enlivening these expeditions, although it was evident to unprejudiced contemporaries that the adventurers, when they crossed the ocean, did not undergo a change of character with the change of climate. The same favor was ere long extended to the military expeditions set on foot against the heretics in Europe, and at last, by Boniface VIII, in 1300, to the year of the Roman Jubilee. Subsequently to that date, several monastic orders and holy places likewise received from successive popes special privileges in the matter of indulgence" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, 1, 236).

**II. Scholastic Doctrine of Indulgence.** — The practice of indulgence had been going on for some time when the Scholastic theologians took it up, and formed a speculative theory to justify it. Three great men contributed to this task: Alexander de Hales (q.v.), Albertus Magnus (q.v.), and Thomas Aquinas (q.v.). Alexander de Hales (t. A.D. 1245) laid a firm foundation for the theory in the doctrine, first fairly propounded by him, of the *Treasure of the Church* (*thesaurus ecclesiae*). It runs as follows: "The sufferings and death of Christ not only made a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of men, but also acquired a superabundance of merit. This superfluous

merit of Christ is conjoined with that of the martyrs and saints, which is similar in kind, though smaller in degree, for they likewise performed more than the divine law required of them. The sum of these supererogatory merits and good works forms a vast treasure, which is disjoined from the persons who won or performed them exists objectively, and, having been accumulated by the Head and members of the Church, and intended by them for its use, belongs to the Church, and is necessarily placed under the administration of its representatives, especially the pope, who is supreme. It is therefore competent for the pope, according to the measure of his insight at the time, to draw from this treasure, and bestow upon those who have no merit of their own such supplies of it as they require. Indulgences and remissions are made from the supererogatory merits of Christ's members, but most of all from the superabundance of Christ's own, the two constituting the Church's spiritual treasure. The administration of this treasure does not pertain to all, but to those only who occupy Christ's place, viz. the bishops" (Alex. Hales, *Summa*, 4, qu. 23, art. 2). As regards the extent of indulgence, Alexander is of opinion that it reaches even to the souls in Purgatory, under the condition, however, that there shall be the power of the keys in the party who dispenses it; faith, love, and devotion in the party to whom it is dispensed; and a competent reason and a proper relation between the two (*I. c.* par. 5). He does not, however, suppose that in such cases indulgence is granted in the way of judicial absolution or barter, but in that of intercession ("per modum suffragii sive interpretationis").

Albert the Great († 1280), adopting the opinions of his predecessor, designates indulgence the remission of some imposed punishment or penance, proceeding from the power of the keys, and the treasure of the superfluous merits of the perfect. With respect to the efficacy of indulgence, Albert proposes to steer a middle course between two extremes. Some, he says, imagine that indulgence has no efficacy at all, and is merely a pious fraud, by which men are enticed to the performance of good works, such as pilgrimage and almsgiving. These, however, reduce the action of the Church to child's play, and fall into heresy. Others, carrying the contrary opinion further than is necessary, assert that an indulgence at once and unconditionally accomplishes all that is expressed in it, and thus make the divine mercy diminish the fear of judgment. The true medium is that indulgence has that precise amount of efficacy which the Church assigns to it (Alb. Magnus, *Sentent.* lib. 4, d. 20, art. 16).

Thomas Aquinas deduces the efficacy of indulgence directly from Christ. The history of the adulteress shows, he says, that it is in Christ's power to remit the penalty of sin without satisfaction, and so could Paul, and so also can the pope, whose power in the Church is not inferior to Paul's. Besides, the Church general is infallible, and, as it sanctions and practices indulgence, indulgence must be valid. This, Thomas is persuaded, all admit, *because there would be impiety* in representing any act of the Church as nugatory. The reason of its efficacy, however, lies in the oneness of the mystical body, within the limits of which there are many who, as respects works of penitence, have done more than they were under obligation to do; for instance, many who have patiently endured undeserved sufferings sufficient to expiate a great amount of penalties. In fact, *so vast is the sum* of these merits that it *greatly exceeds the measure of the guilt of all the living*, especially when augmented by *the merit of Christ*, which, although operative in the sacraments, is not in its operation confined to these, but, being infinite, extends far beyond them. The measure of the efficacy of indulgence — this St. Thomas reckons to be the truth — is determined by the measure of its cause. The procuring cause of the remission of punishment in indulgence is, however, solely the plenitude of the Church's merits, not the piety, labors, or gifts of the party by whom it is obtained; and therefore the quantity of the indulgence does not need to correspond with any of these, but only with the merits of the Church. In respect to *the party who ought to dispense indulgence*, St. Thomas asserts that no mere priest or pastor, but *only the bishop*, is competent for the duty. On the other hand, deacons and other parties not in orders, as, for example, *nuncios*, may grant indulgence if, either in an ordinary or extraordinary way, they have been entrusted with jurisdiction for the purpose. For indulgence does not, like sacramental acts, pertain to the power of the keys inherent in the *priesthood*, but to that power of the keys which belongs to *jurisdiction* (Aquinas, *Supplem. 3 partes Summae Theologici*, qu. 25-27).

**III.** *Opposition to Indulgences within the Church of Rome.* — Such a doctrine could not fail to offend truly pious souls even within the Church. Long before the Reformation the whole system was attacked by eminent doctors. One of its most powerful opponents was John of Wesel (q.v.), in the middle of the 15th century. A festival of jubilee, with vast indulgences, was proclaimed by pope Clement VI in 1450, and cardinal Cusanus visited Erfurt as a preacher of indulgence. This brought the subject practically before Wesel's mind, and he wrote a treatise against indulgences (*Adversus*

*indulgentias*: see Walch, *Monum. Med. avi*, 2, fasc. 1, 111-156). For a full account of it, see Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, 1, 258 sq. The flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences began to cause a reaction against the system even in the popular mind. In the 15th century, in particular, the disposal of them had become almost a common traffic; and a public sale of them was generally preceded by some specious pretext; for instance, the reduction of the Greeks under the yoke of the Romish Church, a war with heretics, or a crusade against the Neapolitans, etc. Too often the pretences for selling indulgences were in reality bloody, idolatrous, or superstitious. It was one of the charges brought against John XXIII at the Council of Constance, in 1415, that he empowered his legates to absolve penitents from all sorts of crimes upon payment of sums proportioned to their guilt. When such- indulgences were to be published, the disposal of them was commonly farmed out; for the papal court could not always wait to have the money collected and conveyed from every country of Europe. And there were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the papal chancery handsome sums for them. Thus both parties were benefited. The chancery came at once into possession of large sums of money, and the farmers did not fail of a good bargain. They were careful to employ skilful hawkers of the indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence with which they imposed upon the simple people. Yet, that this species of traffic might have a religious aspect, the pope appointed the archbishops of the several provinces to be his commissaries, who in his name announced that indulgences were to be sold, and generally selected the persons to hawk them, and for this service shared the profits with the merchants who farmed them. These papal hawkers enjoyed great privileges, and, however odious to the civil authorities, they were not to be molested. Complaints, indeed, were made against these contributions, levied by the popes upon all Christian Europe. Kings and princes, clergy and laity, bishops, monasteries, and confessors, all felt themselves aggrieved by them; the kings, that their countries were impoverished, under the pretext of crusades that were never undertaken, and of wars against heretics and Turks; and the bishops, that their letters of indulgence were rendered inefficient, and the people released from ecclesiastical discipline. But at Rome all were deaf to these complaints; and it was not till the revolution produced by Luther that unhappy Europe obtained the desired relief (Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. 3:sec. 1, chap. 10 Leo X, in order to carry on the expensive structure of St.



Peter's Church at Rome, published indulgences, with a plenary remission to all such as should contribute towards erecting that magnificent fabric. The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a share in the profits arising from the sale of them, was granted to Albert, elector of Mentz and archbishop of Magdeburg, who selected as his chief agent for retailing them in Saxony John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, of licentious morals, but of an active and enterprising spirit, and remarkable for his noisy and popular eloquence. Assisted by the monks of his order, he executed the commission with great zeal and success, but with no less indecency, boasting that he had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted by his preaching. He assured the purchasers of them that their crimes, however enormous, would be forgiven; that the efficacy of indulgences was so great that the most heinous sins, even if one should violate (which was impossible) the mother of God, would be remitted and expiated by them, and the person freed both from punishment and guilt; and that this was the unspeakable gift of God, in order to reconcile men to himself. In the usual form of absolution, written by his own hand, he said: "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of his apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous so ever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend. I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservest in Purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which thou possessedst at baptism: so that when thou diest the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delights shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The terms in which the retailers of indulgences described their benefits, and the necessity of purchasing them, were so extravagant that they appear almost incredible. If any man, said they, purchase letters of indulgence, his soul may rest secure with respect to its salvation. The souls confined in Purgatory, for whose redemption indulgences are purchased, as soon as the money tinkles in the chest, instantly escape from that place of torment, and ascend into heaven. That the cross, erected by the preachers

of indulgences was equally efficacious with the cross of Christ itself. “Lo,” said they, “the heavens are open: if you enter not now, when will you enter? For twelve pence you may redeem the soul of your father out of Purgatory; and are you so ungrateful that you will not rescue the soul of your parent from torment? If you had but one coat, you ought to strip yourself instantly and sell it, in order to purchase such benefit.” It was these abuses, as much as any other one cause, which led to the Lutheran Reformation, and it was against these that Luther first directed his attacks. *SEE LUTHER; SEE REFORMATION.*

**III.** *Present Doctrine and Practice of Indulgence.* The following extracts show what has been, since the Council of Trent, and is now, the Romish doctrine of indulgence. The Council declared that “as the power of granting indulgences was given by Christ to the Church, and she has exercised it in the most ancient times, this holy synod teaches and commands that the use of them, as being greatly salutary to the Christian people, and approved by the authority of councils, shall be retained; and she anathematizes those who say they are useless, or deny to the Church the power of granting them; but in this grant the synod wishes that moderation, agreeably to the ancient and approved practice of the Church, be exercised, lest by too great facility ecclesiastical discipline be weakened” (*Conc. Trid. Sess. 25 De Indulg.*). Pope Leo X, in his bull *De Indulgentiis*, whose object he states to be “that no one in future may allege ignorance of the doctrine of the Roman Church respecting indulgences and their efficacy,” declares “that the Roman pontiff, vicar of Christ on earth, can, for reasonable causes, by the powers of the keys, grant to the faithful, whether in this life or in Purgatory, indulgences, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ, and of the saints (expressly called a treasure); and that those who have truly obtained these indulgences are released from so much of the temporal punishment due for their actual sins to the divine justice as is equivalent to the indulgence granted and obtained” (*Bulla Leon. X, adv. Luther*). Clement VI, in the bull *Unigenitus*, explains this matter more fully: “As a single drop of Christ’s blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race,” so the rest was not lost, but “was a treasure which he acquired in the militant Church, to be used for the benefit of his sons; which treasure he would not suffer to be hid in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but committed it to be dispensed by St. Peter and his successors, his own vicars upon earth, for proper and reasonable causes, for the total or partial remission of the temporal

punishment due to sin; and for an augmentation of his treasure, the merits of the blessed mother of God, and of all the elect, who are known to come in aid." The *reasonable causes*, on account of which indulgences are given, are, where "the cause be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but for any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God or the service of the Church, an indulgence will be valid." We see, occasionally, the very greatest indulgences given for the very lightest causes; as when a *plenary* indulgence is granted to all who stand before the gates of St. Peter, whilst the pope gives the solemn blessing to the people on Easter day; for "indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending everything that is granted by an indulgence." In some cases "the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but bear a certain proportion with the indulgence; that is, the work enjoined must tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of God than the satisfaction remitted," "although it is not necessary that it be in itself very meritorious, or satisfactory, or difficult, and laborious (though these things ought to be regarded too, but that it be a means, apt and useful, towards obtaining the end for which the indulgence is granted." So "the large resort of people," before the gates of St. Peter, when the pope gives his solemn blessing, "is a means, apt and useful, to set forth faith respecting the head of the Church, and to the honor of the apostolic see, which is the end of the indulgence" (Bellarmine, *De Indulgentiis*, lib, 1, can. 12). The first General Lateran Council granted "remission of sin to whoever shall go to Jerusalem, and effectually help to oppose the infidels" (can. 11). The third and fourth Lateran Councils granted the same indulgence to those who set themselves to destroy heretics, or who shall take up arms against them (see Labbe, 10, 1523). Boniface VIII granted not only a full and larger, but the most full pardon of all sins to all that visit Rome the first year in every century. Clement V decreed that they who should, at the Jubilee, visit such and such churches, should obtain "a most full remission of all their sins;" and he not only granted a "plenary absolution of all sins to all who died on the road to Rome," but" also commanded the angels of Paradise to carry the soul direct to heaven." "Sincere repentance," we are told, "is always enjoined or implied in the grant of an indulgence, and is indispensably necessary for every grace" (Milner, *End of Controversy*, p. 304). But as the dead are removed from the possibility, so are they from the necessity of repentance; "as the pope,"

says Bellarmine, “applies the satisfactions of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living, they are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of payment (per modum solutionis). For as when a person gives alms, or fasts, or makes a pilgrimage on account of the dead, the effect is, not that he obtains absolution for them from their liability to punishment, but he presents to God that particular satisfaction for them, in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from the debt of punishment which they had to pay. In like manner, the pope does not absolve the deceased, but offers to God, out of the measure of satisfaction, as much as is necessary to free them” (*ib.*). Their object is “to afford succor to such as have departed real penitents in the love of God, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sills of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into that country where nothing defiled is admitted” (Bull Leo XII). “We have resolved,” says pope Leo XII, in his bull of indiction for the universal jubilee in 1824, “in virtue of the authority given us by heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints which the author of human salvation has entrusted to our dispensation. During this year of the jubilee, we mercifully give and grant, in the Lord, a plenary indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful of Christ, truly penitent, and confessing their sins, and receiving the holy communion, who shall visit the churches of blessed Peter and Paul,” etc. “We offer you,” says Ganganelli, in his bull *De Indulgentiis*, “a share of all the riches of divine mercy which have been entrusted to us, and chiefly those which have their origin in the blood of Christ. We will then open to you all the gates of the rich reservoir of atonement, derived from the merits of the Mother of God, the holy apostles, the blood of the martyrs, and the good works of all the saints. We invite you, then, to drink of this overflowing stream of indulgence, to enrich yourselves in the inexhaustible treasures of the Church, according to the custom of our ancestors. Do not, then, let slip the present occasion, this favorable time, these salutary days, employing them to appease the justice of God, and obtain your pardon.” “The temporal punishment due to sin, by the decree of God, when its guilt and eternal punishment are remitted, may consist either of evil in this life, or of temporal suffering is the next, which temporal suffering in the next life is called purgatory; that the Church has received power from God to remit both of these inflictions, and this remission is called an indulgence”

(Butler's *Book of the Rome. Cath. Ch.* p. 110). "It is the received doctrine of the Church that an indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight" (Milner, *End of Controversy*, p. 305 sq.).

As to the *present practice* of indulgences, it subsists, with all its immoral tendencies, in full force to this day. It is true, however, that the abuses connected with the sale of indulgences are not so flagrant as in former times, especially in those countries where the Roman Church is destitute of political power. Where it has, the system is almost as bad as ever. It is said that, as lately as the year 1800, a Spanish vessel was captured near the coast of South America, freighted (among other things) with numerous bales of indulgences for various sins, the price of which, varying from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked upon each. They had been bought in Spain, and were intended for sale in South America. Seymour tells us as follows: "This inscription is placed in that part of the Church which is of all the most public. It is placed over the holy water, to which all persons must resort, on entering the Church, before partaking of any of its services. It is as follows: '*Indulgence*. — The image of the most holy Mary, which stands on the high altar, spoke to the holy pope Gregory, saying to him, Why do you no longer salute me, in passing, with the accustomed salutation? The saint asked pardon, and granted to those who celebrate mass at that altar the deliverance of a soul from Purgatory, that is, the special soul for which they celebrate the mass.' There is nothing more frequently remarked by Protestants, on entering the churches of Rome, than the constant recurrence of the words '*indulgentia plenaria*,' a plenary indulgence attached to' the masses offered there; and this is tantamount to the emancipation of any soul from Purgatory, through a mass offered at that altar. Instead of these words, however, the same thing is more plainly expressed in some churches. In the church Santa Maria della Pace, so celebrated for the magnificent fresco of the Sibyls by Raphael, there is over one of the altars the following inscription: '*Ogni messa celebrata in quest' altare libera un animo al 'purgatorio'*--Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from Purgatory. In: some churches this privilege extends throughout the year, but in others it is limited to those masses which are offered on particular days. In the church of Sta. Croce di Gerusalemme this privilege is connected in an especial manner *with the fourth Sunday in Lent*. And this is notified by a public notice posted in the church close to

the altar, setting forth that a mass celebrated there on that day releases a soul from Purgatory” (Seymour, *Evenings at Rome*).

Indulgences are now granted in the Romish Church on a very ample scale, especially to all contributors to the erection of churches, and to the funds of the *Propaganda* and other missionary societies, etc. In fact, almost any act of piety (so-called) entitles one to an indulgence: as, for instance, the worship of relics; the visiting of churches or special altars; participation in divine worship on great festivals, such as inauguration of churches, and, especially, taking part in pilgrimages. Indulgences which apply either to the whole Church are called general (*indulg. generalis*), while those that are confined to particular localities, as a bishopric, etc., are called particular (*indulg. particularis*). The most general indulgence is that of the Roman Catholic year of Jubilee (q.v.). The general indulgence is always made out by the pope himself, while the particular indulgences, either *plenarice* or *minus plesne*, are often among the privileges of divers localities, either for special occasions and various lengths of time, or occasionally forever. The papal indulgence is to be proclaimed by the bishop and two canons of the diocese receiving it. “Indulgences are divided into *plenary* and *non-plenary*, or *partial*, *temporary*, *indefinite*, *local*, *perpetual*, *real*, and *personal*.

1. A *plenary* indulgence is that by which is obtained a remission of *all* the temporal punishment due to sin, either in this life or in the next.
2. A *non-plenary* or *partial* indulgence is that which remits only a part of the temporal punishment due to sin: such are indulgences for a given number of days, weeks, or years. This sort of indulgence remits so many days, weeks, or years of penance, which ought to be observed agreeably to the ancient canons of the Church, for the sins which we have committed.
3. *Temporary* indulgences are those which are granted for a certain specified time, as for seven or more years.
4. *Indefinite* indulgences are those which are granted without any limitation of time.
5. *Perpetual* indulgences are those granted *forever*, and which do not require to be renewed after a given number of years.
6. A *general* indulgence is one granted by the pope to all the faithful throughout the world.

- 7.** A *local* indulgence is attached to certain churches, chapels, or other places; it is gained by actually visiting such church or other building or place, and by observing scrupulously all the conditions required by the bull granting such indulgence.
- 8.** A *real* indulgence is attached to certain movable things, as rosaries, medals, etc., and is granted to those who actually wear these articles with devotion; should the fashion of them cease, so that they cease to be deemed the same articles, the indulgence ceases. So long, however, as such articles continue, and are reputed to be the same, the indulgence continues in force, notwithstanding any accidental alteration which may be made in them, as the affixing of a new string or ribbon to a rosary.
- 9.** A *personal* indulgence is one which is granted to certain particular persons, or to several persons in common, as to a confraternity or brotherhood. These privileged persons may gain such indulgences wherever they may happen to be, whether they are in health, in sickness, or at the point of death.
- 10.** Other indulgences are termed *enjoined penances, penitence injustice*. By them is conferred the remission of so much of the punishment which is due to sins at the judgment of God as the sinner would have to pay by canonical penances, or by penances enjoined in all their rigor by the priest. An indulgence produces its effect at the very moment when all the works prescribed in order to obtain it are performed. (Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacree*, 13, 366 sq.) The scales of payment are peculiar, being made to meet a variety of cases, and they are so lenient that the payment of them can form no bar against the subsequent commission of the crime for which an indulgence has already been received.”

**IV.** The “*Congregation of Indulgences*” (*Congregatio Cardinalium de indulgentiis et Sacris reliquiis*) assists the pope in managing the department of indulgences. It is one of the functions of this congregation to investigate the grounds of all applications on the part of bishops, dioceses, churches, etc., for indulgences, and to report thereon to the pope. *SEE CONGREGATION*, vol. 2, p. 475.

**V.** *Criticism of the Romish Doctrine of Indulgence*. — We cannot attempt to give in this place a full refutation of the Romish doctrine of indulgences, nor is it necessary. In her 22nd Article, the Church of England formally condemns the Romish doctrine of indulgence as well as Purgatory (q.v.).

The article was framed (1558) before the Council of Trent, which endeavored to remedy the worst abuses arising from the practice of such a doctrine, but which nevertheless virtually sanctioned the principles naturally involved in the system. In the Parker MS. of 1562 (the 25th session of the Council of Trent, which was held Dec. 3 and 4, 1563) appears the change of terms from *Scholasticorum doctrina* to *Doctrina Romanensium* (comp. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, part 1, p. 207; Blunt, *Hist. of the Reformation*, A.D. 1514-1547, p. 444, 465). The English theologians held "(1) that temporal pain, the fruit of sin, is in its nature remedial and disciplinary, both to the sinner, and to others that they may see and fear; and (2) that as such it is not remissible by any sacrament or ordinance entrusted to the Church." The former proposition they support by Jeremiah 2, 19; <sup><0389></sup>Isaiah 3:9; by the examples of Moses and David; <sup><0402></sup>Numbers 20:12; <sup><0403></sup>Deuteronomy 1:37; <sup><0424></sup>2 Samuel 12:14. The following quotations cover, however, more nearly all the points: "Viewed even in its purest form, as stated by the most eminent doctors, and sanctioned by papal bulls, the doctrine of indulgence not only introduces a contradiction into the Catholic system, in respect that works of satisfaction, which were originally an integral part of the sacrament of penitence, are entirely disconnected with it, and viewed as a mere matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but it has this further radical defect pervading all its constituent parts, that moral and religious things, which can only be taken as spiritual magnitudes, are considered as material ones, *quality* being treated wholly as *quantity*, and, consequently, a standard of external computation and a sort of religious arithmetic applied, which involves contradiction. Even in order to establish the superabundance of the merit of Christ, it was affirmed that though a single drop of his blood would have sufficed for a universal atonement, yet the Savior had shed *so much*, as if it were not the divine sacrifice of love on the part of the Son of God and man, and his atoning death in general, but his several outward sufferings and their quantity in which its value and importance consisted. In like manner, on the part of the saints, it was not their peculiar and more exalted moral and religious character, but their several works, and especially the *volume* rather than the worth of these, which was taken into account; and the whole was handled as something totally disconnected with their persons, as an objective fund, *a sum of ready money* in the Church's hands. According to the same category, the imputation of the merits of Christ and the saints was described as a purely external transference of a portion of that sum to one who needed it. For, although a penitent frame of mind was



required of the sinner, *still it was not for the sake, nor according to the measure of that*, that the merit of Christ and the saints was transferred to him, but solely for the sake of some service performed by him for the Church, and this performance, again, is quite an external and isolated work. At the same time, as respects the merits of the saints, the theory of indulgence rests on the supposition that a man, who is still human, although a saint, may not only possess a sufficiency of merit to answer his own need before God, but may likewise do more than the divine law demands of him, and thus acquire a surplus of merit for the use of others. Even this is a monstrous supposition, but still more monstrous perhaps is another, which invades the religious domain and the glory of God. In point of fact, the doctrine and practice of indulgences gives the Church a position as an absolutely unerring and omniscient judicial power. It identifies the tribunal of the Church with that of God, and the tribunal of the pope with that of the Church, thereby indirectly identifying *the pope's* with *God's*, so that the pope is raised to a position, in virtue of which, as the visible head of the mystical body of Christ, and as the dispenser of all penalties and graces, he decides the highest questions involving the salvation of the living and the dead, according to his mere pleasure. Granting, however, that the whole doctrine were well founded, the position assigned to the pope would be one elevated far above the reach of fancy, and could be designated only as that of a terrestrial god. What an infinite amount of obligation would it impose upon the papacy, and with what conscientiousness sharpened to the utmost ought the popes, if they were bold enough to believe that such plenitude of power had actually been lodged in the hands of any child of the dust, to have dispensed the lofty blessings committed to their trust! How carefully ought they to have guarded them from perversion and debasement! And yet what do we see? Abuse upon abuse, and profanation upon profanation, in an ascending scale, for more than two centuries, until at last moral indignation bursts like a tempest upon their impiety" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, 1, 246). "Either the pope has the power of bringing souls out of Purgatory, or he has not. If he has not, the question is decided. If he has, what cruelty, then, for him to leave there whole millions of souls whom he might by a word bring out of it! Without going so far, why this strange inequality in the distribution of a treasure which is deemed inexhaustible? Why will a *pater* and an *ave* in my parish church avail only for five or six days' indulgence, when they avail for forty days in another church, before another Madonna or another cross? Why is the performance of the works

paid, in such or such a congregation, with a plenary indulgence, and in this or that other with a mere indulgence for a time? Why-but we should never end with the contradictions with which this matter is beset. Yet let us give one-just one more. If plenary indulgence be not merely a lure, how comes it that masses continue to be said for the souls of those who received it when dying? Why that solemn *deprofundis* repeated at Rome during the whole reign of a pope on the anniversary of the death of his predecessor? This is what Luther said in his theses, and the objection is not the less embarrassing for being old. The only means of getting out of the difficulty would be to accept the consequences of the system. You have only to regard as well and duly entered into heaven all who left this world with that infallible passport, and to refuse, therefore, to say a mass for them. And why is this not done? We, have no need to explain. Between a mere act of Inconsistency added to so many others and the drying up of the very best source of her revenues, could Rome ever hesitate? But if there be ground to ask, on the one hand, why the popes and the bishops have not, at least, the charity to grant everywhere, and to all, as many indulgences as they have a right to dispense, no less reason have we to be astonished at the low price they put upon them, and the incredible facilities offered to such as wish to acquire them. See, for instance, the statutes of the brotherhood (*confrerie*) well known under the name of the *Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary*. By a brief of 1838, plenary indulgence is accorded to those who shall worthily confess on the day of their reception into the brotherhood; which is as much as saying to people, ‘Come in among us, and all your previous sins will be wiped out.’ Plenary indulgence, moreover, to such as shall confess themselves, and communicate at certain epochs of the year, and these are ten in number. Further, indulgence of five hundred days to whosoever shall devoutly be present at the mass of Saturday, and shall pray for the conversion of sinners. Though we should believe in indulgences, it strikes us that we could not but feel some scruples at seeing them lavished away in this manner. For a mass that shall have cost you half an hour, to be exempted from Purgatory for near a year and a half! For one confession, to be exempted from it altogether, although you may have deserved a thousand years of it! If not stopped by shame, these bold traffickers in salvation ought at least, one would think, to dread lest their wares should suffer depreciation in consequence of being given away for so little. True, they do not cost them anything, and there is no limit to purchases. Nobody, well knowing to how many years of Purgatory he may be condemned, can reasonably stop in adding to the amount of indulgences

with which he is to appear at the bar of judgment. By placing himself on the most favorable conditions, and taking care to let no occasion be lost, a man of sixty might without difficulty have amassed them for above a million of years, over and above the plenary ones, each one of which ought to suffice, and with which one does not well see what the rest can signify” (Bungener, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 520, 521).

**VI.** For further literature and discussion of the subject, see Bp. Philpot’s *Letters to Mr. Butler*, p. 151-153; Hales, *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 1019-22. Mendham, *Spiritual Venality of Rome* (London, 1836, 12mo); Mendham, *Venal Indulgences and Pardons of the Church of Rome exemplified* (Lond. 1839, 12mo); Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Promta*, s.v.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book 2, ch. 13; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 1, 67; Neander, *History of Doctrines*, 2, 594; Neander, *Church History*, 3:52, 138; 5, 180, 280; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, bk. 4, cent. 16:§ 1, ch. 1 and 2; D’Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*, bk. 3; Amort, *De Origine*, etc., in *Indulgentiarum*, (Aug. Vind. 1735, fol.); Hirscher, *Lehre v. Ablass* (Tübing. 1844); Gieseler, *Church Hist.* 2, § 35, 81; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s.v.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. 19; Bungener, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 518-530; Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, 1, 235 sq.; Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie*, 3:398.

## Indult

(Latin *indultus*, participle of *indulgeo*, I indulge) signifies in ecclesiastical law a peculiar form of dispensation granted by the pope from the requirements of the ordinary law. Thus the power of bestowing benefices is granted to cardinals or princes by an *indult* from the pope.

## Industrial Schools

In Germany, Great Britain, France, and in the United States, efforts have of late years been made to combine with the general rudimentary education of the common school the teaching of the mechanical arts and of agriculture, and thus to afford the poorer classes the advantages of a literary and industrial education within a smaller limit than formerly, thereby greatly alleviating the wants which are so frequent among them. “In elementary schools for girls, industrial work, to the extent of sewing, shaping, knitting, and netting, has been almost universally introduced, and forms one of the most important and interesting features of female primary education, more

especially in Great Britain; but the attempt to connect with these subjects instruction in cooking, washing, and ironing has been tried as yet only to a limited extent, and has been only partially successful. In ragged schools, on the other hand, no department of the schoolwork seems to thrive better, partly because it enters so largely into the scheme of instruction, partly because the children are removed from the control of parents. In England the ragged schools are recognized by the Legislature as ‘industrial schools,’ and may be defined as schools in which the pupils are fed and clothed (wholly or partially), as well as taught the elements of an ordinary education, and the practice of some trade. By a statute passed in 1861, children under 14 found vagrant or begging or convicted of petty offences, may be sent by a magistrate to an industrial school that has been certified by the home secretary. Parents also, on paying for board and lodging a small sum, may place their children in industrial schools if they can show that they are unable to control them. The treasury may contribute to the maintenance of these schools on the representation of the home secretary. If a child abscond from the school before he is 15, the justices may send him back, or place him in a reformatory school (q.v.). In 1861 there were in England 23, and in Scotland 16 industrial schools, and the number of pupils attending was respectively 1574 in the former, and 1606 in the latter” (Chambers, s.v.). In Germany, these schools prove even a greater boon to the poorer classes than elsewhere, especially to orphans. By law every child is obliged to attend school until confirmation (about 14 years of age), and the acquirement of some trade enables children of 14 to begin work to advantage, and earn at least their own livelihood if they may not even aid in the support of their parents or other near relatives. It is to be hoped that in the United States the generous spirit of the different Christian societies will especially further this work, and make industrial schools numerous in all our large cities at least. (J. H. W.)

### Indwelling Scheme

a name used by some English theologians to denote a theory derived from Colossians 2, 9: “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;” which, according to some, asserts the doctrine of Christ’s consisting of two beings; one the self-existent Creator, and the other a creature, made into one person by an ineffable union and *indwelling*, which renders the same attributes and honors equally applicable to both. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY.*

## Indwelling Sin

*SEE SIN.*

## Ineffabilis Deus

*SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.*

## Inerrancy

*SEE INDEFECTIBILITY.*

## Infallibility

is the quality of being incapable either of being deceived, or of leading others astray. Romanists, while acknowledging that God alone is naturally infallible, maintain that he has been pleased to transmit this quality, to some undefined extent, to the Church and to the popes, so that they are infallible in their decisions on all points of doctrine.

**1. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.** — The following is a condensed view of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, as collected from her own authors. Dens affirms. “That the Church, in matters of faith and manners, can by no means err, is an article of belief. Moreover, infallibility in the Church may be considered in a twofold point of view: the one active and authoritative, which is called infallibility in teaching and defining; the other passive or submissive (*obedientialis*), which is called infallibility in learning and believing. Infallibility, considered in the first sense, refers to the Church with respect to the head or chief pontiff, and the prelates of the Church; although this infallibility would not regard the laity or inferior pastors; for, as a man is said to see, although his vision does not apply to all his members, but to his eyes only, so the Church, in like manner, is said to be infallible, although this infallibility refers only to the prelates. But if the Church is not considered with regard to its head, but as it embraces all the faithful, or laics, under the obedience of the pope, it is not proper to say it is infallible in teaching and defining, because its gift in this respect is not to teach, but to learn and believe; wherefore the Church, in this view, is said to be ‘passably infallible,’ or infallible in learning, believing, practicing, etc. Therefore it is impossible that the whole Church, obedient to the pope, should believe any thing as revealed, or practice any thing as good which is not such; hence it can be said that the sense of the universal Church is always true, and its practice or usage always good” (Dens, *Theol.*, tom. 2,

*De Ecclesia*, No.80, *De Infallibilitate Ecclesia*). The same author affirms also that “the Church is an infallible judge of controversies of faith; that this authority is vested in the bishops only, especially in the pope, and that lay persons, priests, doctors, or others, have no part in making infallible decisions in the Church.” He says the government of the Church is a monarchy with regard to its head, but, at the same time, tempered with an aristocracy. A unanimous consent is not necessary to make a decision infallible; a majority is sufficient for this purpose. He also. says that a tacit consent is sufficient to make a decision infallible; for to be silent is to consent. Hence he concludes that ““when the pope defines anything, and the majority of bishops do not object, it is impossible that this definition should embrace error” (Dens, *Theol.* tom. 2, No. 82, *Qualis esse debeat Consensus Episcoporum*). “From the above we collect four principal systems which concern the seat of infallibility, and these contain a considerable number of subdivisions; the chief of which are expressed in the following analysis.

*First System:* This embraces the infallibility of the whole Church, and includes two cases:

- (1.) *The Church diffusive*, that is, all her clergy as a body, inasmuch as the people, whenever infallibility is concerned, compose no part of the Church.
- (2.) The bishops, as the *representatives* of the Church, though not assembled in council.

*Second System:* A council composed of all the bishops; and this also is divided into two cases:

- (1.) The decision of a council when approved by the whole Church.
- (2.) The decision of a council when *not* approved by the whole Church.

*Third System:* A council and pope united. There are four cases of this:

- (1.) A council convened by the pope.
- (2.) A council confirmed by the pope.
- (3.) A council convened by the pope, and whose decisions are received by the whole Church, or the body of her pastors.

- (4.) A council confirmed by the pope, and received subsequently by the Church.

*Fourth System:* Respects the infallibility of the pope himself. This has the four following cases:

- (1.) The pope himself deciding officially.
- (2.) The pope and a few bishops.
- (3.) The pope, when his decisions are received by the whole Church.
- (4.) The pope and a few bishops, whose decisions are received by the whole Church.

Any person who will examine the quotations given from Roman Catholic authors will perceive these four distinct systems, together with the several cases under each. If we also consider their differences in regard to the *extent* of infallibility (some confining it to articles of faith and precepts of morality, and others making distinctions between matters of *right and facts*, and then of facts connected with faith; and also that their Church has not precisely defined where this infallibility is to be found), then we may safely say that the bare recital of their endless divisions respecting the *seat* of infallibility will prove that the thing is not in existence” (Elliott, *On Romanism*, p. 66).

This infallibility of the Church Romanists attempt to prove

- (1.) from a supposed unanimity of the bishops, which, they argue, would, if considered as mere human testimony, carry with it an amount of moral certainty admitting of no doubt, and therefore equivalent to infallibility;
- (2.) from the divinely appointed mission of a clergy regularly descended from the apostles, who themselves had the most positive promises of Christ (~~431~~ John 20:21; 15:15; ~~4189~~ Matthew 28:19, 20; ~~6146~~ John 14:16, 17; ~~2106~~ Luke 10:16).

They also quote ~~5014~~ 2 Timothy 1:14; 2:2; and ~~4108~~ Acts 20:28, to show that the apostles claimed this privilege for themselves, as well as the power of transmitting it to those they appointed over the churches.

The same privilege has also been ascribed to the pope as successor of St. Peter, and God’s only vicegerent. The ultramontanes, such as Bellarmine,

Baronius, etc., maintain that whatever dogmatic judgment or decision on a doctrinal point the pope addressed to the whole church, is necessarily correct. But as it has repeatedly occurred that the Church, as represented in councils, has disagreed with the pope on points of doctrine, it follows that, if both are equally infallible, the people are bound to believe equally two opposite doctrines. The French Church settled the difficulty by proclaiming general councils superior to the pope (or “more infallible”); the assembly of the clergy, in 1682, asserted that “in controversies of faith the office of the pope is the chief, and that his decrees pertain to all churches; nevertheless, that his judgment is not *irreformable* unless it is confirmed by the consent of the Church,” Bossuet sustained this principle with great talent and eloquence in his *Defensio Declarat. Cleri Gallic.* 2, pt. 1, 12 sq. He proves by the decrees of councils, by the testimony of fathers, doctors, and schoolmen, by the declarations of popes themselves, and especially of Adrian VI, that the infallibility of the pope was a new doctrine, altogether unknown in the early ages of the Church. “He disproves the infallibility of the pope not merely by negative, but by a long and strong chain of positive evidence; by adducing a number of instances, as well as direct assertions of his infallibility from generation after generation; by showing, from a large induction of facts, that during a series of centuries he was regarded and treated as fallible, and never as otherwise than fallible; and that, when another opinion began to gain ground, it arose mainly from the exercise of that authority which belongs to a supreme power” (Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 213). — Bossuet’s views were held by Fleury, Dupin, cardinal Bausset, etc. They were attacked by De Maistre in his work *Du Pape*. A work of great interest on this subject is the recently discovered *Refutation of all Heresies* of Hippolytus, which gives us a clear idea of the manner in which the Roman bishops were considered in his times. “In Germany, where truth is held the most precious of all possessions, even by members of the Catholic Church the conviction of the mischief produced by the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope is so strongly felt by many, that one of the greatest philosophers of the last generation, Baader, who was a zealous champion of the Christian truth, and himself an earnest Roman Catholic, used perpetually to repeat the pregnant words of St. Martin, ‘Le Papisme est la faiblesse du Catholicisme; et le Catholicisme est la force du Papisme’ (Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 218).

As regards the infallibility of the Church, Dr. Newman himself, in his *Lectures on Romanism*, p. 61, said: “In the creed of pope Pius not a word



is said expressly about the Church's infallibility: it forms no article of faith there. Her interpretation indeed of Scripture is recognized as authoritative; but so also is 'the unanimous consent of the fathers, whether as primitive or concordant; they believe the existing Church to be infallible; and, if ancient belief is at variance with it, which of course they do not allow, but if it is, then antiquity must be mistaken-that is all.'"

"That general councils are infallible is generally believed by Romanists. Some, however; maintain that the confirmation of the pope is necessary to constitute infallibility; and others, that the decisions of councils are infallible, whether confirmed by the pope or not. We quote-the sentiments of some who contend that the decrees of a general council, with the confirmation of the pope, are infallible. Ferraris says, "The definitions of a general council legitimately assembled, issued in the absence of the pope, are not infallible without his confirmation" (Ferraris, *Biblioth. Prompt. in Concilium*, art. 1, sect. 66). Cardinal Cusanus, as quoted by the former writer, declares that "the pope gives authority to the council" (Cusanus, lib. 3, cap. 15, *De Concord Cathol.*). Dens teaches that "general councils, without the approbation of the pope, are fallible, and often err; that the confirmation of the pope to any particular decrees of a council impart to these decrees plenary authority; it is an article of faith that general councils approved by the pope cannot err in defining matters of faith and morals: hence they are to be considered as manifest heretics who presume to call in question what is decreed by such councils." He also believes that the decisions of particular councils, confirmed by the pope, are likewise infallible, and that this is founded on the infallibility of the pope. But Benedict XIV., to whom Dens refers, thinks that the decisions of such councils are binding only in their own provinces or dioceses. Many Romanist writers, however, maintain strongly that the decisions of general councils are infallible without the pope's confirmation. It would be an endless task to quote the authorities on both sides. They are, for the most part, however, agreed that what they call general councils are infallible: some believe them infallible because they are general councils, while others, believing the same, consider the confirmation of the pope as necessary to the authoritative character of the assembly.

"The discordant sentiments of Romanists respecting those characteristics which are necessary to constitute infallibility form a strong argument against the inerrancy of councils. The four following opinions have been strongly held by the Church of Rome:

(1.) Some have asserted that the diffusive, and not the representative body of the Church possessed infallibility. Occam, Petrus de Aliaco, Cusanus, Antoninus of Florence, Panormitan, Nicholas de Clemangis, Franciscus Mirandula and others, were of this opinion.

(2.) Some say that councils are no farther infallible than as they adhere to Scripture and universal tradition.

(3.) Others, that councils are of themselves infallible, whether the pope confirm them or not. This was the common opinion before the Council of Lateran, under Leo X, as appears from the Councils of Basil and Constance.

(4.) Many make the confirmation of the pope necessary to the infallibility of a general council. There is an irreconcilable difference between the last two opinions; for those who suppose councils to be infallible without the confirmation of the pope believe them to be above him, and that he is fallible; while those who are of opinion that the confirmation of his holiness is absolutely necessary to the infallibility of the council believe him to be infallible, and superior to a council.”

See Elliott, *On Romanism*, book 3, chap. 3; and book 1, chap. 4; Bull, *Reply to the Bishop of Meaux* (Works, vol. 2; Faber, *Difficulties of Romanism*; Ouseley, *On Papal Novelties*; Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Cramp, *Textbook of Popery*, p. 66; Hare, *Contest with Rones*, p. 16, 210, 223; Kitto, *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1854.

**II. INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.** — For many centuries the popes have demanded, and, so far as lay in them, enforced an absolute submission to all their doctrinal decisions. They forbade appeal from their tribunal to the General Council, and even disallowed the plea of the Jansenists, Hermesians, and other schools whose views were censured, that the popes censuring them had erred, not in what they stated to be the Catholic doctrine, but in understanding the right sense of the censured books. Thus the popes for many centuries have acted as though they were infallible; and yet it was distinctly taught within the Church that the infallibility of the pope was not a recognized doctrine, and even many catechisms and manuals of doctrine explicitly stated, with the consent of many bishops, that the infallibility of the pope was not a doctrine of the Church. One of the chief objects for which the Vatican Council was called in 1869 was to make an end of this uncertainty and enrol the doctrine of papal infallibility

among the formal Church doctrines. As soon as it became generally known that it was intended to bring this subject before the council, a number of works appeared, discussing the proposed innovation in every aspect. By far the most important of these is the one published in Germany under the title *Der Papst und das Concil* (Mentz, 1869; Engl. transl. *The Pope and the Council*), which gives an exhaustive history of the views of the Church concerning infallibility. The author of the work, who on the title page calls himself Janus, was subsequently found to be professor Huber, of the University of Munich. The book is a storehouse of immense learning, for the author quotes thousands of individual cases to show that no one can for a moment believe in this doctrine without falsifying the whole history of the Church. "For thirteen centuries," says our author, "an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him." Not a single question of doctrine for the first thousand years was finally decided by the popes; in none of the early controversies did they take any part at all; and their interposition, when they began to interpose, was often far from felicitous. Pope Zosimus commended the Pelagian teaching of Celestius, pope Julian affirmed the orthodoxy of the Sabellian Marcellus of Ancyra, pope Liberius subscribed an Arian creed, pope Vigilius contradicted himself three times running on a question of faith, pope Honorius lent the whole weight of his authority to the support of the newly-introduced Monothelite heresy, and was solemnly anathematized by three ecumenical councils for doing so. Nor do these "errors and contradictions of the popes" grow by any means fewer or less important as time goes on. The blundering of successive popes about the conditions of valid ordination--on which, according to Catholic theology, the whole sacramental system, and therefore the means of salvation, depend--are alone sufficient to dispose forever of their claim to infallibility. Neither, again, did the Roman pontiffs possess, in the ancient constitution of the Church, any of those powers which are now held to be inherent in their sovereign office, and which must undoubtedly be reckoned among the essential attributes of absolute sovereignty. They convoked none of the general councils, and only presided, by their legates, at three of them; nor were the canons enacted there held to require their confirmation. They had neither legislative, administrative, nor judicial power in the Church, nor was any further efficacy attributed to their excommunication than to that of

any other bishop. No special prerogatives were held to have been bequeathed to them by St. Peter, and the only duty considered to devolve on them in virtue of their primacy was that of watching over the observance of the canons. The limited right of hearing appeals, granted to them by the Council of Sardica in 347, was avowedly an innovation, of purely ecclesiastical origin, and, moreover, was never admitted or exercised in Africa or the East. Many national churches, like the Armenian, the Syro-Persian, the Irish, and the ancient British, were independent of any influence of Rome. When first something like the papal system was put into words by an Eastern patriarch, St. Gregory, the greatest and best of all the early popes, repudiated the idea as a wicked blasphemy. Not one of the fathers explains the passages of the New Testament about St. Peter in the ultramontane sense; and the Tridentine profession of faith binds all the clergy to interpret Scripture in accordance with their unanimous consent. "To prove the doctrine of papal infallibility, nothing less is required than a complete falsification of Church history."

The following are interesting specimens of cases in which the popes expressly contradicted other popes, or the doctrine of the Church as it is now recognized:

"Innocent I and Gelasius I, the former writing to the Council of Milevis, the latter in his epistle to the bishops of Picenum, declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive communion, that those who die without it go straight to hell (St. August. *Opp.* 2, 640; *Council Coil.* [ed. Labbe], 4:1178). A thousand years later the Council of Trent anathematized this doctrine.

"It is the constant teaching of the Church that ordination received from a bishop, quite irrespectively of his personal worthiness or unworthiness, is valid and indelible. Putting aside baptism, the whole security of the sacraments rests on this principle of faith, and reordination has always been opposed in the Church as a crime and a profanation of the sacrament. Only in Rome, during the devastation which the endless wars of Goths and Lombards inflicted on Central Italy, there was a collapse of all learning and theology, which disturbed and distorted the dogmatic tradition. Since the 8th century, the ordinations of certain popes began to be annulled, and the bishops and priests ordained by them were compelled to be reordained. This occurred first in 769, when Constantine II, who had got possession of the papal chair by force of arms, and kept it for thirteen months, was

blinded, and deposed at a synod, and all his ordinations pronounced invalid.

“But the strongest case occurred at the end of the 9th century, after the death of pope Formosus, when the repeated rejections of his ordinations threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid sacraments in Italy. Auxilius, who was a contemporary, said that through this universal rejection and repetition of orders (‘ordinatio, exordinatio, et superordinatio’), matters had come to such a pass in Rome that for twenty years the Christian religion had been interrupted and extinguished in Italy. Popes and synods decided in glaring contradiction to one another, now for, now against the validity of the ordinations, and it was self-evident that in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine of ordination was lost. At the end of his second work, Auxilius, speaking in the name of those numerous priests and bishops whose ecclesiastical status was called in question by the decisions of Stephen VII and Sergius III, demanded the strict investigation of a General Council, as the only authority capable of solving the complication introduced by the popes (Mabillon, *Analecta* [Paris, 1723], p. 39).

“But the council never met, and the dogmatic uncertainty and confusion in Rome continued. In the middle of the 11th century the great contest against simony, which was then thought equivalent to heresy, broke’ out, and the ordinations of a simoniacal bishop were pronounced invalid. Leo IX reordained a number of persons on this ground, as Peter Damiani relates (Petri Damiani *Opusc.* p. 419). Gregory VII, at his fifth Roman synod, made the invalidity of all simoniacal ordinations a rule, and the principle, confirmed by Urban II, that a simoniacal bishop can give nothing in ordination, because he has nothing, passed into the *Decretum* of Gratian (Cans. 1, qu. 7, c. 24).

“In these cases it is obvious that doctrine and practice were most intimately connected. It was only from their holding a false, and, in its consequences, most injurious notion of the force and nature of this sacrament, that the popes acted as they did, and if they had then been generally considered infallible, a hopeless confusion must have been introduced, not only into Italy, but the whole Church.

“In contrast to pope Pelagius, who had declared, with the whole Eastern and Western Church, the indispensable necessity of the invocation of the

Trinity in baptism, Nicolas I assured the Bulgarians that baptism in the name of Christ alone was quite sufficient, and thus exposed the Christians there to the danger of an invalid baptism. The same pope declared confirmation administered by priests, according to the Greek usage from remote antiquity, invalid, and ordered those so confirmed to be confirmed anew by a bishop, thereby denying to the whole Eastern Church the possession of a sacrament, and laying the foundation of the bitter estrangement which led to a permanent division (*Council Coll.* [ed. Labbd], 6:548).

“Stephen II (III) allowed marriage with a slave girl to be dissolved, and a new one contracted, whereas all previous popes had pronounced such marriages indissoluble (*ib.* 6, 1650). He also declared baptism, in cases of necessity, valid when administered with wine (*ib.* 6, 1652).

“Celestine III tried to loosen the marriage tie by declaring it dissolved if either party became heretical. Innocent III annulled this decision, and Hadrian VI called Celestine a heretic for giving it. This decision was afterwards expunged from the MS. collections of papal decrees, but the Spanish theologian Alphonsus de Castro had seen it there (*Adv. Hor.* [ed. Paris], 1565; comp. Melch. Canus, p. 240).

“The Capernaite doctrine, that Christ’s body is sensibly (*sensualiter*) touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist--an error rejected by the whole Church, and contradicting the impassibility of  $\dot{\rho}$  his body--was affirmed by Nicolas II at the Synod of Rome in 1059, and Berengar was compelled to acknowledge it. Lanfranc reproaches Berengar with afterwards wishing to make cardinal Humbert, instead of the pope, responsible for this doctrine (Lanfranc, *De Euch.* c. 3 [ed. Migne], p. 412).

“Innocent III, in order to exhibit the papal power in the fullest splendor of its divine omnipotence, invented the new doctrine that the spiritual bond which unites a bishop to his diocese is firmer and more indissoluble than the ‘carnal’ bond, as he called it, between man and wife, and that God alone can loose it, viz. translate a bishop from one see to another. But as the pope is the representative of the true God on earth, he, and he alone, can dissolve this holy and indissoluble bond, not by human, but divine authority, and it is God, not man, who looses it. (Decretal ‘*De Transl. Episc.*’ c. 2, 3, 4. This was to introduce a new article of faith. The Church had not known for centuries that resignations, depositions, and translations of bishops belonged by divine right to the pope.) The obvious and direct

corollary, that the pope can also dissolve the less firm and holy bond of marriage, Innocent, as we have seen, overlooked, for he solemnly condemned Celestine III's decision on that point, and thus he unwittingly involved himself in a contradiction. Many canonists have accepted this as the legitimate consequence of his teaching.

“Innocent betrayed his utter ignorance of theology when he declared that the Fifth Book of Moses, being called Deuteronomy, or the Second Book of the Law, must bind the Christian Church, which is the second Church (Decretal *‘Qui filii sint legitimi,’* c. 13). This great pope seems never to have read Deuteronomy, or he could hardly have fallen into the blunder of supposing, e.g., that the Old-Testament prohibitions of particular kinds of food, the burnt-offerings, the harsh papal code and bloody laws of war, the prohibitions of woolen and linen garments, etc., were to be again made obligatory on Christians. As the Jews were allowed in Deuteronomy to put away a wife who displeased them and take another, Innocent ran the risk of falling himself into a greater error about marriage than Celestine III.

Notable contradictions as to temporal privileges occur in the history of the alternate approbations and persecutions of the Franciscan order by the popes.

“One of the most comprehensive, dogmatic documents ever issued by a pope is the decree of Eugenius IV ‘to the Armenians,’ dated November 22, 1439, three months after the Council of Florence was brought to an end by the departure of the Greeks. It is a confession of faith of the Roman Church, intended to serve as a rule of doctrine and practice for the Armenians on those points they had previously differed about. The dogmas of the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Seven Sacraments, are expounded and the pope, moreover, asserts that the decree thus solemnly issued has received the sanction of the council, that is, of the Italian bishops whom he had detained in Florence.

“If this decree of the pope were really a rule of faith, the Eastern Church would have only four sacraments instead of seven; the Western Church would for at least eight centuries have been deprived of three sacraments, and of one, the want of which would make all the rest, with one exception, invalid. Eugenius IV determines in this decree the form and matter, the substance of the sacraments, or of those things on the presence or absence of which the existence of the sacrament itself depends, according to the universal doctrine of the Church. He gives a form of confirmation which

never existed in one half of the Church, and first came into use in the other after the 10th century. So, again, with penance. What is given as the essential form of the sacrament was unknown in the Western Church for eleven hundred years, and never known in the Greek. And when the touching of the sacred vessels, and the words accompanying the rite, are given as the form and matter of ordination, it follows that the Latin Church for a thousand years had neither priests nor bishops--nay, like the Greek Church, which never adopted this usage, possesses to this hour neither priests nor bishops, and consequently no sacraments except baptism, and perhaps marriage. (Comp. Denzinger, *Enchirid. Symbol. et Definit.*, Wirceb. 1854, p. 200 sq. But Denzinger, in order to conceal the purely dogmatic character of this famous decree, *has omitted the first part, on the Trinity and Incarnation*, which is given in Raynaldus's *Annals*, 1439. [The same conspicuously untenable explanation was adopted in the *Dublin Review* for January, 1866. — Ti.])

“It is noteworthy that this decree—with which papal infallibility or the whole hierarchy and the sacraments of the Church stand or fall—is cited, refuted, and appealed to by all dogmatic writers, but that the adherents of papal infallibility have never meddled with it. Neither Bellarmine, nor Charles, nor Aguirre, nor Orsi, nor the other apologists of the Roman court, troubled themselves with it.”

Into dogmatic theology the doctrine of papal infallibility was introduced by Thomas Aquinas. On the basis of fabrications invented by a Dominican monk, including a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, giving all bishops an unlimited right of appeal to the pope, and on the forgeries found in Gratian, Thomas built up his papal system, with its two leading principles, that the pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and the absolute ruler of the Church. The popes were so well pleased with the teachings of Thomas that John XXII affirmed Thomas had not written without a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and Innocent VI said that whoever assailed his teaching incurred suspicion of heresy. The powerful mendicant orders of Dominicans and Franciscans found the papal system, with its theory of infallibility, indispensable for the success of their own claims against the bishops and universities, and they became the violent champions of the new doctrine. The boldest champions of papal absolutism admitted, however, that the popes could err, and that their decisions were no certain criterion. But they also held that in such cases a heretical pope *ipso facto* ceased to be pope, without or before any judicial sentence, so that councils, which



are the Church's judicature, only attested the vacancy of the papal throne as an accomplished fact. The contest between the Council of Basel and pope Eugenius IV evoked the work of cardinal Torquemada, whose argument, which was held, up to the time of Bellarmine, to be the most conclusive apology of the papal system, rests entirely on fabrications later than the pseudo-Isidore, and chiefly on the spurious passages of St. Cyril. Torquemada also holds that a pope can lapse into heresy and propound false doctrine, but then he is *ipso facto* deposed by God himself before any sentence of the Church has been passed, so that the Church or council cannot judge him, but can only announce the judgment of God, and thus one cannot properly say that a pope can become heretical, since he ceases to be pope at the moment of passing from orthodoxy to heterodoxy. The doctrine entered on a fresh phase of development from the time of Leo X. Its foremost defender at that time was Thomas of Vic or Cajetan, yet the doctrine was so far from becoming dominant at Rome that the successor of Leo X, Adrian VI, who, as professor of Louvain, had maintained in his principal work that several popes had been heretical, and that it was certainly possible for a pope to establish a heresy by his decision or decretals, caused, as pope, his work denying infallibility to be reprinted in Rome.

Another patron of the infallibility theory, who labored hard to naturalize it in Belgium, the Louvain theologian, Ruard Tapper, returned in 1552 from Trent cruelly disillusionized, and thought the deep-seated corruption of the Church a matter not to be disputed, but to be deplored. The third of the theological fathers of papal infallibility in the 16th century was Tapper's contemporary, the Spaniard Melchior Canus, whose work on theological principles and evidences was, up to Bellarmine's time, the great authority used by all infallibilists. Like Tapper, he became in later years disgusted with the effect of the papal system on the popes and the *Curia*, and in a report to the king of Spain expressed the opinion that the whole administration of the Church at Rome was "converted into a great trading business, a traffic forbidden by all laws, human, natural, and divine." Out of Italy the hypothesis of infallibility had but few adherents, even in the 16th century, till the Jesuits began to exercise a powerful influence.

The bishops and prominent scholars of France, Spain, Germany, and other countries were almost unanimous in advocating the superiority of ecumenical councils over the pope. The turning of the tide was chiefly due to the influence of the Jesuits, who were naturally inclined to favor the

extremist absolutism in the Church. As their representative, cardinal Bellarmine further developed the ideas of Cajetan, in which he generally concurs; but he rejects decisively Cajetan's hypothesis of a heretical pope being deposed *ipso facto* by the judgment of God. A heretical pope is legitimate so long as the Church has not deposed him. If Cajetan said the Church was the handmaid of the pope, Bellarmine adds that whatever doctrine it pleases the pope to prescribe the Church must receive; there can be no question raised about proving it; she must blindly renounce all judgment of her own, and firmly believe that all the pope teaches is absolutely true, all he commands absolutely good, and all he forbids simply evil and noxious. For the pope can as little err in moral as in dogmatic questions. Nay, he goes so far as to maintain that if the pope were to err by prescribing sins and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to consider sins good and virtues evil, unless she chose to sin against conscience; so that if the pope absolve the subjects of a prince from their oath of allegiance, which, according to Bellarmine, he has a full right to do, the Church must believe that what he has done is good, and every Christian must hold it a sin to remain any longer loyal and obedient to his sovereign. Through the influence of Bellarmine and other writers of his order, the infallibility hypothesis now made immense strides. One great stumbling block had, however, to be removed. Every theologian, on closer inspection, found papal decisions which contradicted other doctrines, laid down by popes or generally received in the Church, or which appeared to him doubtful, and it seemed impossible to declare all these products of an infallible authority. It became necessary, therefore, to specify some distinctive marks by which a really infallible decision of a pope might be recognized, or to fix certain conditions, in the absence of which the pronouncement is not to be regarded as infallible. And thus, since the 16th century, there grew up the famous distinction of papal decisions promulgated *ex cathedra*, and therefore dogmatically, and without any possibility of error. By means of this ingenious distinction, some of the most inconvenient decisions of popes, which it was desirable to except from the privilege of infallibility generally asserted in other cases could be explained away. Thus pope Honorius, in the dogmatic letter which was condemned as heretical by the sixth ecumenical council, and the decision addressed by Nicolas I to the Bulgarian Church that baptism administered simply in the name of Jesus is valid, were declared to be judgments given by the popes as private persons. A number of other limitations were proposed by the theologians advocating infallibility, but only two were.

commonly received, viz. Bellarmine's, that the papal decree must be addressed to the whole Church; and Cellot's, that he must anathematize all who dissent from his teaching. According to this doctrine, which is taught by the most prominent dogmatic writer of the order in the present century, Perrone (*Proelect. Theolog.* 8, 497, Louvain, 1843), and received by pretty nearly the whole order; the pope is liable to err when he addresses an instruction to the French or German Church only; and, moreover, his infallibility becomes very questionable whenever he omits to denounce an anathema on all dissentients. Since the time of Bellarmine, the infallibility hypothesis has been one of the chief distinctions of the Jesuits and the most radical portion of the Ultramontane party on the one hand, and all other schools within the Catholic Church on the other. A number of synods, bishops, and prominent theologians, and in some instances the whole Catholic Church of several countries, put themselves on record against the doctrine, for which, on the other hand, the Jesuits and other Ultramontane writers incessantly strove to gain friends among bishops, clergy, and laity, and, in particular, among the sovereigns.

When pope Pius IX intimated his intention to convoke a council for the definition of the doctrine, a number of bishops, especially in France and Germany, declared themselves to be decidedly opposed to the doctrine, and at least one of them, the French bishop Maret (bishop of Sura *in partibus infid.*, and dean of the theological faculty of Paris), published an elaborate work (*On the General Council and the public Peace*) to refute it, and to prove that it would subvert the very foundation of the Church. The substance of his argument against papal infallibility is as follows: According to the holy Scriptures the Church is a limited monarchy, which stands under the common rule of the pope and the bishops. The history of the councils is at least as much in favor of the divine right of the bishops as of the supremacy of the holy chair. Freedom of discussion, vote by majority, a juridical examination of the apostolic decrees, and in certain cases a right to condemn the doctrines and the person of the pope — these are rights which prove beyond all doubt the participation of the bishops in the sovereign powers of the holy father. But these rights do not extend far enough to give the episcopal body a supremacy over the pope, and the latter therefore exercises, in general, all the privileges of supremacy. He summons the council, presides over it, dissolves it, and sanctions its decrees. In a word, he always remains the head of the Church. If, however, the changes desired by a certain school are made, the Church will cease to

be a limited, and become an absolute monarchy. This would be a complete revolution; but what is truly divine is unchangeable, and, consequently, if the constitution of the Church is changed, it ceases to be divine. Pius IX, in his bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, has himself, said of doctrine, *Crescat in eodem sensu, in eadem sententia*; but the new dogma would lead to a development of doctrine *in alio sensu, in alia sententia*. It would therefore amount to a denial of the divinity of the Church. "If it were realized," exclaims the bishop, "what a triumph would it be to the enemies of the Church! They would call the asseverations of centuries, and history itself, as witnesses against Catholicism: she would be crushed by the weight of opposing testimony; the holy Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils would rise in judgment against her. They would bury us in our shame, and from the desert atheism would rise more powerful and threatening than ever" (2, 378).

When the council met (Dec. 8. 1869) it was soon found that there were, with regard to this question, three parties among the bishops: one, which regarded the promulgation of this new doctrine as the best and most urgent work the council should attend to; the second, which petitioned the pope against this doctrine, which they believed would be at least a great stumbling block for all non-Catholics, and even for a great many members of the Catholic Church; the third, which was in favor of a compromise, would have some regard for the arguments adduced by the second class, and therefore, instead of promulgating in unmistakable and bold clearness the doctrine of papal infallibility, would attain the same end in a less offensive way, by inculcating the duty of an absolute submission to every decision of the pope in matters of faith. The majority of the bishops signed a petition for the promulgation of infallibility, which had been drawn up by the German bishop of Paderborn, and received 410 signatures. The counter address (or, rather, counter addresses) against the infallibility was signed by 162 bishops, among whom were 20 Americans, 46 Frenchmen, 37 Germans and Austrians, 19 Orientals, 2 Portuguese, 14 Hungarians, 3 Englishmen, and 15 Italians. The address of the middle party, which desired to effect a compromise, was drawn up by the archbishop of Baltimore. The address against the proclamation of the doctrine of infallibility, drawn up by the cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna, is couched in the most submissive expressions, assures the holy father of the devotedness of all the bishops to the apostolical see, and continues: "It would not be right to ignore that many difficulties, arising from expressions

or actions of the Church fathers from the documents of history, and even from the Catholic doctrine, remain, which must be thoroughly explained before it would be admissible to lay this doctrine before the Christian people as one revealed by God. But our minds revolt against a controversial discussion of this question, and confidently implore thy kindness not to lay upon us the duty of such a transaction. As we, moreover, exercise the episcopal functions among great Catholic nations, we know their condition from daily intercourse; hence we are satisfied that the asked-for doctrinal decision will offer weapons to the enemies of religion, in order to excite aversion to the Catholic religion, even of men of good character, and we are certain that this decision would offer, at least in Europe, an opportunity or a pretext to the governments of our countries to make encroachments upon the rights which have remained to the Church. We have concluded to lay this before thy holiness, with the sincerity which we owe to the father of the faithful, and we ask thee that the doctrinal opinion, the sanction of which is demanded by the address, be not submitted to the council for consideration.” Among the signers are, besides the cardinal archbishop of Vienna, nearly all the archbishops of Germany and Austria; in particular, the cardinal archbishop of Prague, the archbishops of Cologne, Munich, Bamberg, and others. The bishops who signed this remonstrance against the promulgation of papal infallibility as a doctrine confined themselves to urging the inopportuneness. Only a few plainly expressed themselves against the dogma itself. But what the bishops failed to do, the catholic scholars, especially those of Germany, did so emphatically that their protests against the ultra papal theories, and against the whole spirit prevailing in Rome, made a profound sensation throughout the Christian world.

One of the most learned Church historians of the Roman Catholic Church, professor Döllinger, of the University of Munich, in a letter addressed to the *Augsburger Zeitung*, and since published as a pamphlet in an enlarged form (*Erwagungen für die Bischöfe des Concils*, Ratisbon, 1869), subjected the address of the bishops who asked for the promulgation of infallibility to the most crushing criticism, Dr. Döllinger says of this petition of the champions of papal infallibility that henceforth “one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be forced, on pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments, and everlasting damnation, to believe and to profess that which hitherto the Church has *not* believed, *not* taught.” The proclamation of this dogma, he says, would be an “alteration

in the faith and doctrine of the Church such as *has never been heard of since Christianity was first founded.*” The whole foundation of the Church would thereby be affected. Dr. Döllinger shows conclusively that until the 16th century the doctrine of papal infallibility was entirely unknown, and that, when it was taken up by cardinal Bellarmine, it could only be supported by the testimony of Isidorian decretals, which are *forged*, and those of Cyril, which are a *fiction*.

The views of Döllinger and Gratry received the emphatic assent of the large majority of the Catholic scholars of Germany and France. The governments of France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and other Catholic countries instructed their ministers in Rome to enter an earnest protest against a doctrine which would compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the pope to choose kings and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Even some of the members of the council, in particular the cardinal archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, who was regarded as the most learned bishop of the council, published pamphlets against the dogmatization of infallibility while it was discussed by the council. But all this opposition failed to make the least impression upon the majority of the bishops. From the opening of the council, the infallibilists showed themselves so uncompromising that they refused to give to the minority even one single representative in the important commission on dogmatical questions, which, on the other hand embraced the name of every bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position as a defender of infallibility: in particular, archbishop Manning, of Westminster; archbishop Dechamps, of Malines; archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; bishop Martin, of Paderborn; bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. The discussion of the question commenced on the 13th of May. The *schema* was comprised in a preamble and four chapters, and was known to form the first part of the dogmatic constitution *De Ecclesia Christi*. The debate is known to have been long and animated, many bishops entering a very earnest protest against the promulgation of such an innovation. Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia and Sirmium, in Croatia; bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans, in France; archbishop Darboy, of Paris; bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, in Wurtemberg; cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna; cardinal archbishop prince Schwarzenberg, of Prague, are mentioned as those bishops who spoke with the greatest effect against the proposed doctrine. The regulations of the

council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the proposal being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made on the schema in general, one hundred and fifty bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the pope a protest against the closing of the general discussion, as it had deprived the council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments against the new doctrine. The discussion of the schema as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole *schema* by name, with *placet*, or *placet juxta modum*, or *non-placet*. The result was as follows: 451 *placets*, 62 *placets juxta modum*, and 88 *non-placets*. Some of the *placets juxta modum* recommended the insertion of words that would make the decree clearer and stronger. The schema was accordingly altered, and the amendments were retained in the general congregation, held Saturday, July 16. The final step was then taken, in the fourth public session of the council, on the 18th of July. The roll of the members was again called, when 534 answered *placet*, 2 replied *non-placet*, and 106 were absent, some because sick, the far greater number not willing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known officially to Pius IX, he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, "Wherefore," he continued, "by virtue of our apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read." The following is a faithful translation of chapter iv of the schema, which treats of papal infallibility:

*Of the infallible Authority of the Roman Pontiff in Teaching.* — This holy see hath ever held the unbroken custom of the Church doth prove and the ecumenical councils, those especially in which the East joined with the West in union of faith and of charity, have declared, that in this apostolic primacy, which the Roman pontiff holds over the universal Church as successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, there is also contained the supreme power of 'authoritative teaching. Thus the fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth this solemn profession:

"The first law of salvation is to keep the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said, Thou art

Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church (~~4168~~ Matthew 16:18), these words, which he spake, art proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted, and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic-see preaches, in which is the fill and true firmness of the Christian religion.” [Formula of St. Hormisdas, pope as proposed by Hadrian II to the fathers of the eighth General Council (Constantinople, IV), and subscribed by them.]

So, too, the Greeks, with the approval of the second Council of Lyons, professed that the holy Roman Church holds over the universal Catholic Church a supreme and full primacy and headship, which she truthfully and humbly acknowledges that she received, with fullness of power, from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince or head of the apostles, of whom the Roman pontiff is the successor; and as she, beyond the others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so, if any questions arise concerning faith, they should be decided by her judgment. And, finally, the Council of Florence defined that the Roman pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, and ruling, and governing the universal Church (~~4215~~ John 21:15-17).

In order to fulfill this pastoral charge, our predecessors have ever labored unweariedly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long-established custom of the churches (St. Cyril, Alexand., and St. Caelest. Pap.), and the form of ancient rule (St. Innocent I to Councils of Carthage and Milevi), referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail (St. Bernard, *epistle* 190). And the Roman pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the Church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as divine Providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be held which, by the aid of God, they knew to be conformable to the holy Scriptures and the apostolic



traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter that they may make known new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully set-forth the revelation delivered by the apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this their apostolic teaching all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Savior made to the prince of the apostles: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren (Conf. St. Agatho, *Ep. ad Imp. a Conc. AEcum. VI approb.*)

Therefore this gift of truth, and of faith which fails not, was divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors in this chair, that they should exercise their high office for the salvation of all, that through them the universal flock of Christ should be turned away from the poisonous food of error and should be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that, the occasion of schism being removed, the entire Church should be preserved one, and, planted on her foundation, should stand firm against the gates of hell.

Nevertheless, since in this present age, when the saving efficacy of the apostolic office is exceedingly needed, there are not a few who carp at its authority, we judge it altogether necessary to solemnly declare the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God has designed to unite to the supreme pastoral office.

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition handed down from the commencement of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Savior, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed, that, when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority; he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

And if any one shall presume, which God forbid, to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

Given in Rome, in the public session, solemnly celebrated in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our pontificate. Ita est.

Joseph, Bishop of St. Polten,  
*Secretary of the Council of the Vatican.*

The expectation that some of the bishops who opposed infallibility at the council would persist in their opposition, and decline to promulgate the new doctrine in their dioceses, was not fulfilled. The bishops not only submitted themselves, but forced also their dioceses to submit. In Germany a number of the most prominent theological scholars were removed from their chairs, and suspended from their priestly functions, for refusing to comply with the demands of Rome. Thus the creed of the Roman Catholic Church received a new doctrine which, in the opinion of many theologians who up to that time had been regarded throughout the Church as her ablest scholars, radically changes the character of the Church.

According to the opinion of Dr. Döllinger, more has been written on this subject during the last one hundred and thirty years than on any other point of Church history during fifteen hundred years. The most important work on the subject, that of Janus (*The Pope and the Council*), as well as the works of Maret, Döllinger, Maistre, and several works of former centuries, have already been noticed. Other important works treating on the subject are Ballerini, *De Vi ac Ratione Primatus*; Schrader (Jesuit), *De Unitate Romana* (vol. 1, Freiburg, 1862; vol. 2, Vienna, 1866); Philipp, *Kirchenrecht* (vol. 5); Rudis, *Petra Romana* (Mentz, 1869); Deschamps (archbishop of Malines), *L'Infallibilite du Pape* (Malines, 1869); Gratry, *Lettres sur L'Infallibilite du Pape* (Paris, 1869, 1870); Weninger (Jesuit), *The Infallibility of the Pope* (Cincinnati, 1869); Hergenröther *Anti-Janus* (Wurzburg, 1870); Frohshammer. *Zur Würdigung der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und d. kirchle* (Munich, 1869); Bickell, *Gründe für die Unfehlbarkeit des Kirchenoberhauptes* (Münster, 1870); Rauscher (cardinal archbishop of Vienna), *Observationes quaedam de infailibilitatis ecclesie subjecto* (Naples, 1870, against the dogmatization of infallibility); Kleutgen (Jesuit), *De Romani Pontifis Suprema potestate docendi* (Naples, 1870); Schmitz, *1st der Papst perssnlich unfehlbar* (Munich, 1870). The

fullest account of the proceedings of the council relative to the dogmatization of infallibility is given in Quirinus, *Rinzische Briefe vom Concil* (Munich, 1870). (A.J. S.)

## Infant Baptism

*SEE BAPTISM; SEE PAEDOBAPTISM.*

## Infant Communion

Notwithstanding the apostle's direction, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup" (~~4128~~ 1 Corinthians 11:28), which so clearly points to a mature age when man is capable of self-examination as a requisite in those who approach the Lord's table, we find infants admitted to holy communion as early as in the 3rd century. The first instances of it occurred in the North-African Church. Cyprian, in his *Tractatus de lapsis* (p. 139, ed. Gersdorf), speaks of children who at their entrance into the world partook of the body and blood of the Lord (*cibum et poculum dominicum*); he further gives the example of a girl (*puella*) whom a deacon had obliged to partake of the cup, but who could not retain what she had taken because she had previously, by her nurse's fault, partaken of bread dipped into wine, and had made an offering to idols. This practice of infant communion was undoubtedly connected with infant baptism, and, as a reason for it, Augustine lays down the principle that, unless we partake of the Supper of the Lord, to which no one can be regularly admitted who is not baptized, we can have no life in us (~~4118~~ John 6:53); and this, he maintains, applies as well to children as to men (*Epist.* 23, *ad Bonif.*; *Ep.* 106, *contra duas epistolas Pelag.* 1, 22; *Sermon 8, de verbis apostol. de peccat. merit.* 1, 20). The same reasons are given by his contemporary, Innocent I, bishop of Rome (416), in his letter to Augustine and" to the Council of Milevi: *Aug. ep.* 93, "Parvulos seterne vite praeiis etiam sine baptismatis gratia donari posse perfatum est; nisi enim manducaverint carnem Christi et biberint sanguinem ejus, non habebunt vitam in se ipsis." From a similar point of view, Gelasius I, pope of Rome, writes about A.D. 495, "No one should venture to *exclude* any child from this sacrament, without which no one can attain to eternal life." But as early as the 9th century, Fulgentius, the Augustine of that century, advocated the rite of baptism, only suggesting that by it "children were incorporated into Christ, and so partook of his flesh and blood." The custom continued, however, in the Western Church, to the time of

Charlemagne. In the *Sacramentaria* of Gregory I, and in the old *Ordo Romanus*, we find passages in which it is expressly stated. Thus the latter recommends that after baptism children should not be permitted to taste food before partaking of the Eucharist, and should not even be nursed except in case of absolute necessity. We find the same in Alcuin's *De Afflic.*, where it is expressly directed that, whenever a bishop is present. Baptism should be immediately followed by confirmation, and then by communion. In the synodal decrees of Walter of Orleans, in the same century, we find that priests are always to have the Eucharist ready, so that if a child should be taken in it should not be in danger of dying without the *viaticum*. In the 9th century this question of infant communion gave rise to controversies. Thus Paschasius Ratbertus maintained that children dying before communion were not therefore in danger, since by baptism they had already entered into communion with Christ. Still, in the 12th century, we find Radulphus Ardens saying (*Hom. in die Paschce de Euchar. necess.*) that it is prescribed (*statutum*) that children should receive communion, at least with the cup, soon after being baptized, so that "they might not be in danger of dying without that necessary sacrament." Hugo of St. Victor also recommends infant communion, where it can take place without danger, but remarks that this custom had already fallen into disuse in his time, the practice only remaining for the priest to give the newly-baptized child a little ordinary wine, instead of the blood of Christ, which practice he condemns. Soon after this, Odo, bishop of Paris, forbade giving children unconsecrated wafers, and thus the custom was lost in the Gallican Church. In Germany traces are to be found of it at a still later period; the thing ended in a mere senseless superstition. The Council of Trent condemns the principle of the necessity of infant communion, saying that the practice arose in the circumstances of the early ages, and that the fathers had sufficient grounds for introducing it in their days, without its being made a necessity of salvation; wherefore the usage could lawfully be altered and dropped (Sess. 21).

In the Greek Church we find passages of some theologians, which in their exposition of the doctrine of baptism would seem to imply that they rejected this necessity of infant communion based on John vi; 53; for they designate the former sacrament, as a purification through the blood of Christ, a partaking of the Lamb of God, etc. Yet infant communion was one of the early practices in that church, as is evident from the fact that in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii, 12) mothers are recommended to bring

their children with them to communion, and children are counted among those who partake of the Lord's Supper (viii, 13). (Comp. Stanley, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 118,119.) This custom is also defended by Pseudo-Dionysius (*Hier. Eccl.* 7:11) against the profane, who considered it ridiculous. The Greek Church still upholds infant communion. According to Metophanes Kritopulos (*Conf. Ecc. Gr.* c. 9), children (βρέφη), after they are baptized, should commune whenever their parents do.

The Roman Church and all Protestant churches now agree in rejecting infant communion. Nevertheless, there have been a few advocates of the practice even among Protestants in modern times. Among the most prominent of them is Pierce (*Essay on the Eucharist*, London, 1504), who argues for the practice (1) on the ground of primitive usage; (2) from Scripture. The latter argument is "that Christians succeeding to the Jews as God's people, and being grafted upon that stock, their infants have a right to all the privileges of which they are capable, till forfeited by some immoralities; and, consequently, have a right to partake of this ordinance, as the Jewish children had to eat of the Passover and other sacrifices; besides this, he pleads those texts which speak of the Lord's Supper as received by all Christians. The most obvious answer to all this is that which is taken from the incapacity of infants to examine themselves, and discern the Lord's body; but he answers that this precept is only given to persons capable of understanding and complying with it, as those which require faith in order to baptism are interpreted by the Paedobaptists. As for his argument from the Jewish children eating the sacrifice, it is to be considered that this was not required as circumcision was; the males were not necessarily brought to the Temple till they were twelve years old (~~1000~~ Luke 2:42); and the sacrifices they ate of were chiefly *peace offerings*, which became the common food to all that were clean in the family, and were not looked upon as acts of devotion to such a degree as our Eucharist is; though, indeed, they were a token of their acknowledging the divinity of that God to whom they had been offered (~~1000~~ 1 Corinthians 10:18); and even the Passover was a commemoration of a temporal deliverance; nor is there any reason to believe that its reference to the Messiah was generally understood by the Jews. On the whole, it is certain there would be more danger of a contempt arising to the Lord's Supper from the admission of infants and of confusion and trouble to other communicants; so that, not being *required* in Scripture, it is much the best to omit it. When children are grown up to a capacity of behaving decently, they may soon be

instructed in the nature and design of the ordinance; and if they appear to understand it, and give proof of love to Christ, it would be advisable to admit them to communion, though very young; which, by the way, might be a good security against many of the snares to which youth are exposed.” See Augusti, *Bandbuch d. christl. Archäol.* 2, 639 sq.; Bihmer, *Die christlich-kirchliche Aterthumswissenschaft*, 2, 365 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 549 sq.; Zorn, *Historia Euclaristice Infantium* (Berlin, 1736, 8vo); Knapp, *Theology*, § 144; Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lect. 207; Neander, *Church History*, 1, 311: 315, 2, 319; 3:496; Smith, *Account of the Gr. Church*, p. 161; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 15, ch. 3:§ 7; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 21:§ 8; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 242; Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 542.

Infanticide is the term for the act or practice of murdering infants, which was very general among the ancients, and which still prevails among rude nations. The Greeks and Romans, with all their high notions of civilization, were guilty of favoring this horrible practice--by legislative enactments, and Plato and Aristotle are found among its supporters. Thus, at Sparta, the law required that a child, immediately after birth, was to be exhibited to the authorities for inspection, and if its look was not wholesome, or its limbs crippled, “it was thrown into a deep cavern at the foot of the mountain Taygetus; and it was said that this law had a wholesome effect, for it made women with child very careful as to their eating, drinking, and exercise, and hence they proved excellent nurses. In the other Grecian republics a similar disregard of the life of sickly infants was shown.” Among the Romans it seems to have been the duty of the father to decide the fate of his newborn babe. Among the Norse a somewhat similar rule determined the life of the infant. If weak, or of the weaker sex, the father not infrequently “disapproved of its living, and it was exposed to die by wild beasts or the weather.” Among the barbaric tribes, child-murder prevails most extensively. Thus it is general throughout the whole of the South-Sea Islands, and is even a regular system among the Fijians (q.v.). In Vanu Levu, we are informed by a recent authority “the extent of infanticide reaches nearer two thirds than one half of all the children born.” Among the people of India, especially the Hindus, as well as the Brahmans, this evil prevailed to a very great extent, due no doubt, in a great measure, to the national prejudice of remarriage of a widow (compare Max Muller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, 2, 312). But, since the rule of the English, laws ‘have been enacted likely to modify the practice, if not to

cheek it altogether. “The Rajputs, it is said, destroy all the female children but the first-born—a peculiar custom, due to its being a point of honor with a Rajput to nearly ruin himself in the marriage feast and portion of his daughter, so that he could not afford to have more than one. The Mohammedans were inclined to the same practice, but effected their object by-means of abortion. In New Holland the native women think nothing of destroying by compression the infant in the womb, to avoid the trouble of rearing it alive. In China infanticide is supposed to be common, the chief cause being said to be the right of periodically repudiating their wives which is possessed by Chinamen. Some statistics, recently published in the *Esperance* of Nancy, indicate the fearful extent to which life is lost through this practice prevailing in so vast a population as that of China.” Newcomb (*Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 487) says, “It is computed from authentic data that not less than 9000 children are exposed in the streets of Peking every year, and as many more in the provinces, and that it is a part of the duty of the police to carry away in carts, every morning, those that have been exposed at night, *some of whom are yet alive; but they are all carried to a pit without the walls, and buried promiscuously.*” In Japan, poverty of the parent is deemed an admissible excuse for the destruction of an infant’s life, and in Greenland the infant is buried with the mother, if she dies in or shortly after childbirth. The South American women commit the same atrocity as the poor parents of Japan. In Africa the Bushmen follow the practices that we detailed as prevalent among the ancient Greeks and Romans; and so frequent has been the practice of feeding lions with infants’ flesh, that “it has greatly increased the desire of the lion for human flesh.” “In Madagascar the fate of the infant depends upon the calculation of lucky and unlucky days.” Among the North American Indians infanticide has also prevailed, and does still prevail very extensively. The lower castes of the Natchez Indians on the lower Mississippi, Brinton (*Myths of the New World* [N.Y. 1868, 8vo], p. 239) says, deliberately murder their own children on the funeral pyre of a son or chief to gain admittance to a higher caste. But as a principal reason of the great extent of infanticide, especially of female children, among savage tribes, Lubbock (*Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of Man* [London, 1870, 8vo], p. 93) assigns the scarcity of game, and the fact that female children are only consumers, and not providers. “Under these circumstances, female children became a source of weakness in several ways. They ate, and did not hunt; they weakened their mothers when young, and when growing up were a temptation to surrounding tribes.” But while these reasons, which seem

quite plausible at the outset, may have helped to aggravate and spread the horrid crime of infanticide, it is no doubt true, after all, that the practice of child-murder is due to a false comprehension of the duties and relations of man towards his Maker. Perverted religious teachings have done much to foster this great crime among these ignorant human beings, whom Christianity is slowly but surely convincing of the error of their ways. The benign effect of Christianity, which was so marked on the legislation of the Greco-Roman empire in the treatment of woman, and, as a natural consequence, in the treatment likewise of her offspring, is already apparent also among these uncivilized tribes. One of the maxims of modern civilization, or, rather, of Christianity, is found among the enactments of the first Christian emperor, namely, Constantine's declaration that "the killing of a child by its father, which the Pompeian law left unpunished, is one of the greatest crimes" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:114). "Instead of encouraging the destruction of life, modern civilization abounds in every kind of machinery for preserving it, however unsuccessful the attempt. The chief cause which, among Christian nations, leads to infanticide, is that of shame, which, however, operates only in the case of the child being illegitimate. The parents often incur the risk of committing the crime of murder to avoid social disgrace. In order, therefore, to appreciate the force of the checks put by the law on the tendency to infanticide, the law of bastardy, the practice of instituting foundling hospitals (q.v.), and the kind and degree of the punishments attending any attempt more or less direct to destroy the child, either before or after birth, require to be taken into account. The criminal law deals with the cognate offences which make up infanticide in the following manner, whether the child is legitimate or illegitimate. As regards the procuring of abortion, every woman who takes poison or other noxious thing, or uses instruments or other means to procure her miscarriage, is guilty of felony, and liable to penal servitude for life, or not less than three years; and so is any person who administers poison, or uses instruments upon the woman with such intent. Whoever supplies drugs, poison, or instruments for the same purpose is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to penal servitude for three years. The concealment of birth is also a criminal offence. Whoever, after a child is born, by any secret disposition of the body, endeavors to conceal its birth, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to imprisonment for two years. This is the offence which, perhaps, is most frequently committed, or at least made the subject of prosecution in such cases, as the attempt to establish the larger crime of murder to the satisfaction of a jury is frequently foiled



by the secret sympathy shown towards the mother, who is presumed to have been the victim of seduction, or otherwise wronged” (Chambers). But one of the greatest difficulties we are beginning to encounter in our own day, in several *Christian* lands, among which our own is perhaps the most prominent, is the practice of abortion, only another form of infanticide, so general among the so-called higher classes of society. It is really alarming to the Christian man to see how extensive this great sin has become in this country, as well as in England. We do not deign to speak of France, for that country, in this respect at least, can scarcely make the profession of being a Christian land. Houses for abortion are among us in the best parts of the largest cities. They are kept with the approval of our citizens, and are suffered to further a crime which must sooner or later prove the greatest curse that has yet befallen us. Mr. Greenwood, in his *Seven Curses of London*, speaks of “baby farming” as “a mischief of gigantic extent.” Recent statistics, and, indeed, the unblushing advertisements of abortionists, male and female, in the daily prints, proclaim the equally fearful extent of the crime of infanticide in our own land. It is high time that the clergy raise their voice against this varied form of *feticide*, which ‘threatens to decimate the population in the higher classes, and is poisoning the moral sense of outwardly respectable families. (J. H. W.)

## Infant Jesus, Daughters of the Congregation of the Picture for Infant Jesus, Daughters of

is an order in the Romish Church which has its seat at Rome. It owes its origin to Anna Moroni, a native of Lucca, who, having come to Rome entirely destitute, succeeded by her industry and economy in securing a competency. In more advanced years, her charitable feelings prompted her to establish an institution where poor girls should be instructed in such female work as would enable them to earn a livelihood. A priest, Cosmus Berlintani, and other members of the clergy, approved of her plan, and afforded her much assistance. By their joint efforts it was finally established as a regular institution, and in 1673 pope Clement X acknowledged the existence of the society, gave it bylaws, and endowed it with sundry particular privileges, under the appellation of “Daughters of the Infant Jesus.” The number of the “Daughters” allotted to each convent was fixed at 33, in commemoration of the number of years Jesus lived upon earth. The novitiate lasts three years; the sisters make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Such as may wish to leave the convent are allowed to do

so before taking the vows, but, in that case, they are to leave to the convent all they brought to it at their admission. Prayers and fasts are strictly enforced. The regular habit of the order consists of a wide, dark brown dress, and a white hood. There also existed in former times an organization whose members bore the name of “Sisters of the good Jesus;” these, in the earlier part of the 15th century, were transformed from a lay association into a regular order, and supported themselves by suitable avocations. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 6, 615.

### Infant Membership

*SEE MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

### Infant Regeneration

*SEE REGENERATION.*

### Infant Salvation

On this question most Christians will agree with the following statements: “The great consideration which leads to a solution of the case of persons dying in infancy is found in ~~415~~Romans 5:18, Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.’ In these words, the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are pronounced to be co-extensive; the words applied to both are precisely the same, ‘*judgment* came upon all *men*,’ ‘the free *gift* came upon *all men*.’ If the whole human race be meant in the former clause, the whole human race is meant in the latter also; and-it follows that as all are injured by the offence of Adam, so all are benefited by the obedience of Christ. Whatever, therefore, that benefit may be, all children dying in infancy must partake of it, or there would be a large portion of the human race upon whom the ‘free gift,’ the effects of ‘the righteousness of one,’ did not ‘come,’ which is contrary to the apostle’s words” (Watson, *Institutes*, 2, 57).

“Theologians have pursued two different methods in treating of this subject. (a.) Some are content with saying that God will pardon and save infants on account of the merits of Christ, which extend to all, although they may not have believed in Christ during their lifetime; and that their being born with natural depravity will not harm them, because they themselves are not to blame for it. These writers refer to ~~415~~Romans 5:15-17 for an analogous proceeding. This is the most simple and safest view.

(b.) Others, misunderstanding the passage <sup><4166></sup>Mark 16:16, suppose that faith in Christ is an indispensable requisite for salvation in all men, and have therefore (together with some schoolmen) embraced the doctrine of *faith of infants*, which they have variously explained and described as *fides praesumpta, implicita, per baptismum sine verbo* (some say *sine cognitione*) *infants; talis affectio in infante qualis Deo placeat*. The schoolmen describe it as *dispositio ad justitiam*. But none of them succeed in conveying any intelligible idea. Nothing is said in the N.T. about such a faith. Faith always presupposes *knowledge* and power to exercise the understanding. Now, since children have neither of these requisites, faith cannot be ascribed to them; nor, indeed, *disbelief*, unless the word is used very improperly. The mere want of *faith* is not *damnable*, but *unbelief* only, or the guilty destitution of faith. Those who have adopted this view have thus been compelled (as appears from the preceding remarks) to vary the idea which is uniformly attached to the word *faith* where adults are referred to, as soon as they speak of children, and call something in them by this name which is nowhere else so denominated. The passage <sup><4166></sup>Matthew 18:6, does not bear upon this point, since the disciples of Christ are there meant. **SEE BAPTISM**. From the words of Christ, however, <sup><4194></sup>Matthew 19:14, ‘Of such is the kingdom of God,’ it is clear that he considers *children* as belonging to his kingdom. And this is enough” (Knapp, *Theology*, p. 423).

Calvin, who laid particular stress on infant baptism in harmony with the other leading reformers, held that “it is no small injustice to the covenant of God if we do not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the fulfillment depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism are lost, makes our condition worse than that of the ancient Israelites, as though’ the grace of God were more restricted now than it was under law; it leads to the conclusion that Christ came, not to fulfill the promises, but to abolish them; since the promise, which at that time was of itself sufficiently efficacious to insure salvation before the

eighth day, would have no validity now without the assistance of the sign.” What Calvin here says is so clear, positive, and decided, and so entirely free from the least ambiguity, that he cannot be misunderstood.

Of late years a controversy has arisen in the “Reformed Church” as to the doctrines which she really promulgates on this point, and, as a result, we think we may justly send forth the following: “We still hold on to the old faith of the Church, that the sacraments are *sealing* ordinances, and feel as confident as ever that God will remain true to his promise, and save the children of the covenant, though they should die without its seal.” Indeed, it seems almost impossible for the “Reformed Church” to take any other ground, since one of her founders and great theological teachers, Ursinus, held not only in the case of infants, but also in the case of all God’s reasoning creatures, that “not all those who are not baptized are excluded from the grace of Christ; for not the want, but the *contempt* of baptism, excludes men from the covenant of God, made with the faithful and their children.” (Compare articles in the *Ref. Ch. Messenger*, March 4, 1868; March 11, 1868).

One of the greatest arguments against the salvation of children not baptized, which has been advanced, is, that the rite of *baptism* is essential to covenantship, provided the parents had not by peculiar circumstances been prevented from attending to this duty. But this point does not seem to be well taken, for among the Israelites circumcision did *not* admit their children into covenant with God, as they were in that covenant by *birth*. Circumcision was merely the sign or seal of the covenant, without which they could not be recognized as being of the people of God. So Christian children are included in the covenant with Christ; but the rite of baptism is their natural sign and seal of that covenant, and without it they cannot be considered, as belonging to the visible followers of Christ. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Wesley, *Works*, 5, 377; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1860, p. 387 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1859, p. 632; 1864, p. 517 sq., 552 sq.; 1865, p. 81; 1870, p. 290; Fairchild, *Are Infants elected* (Tract of the Presb. Ch. No. 229); McConoughy, *Are Infants saved* (Presb. Ch. Tract No. 132); *Children in Heaven* (Phila. 1865, Presb. Board of Publ.), p. 352; *Christian Examiner*, 4:431; 5 229, 310; Russell, *Ons Infant Salvation* (London, 1822, 12mo); Harris, *Hope for Salvation of all dying in Infancy* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, Lect. 168.

## Infel

*SEE INFULA.*

### Inferential Theology

Many pious minds of the Christian Church have earnestly opposed the opinion of the more liberally inclined orthodox theologians, that the Christian theology is in some respects ‘inferential.’ Liddon adroitly puts this question in his Bampton Lecture of 1866 (*Our Lord’s Divinity*, p. 441, 442): “No one would deny that in all ages of the Church the field of theology has been the scene of hasty, unwarrantable, and misleading inferences. False conclusions have been drawn from true premises, and very doubtful or false premises have been occasionally assumed, if not asserted to be true... But if this should be admitted it would not follow that theology is in no sense ‘inferential.’ Within certain limits, and under due guidance, ‘inference’ is the movement, it is the life of theology. The primal records of revelation itself, as we find them in Scripture, are continually inferential, and it is at least the business of theology to observe and marshal these revealed inferences, to draw them out, and to make the most of them. The illuminated reason of the collective Church has for ages been engaged in studying the original materials of the Christian revelation. It has thus shaped, rather than created, the science of theology. What is theology but a continuous series of observed and systematized inferences respecting God in his nature and his dealings with mankind, drawn from premises which rest upon God’s authority? If we reject conclusions drawn professedly from the substance of revelation, but really enlarging instead of explaining it, it does not follow that we should reject inferences which are simply explanatory, or which exhibit the bearing of one revealed truth upon another. This, indeed, is the most fruitful and legitimate province of inference in theological inquiry. Such ‘inference’ brings out the meaning of the details of revelation. It raises this feature to prominence, it throws that into the shade. It places language to which a too servile literalism might have attributed the highest force in the lower rank of metaphor and symbol; it elicits pregnant and momentous truths from incidents which, in the absence of sufficient guidance or reflection, may have been thought to possess only a secondary degree of significance.’

## Inferior Clergy

“the several classes of assistants to the priesthood in the ancient churches. They were distinguished by the title ἀχειροτόνητος ὑπηρεσία, because they were appointed to their respective offices without the imposition of hands. Not being ordained at the altar, nor in ecclesiastical form, they were, of course, ineligible for the exercise of any of its sacerdotal functions; indeed, so distinctly drawn was the line between them and the superior orders, called ἱερόμενοι, *holy*, that they were strictly forbidden to touch the sacred vessels, or so much as to enter the ‘diaconicum’ sanctuary. The inferior clergy of the Church of England includes all those in holy orders not distinguished by their position and title as *dignitaries of the Church*. The offices of churchwarden, vergers, sextons, and pew openers in the Church of England correspond in general to the offices of the inferior clergy of ancient times” (Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book 1, ch. 1. **SEE CLERGY.**

## Infeudation

is a term in law for the placing in possession of a fee or freehold estate. It was used in ecclesiastical law to designate the granting of tithes to laymen, and the temporary possession by ecclesiastical associations of lay property. Pope Urban VIII, in the year 1625, declared himself against all infeudation, and made it null and void if thereafter contracted. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3, 450.

## Infidel

(ἄπιστος, <sup><4165></sup>2 Corinthians 6:15; <sup><5418></sup>1 Timothy 5:8), an *unbeliever*, as elsewhere rendered.

## Infidelity

etymologically means simply *want of belief*. By common usage it has come to mean (1), in a restricted sense, a rejection of the Christian faith; and (2), in a wider sense, the rejection of religion generally. Thus Atheists, who disbelieve in God and Deists, who believe in God, but reject Christianity, are alike called infidels.

**I.** *Various Forms of Infidelity.* — Pearson, in his excellent prize essay on *Infidelity, its Aspects, Causes, and Agencies* (Lond. 1860, 8vo), classifies the forms of modern infidelity as follows:

1. Atheism, or the denial of the divine existence;
2. Pantheism, or the denial of the divine personality;
3. Naturalism, or the denial of the divine government;
4. Spiritualism, or the denial of the divine redemption. To these may be added, what belong more properly to practical than to theoretical infidelity,
5. Indifferentism, or the denial of man's responsibility; and,
6. Formalism, or the denial of the power of godliness.

Each of these will be found noticed in this Cyclopaedia under their proper heads. Riddle (*Bampton Lecture* for 1852) gives the following survey of the various phases of infidelity.

(1.) *Rationalism*. — “Infidelity, scarcely fashioned, and perhaps hardly conscious of its own true character, but yet really existing and putting forth some degree of energy, appears in the form of a *rationalistic rejection of Christian doctrine*. In this form, having reference rather to the substance of the Gospel than to its proofs and evidences, infidelity is susceptible of such diversified modifications, and assumes so many disguises, that it may sometimes escape detection, and is often in a disposition to repel, with logical correctness, the charges which may be justly brought against it by those who perceive its real tendency and nature. The faintest, but still dangerous phase of this rationalistic spirit consists in the habit of making an arbitrary *choice and selection* of dogmas to be believed by those who professedly, and with more or less sincerity, accept the Christian revelation as a whole. From this unhealthy state or mind the transition is too easy to a systematic *elevation of reason above all the notices of revelation*; that is, to *rationalism* applied to the whole substance of the Gospel. This takes place when men systematically require that revealed truth shall be, not only not contradictory to sound reason, which is justly to be expected, but that it shall be in accordance with the independent notions of reason or deductions of the understanding.” With the class of thinkers who have this tendency most prominently affiliates Mr. Leckey, who has lately published a *History of Rationalism* (London, 2 vols. 8vo). His aim, and that of his school, evidently is to reduce Christianity to a system of ethics, and deprive it of its supernatural character, holding that the contest between the champions and the adversaries of religion is no longer to be fought, as it

was in the 16th and 17th centuries, upon points of dogmatic theology, and that the dogmatic forms of the Protestant churches are no longer the efficient antagonists of the Church of Rome. Nor are the free-thinkers of the present day to be confounded with those of the old Voltairean school in France, or with the English Deists of the last century. Their system is no longer exclusively negative and destructive, but, on the contrary, intensely positive, and, in its moral aspect, intensely Christian. It embraces a series of essentially Christian conceptions—equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the education of the poor, the abolition of slavery, the diffusion of liberty. It revolves around the ideal of Christianity, and represents its spirit without its dogmatic system and its supernatural narratives. From both of these it unhesitatingly recoils, while deriving all its strength and nourishment from Christian ethics. Hardly conscious of its own character, as Mr. Riddle tells us, modern Rationalists go forth under such leaders as Leckey, and declare that “the idolatry of dogmas will pass away,” and that “Christianity, being rescued from sectarianism and intolerance that have defaced it, will shine by its own moral splendor, and, sublimated above all the sphere of controversy, will assume its rightful position as an ideal, and not a system; as a person, and not a creed.” We see this great result, which Mr. Leckey succeeds in *picturing*, in a somewhat *modified* form, in the efforts of the free-thinkers of our land, especially since the last meeting of the “Free Religious Association,” more particularly in the abolition of the Sunday laws for *certain purposes* in the city of Boston, inaugurated first by the followers of Theodore Parker. *SEE RATIONALISM.*

(2.) *Spiritualism.* — “But while Rationalism appears to have lost much of its former reputation, there is another method of arriving at the same end which finds acceptance in the minds of many persons at the present day. These men are not Rationalists; they are so-called *Spiritualists*. They do not deny the great truths which lie on the very surface of the sacred record; nor do they disavow the fact of a divine revelation, and so leave man entirely to the dictates of his reason, and the conclusions of his understanding, with the additional aid to be derived from his fellow-creatures, all uninspired like himself. But their theory is this. There is, say they, a revelation made from God to man, but it is only subjective, inward, to the already existing spiritual life, or religious consciousness of humanity: the inspiration by which this life or consciousness is awakened is common to every man who will wait and seek for it; and as to religious truth, it is simply that which individuals, or the mass of humanity, so far as their



powers have been heightened by the divine afflatus, are able to apprehend. According to this system, we are not to suppose that the Gospel announces positive spiritual facts, such, for example, as that which is usually understood by the atonement; but it propounds ideas which may be differently received by different men, and will possess a power and value according to the spiritual mould into which they may be cast. Now, in this Spiritualism, let it be observed, there is nothing original or new. This system is, in substance, only one of those phases of unbelief which have appeared-and disappeared at intervals from the earliest ages of Christianity, but which, thanks be to God, have never yet succeeded in making the Gospel obsolete, and in robbing mankind of the knowledge of salvation. It is, however, fraught with danger, and its power of mischief arises, in no small degree, from its capability of disguise. It can put on the semblance of Christian truth; it can comply with any form of words, even the soundest form, in creeds and confessions drawn up with the greatest fidelity and care.” (Comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 1, 5 sq.) **SEE SPIRITUALISM.**

**(3.) Naturalism.** — “The mind that revolts at mystery, or religious truth which we cannot know independently of a direct and outward revelation, is also shocked and repelled by miracle. Accordingly we find that infidelity sometimes assumes the form of *naturalism*, or an assault upon the Bible chiefly with reference to its supernatural historic elements. According to some, the miracles of Scripture were really wrought, and presented all the appearances described in the sacred record; but they were miraculous only to the apprehension of ignorant persons, who did not understand how they were performed. Far more elaborate, and perhaps more plausible, has been an attempt of recent date to exhibit all the miraculous and supernatural features of the Gospel history under the character of an aggregate of myths or legends. Such is the hypothesis of Strauss. **SEE NATURALISM.**

**(4.) Deism.** — “This is a class of anti-Christian principles well known as having prevailed in England chiefly in the last century.” Infidelity in this form no longer appears as mere philosophy, or speaks in the accents of calm or lofty speculation. It includes, indeed, some attempts at historical and verbal criticism, and makes some show of wisdom suited to the age in which it flourished; but, for the most part, it opens its mouth in blasphemy, and proclaims aloud the sentiments of an evil and ungodly heart. For, whether we ‘consider the ignorant misrepresentations of Paine, the sneers of Gibbon, or the scoffings of Voltaire, it is impossible not to perceive that

their opposition to the Gospel is founded upon moral repugnance and distaste. Their writings are a clear echo of that rebellious sentiment, ‘We will not have this man to reign over us’ (~~2914~~Luke 19:14). And, so far as the school of infidelity continues to subsist, we find its adherents, for the most part, among men of depraved moral habits, of low taste and uncultivated intellect reveling very often in the haunts of profligacy and vice, or filled with political rancor, and struggling against the restraints of all laws, human and divine.” (Comp. Materland, *Works*, 5, 4 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 1, 38 sq.) *SEE DEISM.*

(5.) *Pantheism.* — “Some men there are who, while they reject Christianity, and know not the true God, yet retain the impression of a presiding or universal Intellect; but, at the same time, that which they thus recognize as mental energy, or the divine essence, or even a divine being, they regard as more or less identical with nature, conceiving that, in some way or other, either God is the universe, or the universe is God. This is *Pantheism* in its twofold aspect.” *SEE PANTHEISM.*

(6.) *Atheism.* — “There appears to be only one step lower to which even the boldest infidelity can descend, and that is *Atheism*, properly so called. The Atheist is sometimes satisfied with taking a merely negative position. Without attempting to prove that there is no God, he simply affirms that, to his apprehension, there is no sufficient proof of his existence, or that the evidences of his being and his operation, to which many men appeal, are to his mind no evidence whatever, and therefore he holds himself excused from believing that there is a God, and from accepting the consequences which must follow from such admission, respecting the creation of the world, the responsibility of man, and the prospect of immortality hereafter. But this position, dreary as it is, by no means forms a resting-place of this infidel philosophy. Atheism, even in the present day, is positive and dogmatic in its teachings. It professes to account for the absence of a Deity, and to prove that there is no God, or, at least, that there is none engaged in present operation on the universe around us.” *SEE ATHEISM.*

**II.** *Causes of Infidelity.* — The chief source of infidelity is undoubtedly a moral one. “It is evident,” remarks Pearson (*Modern Infidelity*, pt. 2, ch. 1), “that unbelief, generally speaking, can originate in only one of two sources; either in a deficiency of evidence, or in a state of mind and heart on which the clearest and strongest evidence has no power. The causes of infidelity, we are persuaded, are more ethical than intellectual. This

persuasion is greatly strengthened by the perusal of some of the productions of our modern infidel writers.” “Nothing can be more contemptible,” says professor Garbett (*Mod. Philosoph. Infidelity*, p. 5), “than the *argumentative* resources of modern infidelity. *It does not reason, it only postulates*; it dreams and it dogmatizes. Nor can it claim *invention*.” This testimony is true. Indeed, we venture to assert, that the general strain of argument brought to bear against Christianity by its modern assailants would not be tolerated for a moment within the province of purely literary criticism. The strong determination to withstand everything in the shape of reasonable evidence contrasts very much with the feeble argumentation by which many of the truths of religion are set aside. Be it atheism or pantheism, naturalism or spiritualism, indifferentism or formalism, the will has much to do with it. Moral evidence is the appropriate proof of moral truth. All moral evidence is cumulative; but, however strong it may be, it is never irresistible. An indocile mind can ward it off. The existence of God, **SEE GOD** does not admit of demonstration, but moral certainty. **SEE EVIDENCE**. So the personality of God, though much more rational than pantheism, does not admit of mathematical demonstration. Christianity is based upon evidence. The reason why evidence is necessary-is to be found in our moral constitution as rational, discriminating, accountable agents; and in the fact that, from the existence of evil in the world, we were otherwise liable to deception in reference to our highest interests. It could never be a man’s duty to believe in a revelation claiming to itself the authority of heaven, unless that revelation bore, legibly on its front, heaven’s signature, or was in some way attended with heaven’s evidencing power. The evidence that attests the truth of Christianity, vast, varied, and of great cumulative power though it be, is not, however, irresistible. No man is warranted to expect it to be so. Faith is a moral act, and, while resting on a strong groundwork of proof, it must have some difficulties over which to triumph. Origen, speaking of the difficulties in the Bible revelation, and of those in the revelation of nature, says: “In both we see a self-concealing, self-revealing God, who makes himself known only to those who earnestly seek him; in both are found stimulants to faith, and occasions for unbelief.” “There is light enough,” says Pascal, “for those who sincerely wish to see, and darkness enough for those of an opposite description.” Mr. Newman tells us it “supersedes the authoritative force of outward miracles entirely” to say that “a really overpowering miraculous proof would have destroyed the moral character of faith.” This, however, is not argument, but a foolish dogmatic assertion.

The Christian miracles are of “a convincing and stupendous character,” and yet not so overpowering as the axiom that a whole is greater than its part; and we lack sagacity to perceive where lies the contradiction between these statements. Evidence is obligatory on man, not because it is overpowering or irresistible, but because it preponderates.

Besides the *moral* ground, there are certain subordinate causes constantly operating, e.g. Speculative Philosophy (q.v.); corruptions of Christianity, *SEE CHRISTIANITY*; *SEE ROMANISM*; religious intolerance, *SEE TOLERATION*; and, more especially, the connection of Church and State. In our own country, on the other hand, the fact that religion is a matter of private opinion has brought upon us the charge, from the other side of the Atlantic, that in our corporate capacity we, by our peculiar position on this point, permit the inference that we “distinctly affirm that no religion is true, but that all theological systems are human speculations upon a doubtful matter, more or less plausible in themselves, and containing a greater or less amount of truth, but no one of which is so probable that we will act in a matter so important and legislate upon the theory of its truth.” It is held by skeptics that it is not possible to prove any other theoretical justification of toleration, or religious equality, or whatever else the system which treats religion as a matter of private opinion is called, than one which is founded on the principle that religion is matter of opinion; in other words, that the best of all religions is doubtful. The mere non-acceptance of the Koran or of the Roman Catholic Creed, after notice of their contents, appears to them to amount to a denial of the truth of the claims of Mohammed and the pope respectively. They argue thus from the position that a nation cannot remain on *neutral* grounds in a matter in which it is theoretically, and practically too, impossible to be neutral, and that the 18th century theories of government, which led the founders of our constitution to think otherwise, are fundamentally wrong (*The Nation*, 1868, p. 345). *SEE CHURCH*.

For further information, see the different articles referred to above, and also the articles *SEE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY*; *SEE PARKER*; *SEE POSITIVISM*; *SEE UNBELIEF*. See also Garbett, *Modern Philosophical Infidelity*; Rogers, *Reason and Faith*; Rogers, *Eclipse of Faith*; Riddle, *Natural History of Infidelity* (Bampton Lect. for 1852, 8vo); Thomson, *Aids to Faith* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Morgan, *Christianity and Modern Infidelity* (London, 1854, 12mo); Pearson, *Prize Essay on Infidelity* (Lond. 1860, 21st edition); *London Review*, No. 5, art. 1; *Ch. of*

*England Review*, Oct. 1854, art. 3; Wharton, *Theism and the Modern Skeptical Theories* (Phila. 1859, 12mo); Saintes, *History of Rationalism* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); *Christian Review*, 3, 134; *North British Review*, 15, 18; *Princeton Review*, 12, 31; Nelson, *Cause and Cure of Infidelity* (N. Y. 12mo); Godwin, *Philosophy of Atheism* (Lond. 1853); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Infidelity* (Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (2nd ed. N. Y. 1866, 8vo); Hagenbach, *German Rationalism* (N. York, 1865); Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought* (N. Y. 1863, 8vo); *Evangel. Quart. Rev.* 1865, p. 162 sq.; *Mercersb. Rev.* July, 1869; *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1863, p. 687 sq.; 1864, p. 682 sq.

## Infinite

*SEE ATTRIBUTES; SEE GOD.*

## Infinity

without end or limit, the negation of finite: ἄπειρον, “un-endlich.”

**I.** *The Indefinite.* — Besides the definite consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an indefinite consciousness which cannot be formulated. Besides complete thoughts, and besides the thoughts which, though incomplete, admit of completion, there are thoughts which it is impossible to complete, and yet which are real, in the sense that they are normal affections of the intellect. Positive knowledge, however extensive it may become, does not and never can fill the whole region of possible thought. At the uttermost reach of discovery there arises, and must ever arise, the question, What lies beyond? Regarding science as a gradually increasing sphere, we may say that every addition to its surface does but bring it into wider contact with surrounding nescience. There is always something which forms alike the raw material of definite thought, and remains after the definiteness which thinking gave to it has been destroyed (H. Spencer, *First Principles*, p. 21 sq., 88, 90 sq.). This vague element in thought, which is ineradicable, Spencer considers to be the groundwork of the feeling of awe, and-of natural religion. It is the infinite in this sense, the attempt to conceive which involves a contradiction in terms; which can only be believed to exist, but can never become an object to consciousness. “If all thought is limitation; if whatever we conceive is, by the very act of conception, regarded as finite, the infinite, from a human point of view, is merely a name for the absence of those conditions under which thought is

possible” (Mansell’s *Bampton Lectures*, p. 48; comp. p. 30, 63, 80, 118; see esp. notes on p. 48 and 51, 4th ed.).

**II.** *The Infinite as an Interminable Series.* — Aristotle mentions five ways (*Phys. Ausc.* 203, b. 15) in which the notion of the ἄπειρον is attained:

- (a) From the unlimited duration of time;
- (b) from the possibility of perpetually subdividing magnitudes;
- (c) from the continuance of growth and decay in nature;
- (d) from the fact that limitation is always relative, and never absolute; and
- (e), “the strongest proof of all,” from the inability to conceive a limit to number, magnitude, and space.

Any given moment of time is both preceded and succeeded by another, and that by another without end. Any magnitude admits of multiplication or division, and the multiples or parts are again capable of multiplication or division, respectively, without limit. Any effect in nature is the result of a cause which, again, is the effect of another cause in an endless regress; and, conversely, every effect is itself the cause of some other effect, and this, in its turn, is the cause of another effect, and so on in an interminable progress. Time, space, and causation thus exhibit infinity in the form of a straight line or series of terms without beginning or end. The characteristics of this mode of the infinite are: (1) that it is purely negative, i.e. is the mere process of passing beyond limitations; (2) that it postulates the perpetual recurrence of limitations as its condition; and (3) that, as an endless series, it is incapable of being thought out, it is always possible and never actual, it cannot be said to exist, but always to be in the act of coming into existence.

It follows from this that, if infinity is an idea realizable by the mind, it must be conceived in some other way than as a linear series; it must be capable of an expression which is at once definite, and yet preserves the true character of infinity. Mathematical science does this by ‘the summation of an infinite series in a finite expression, and manipulates both the infinite and the infinitesimal as terms having a definite meaning in calculation. The possibility of conceiving the infinite as complete may be seen more easily from the consideration that any object which we can see, handle, imagine,

conceive, without any difficulty, e.g. a fruit, or a stone, is really-the sum of an infinite number of parts into which it may be divided, an infinite, therefore, which is not merely coming into existence, but actually exists here and now. Regarded, too, under the aspect of a term in the line of causation, any object in nature sums up an infinite series in itself. For, as an effect, it is the result of all previous causes, and, as a cause, the germ of all succeeding effects.

These summations of the serial infinite, whether achieved by the formulae of mathematics or presented as complete, in every portion of space, in every period of time, and in every object in nature, are anticipations of a higher form of infinity which is revealed by the mind of man.

**III.** *The Spiritual Infinite* (infinitum rationis, infinitum actu, ὄλον τέλειον) differs from the former, not so much in excluding as including the limit or boundary of which it is the negation, i.e. as not limited from without and perpetually passing beyond the limit, but as limiting itself. As the natural or mathematical infinite is represented by the line, so the rational or spiritual infinite finds its appropriate symbol in the circle, i.e. the line which is without beginning or end, and at the same time is limited at every point by itself. It is thus at once absolutely unlimited, and yet absolutely definite. The transition from II to III may be illustrated by the mathematical definition of a straight line as the chord of an infinite circle. Such is the infinite as exhibited in (a) the thought and (b) the volition of man.

(a) Consciousness, and thought as a mode of consciousness, involve the opposition of the subject which thinks and the object about which it thinks. As a condition of thinking at all, the mind must set its thought over against itself as not itself, and conversely, as the condition of an object being thought of at all, it must be presented as distinct from the mind which thinks of it. Here, then, is a limitation or barrier which constitutes what is called “the finiteness” of the human understanding. The thinker is limited and conditioned by his thought, the thought is limited and conditioned by the thinker. But, as it is possible to present any object to thought, it is competent for the thinker to present *himself* as the object about which he thinks, i.e. to be at once the subject which thinks and the object which is thought about. This capability of self-consciousness, of which, so far as can be ascertained, the lower ‘animals are destitute, constitutes at once the pride and the degradation of man, is a source at once of his best and his



worst actions. Here we have the analogue of the line returning, as the circumference of a circle, into itself. The limitation of the thinker by the object thought of is as real as before, only it is a limitation of himself by himself: he is conditioned, as before, but self-conditioned, i.e. infinite. *SEE PERSONALITY.*

**(b)** The same infinity appears in free will. As free, a man does an action which originates absolutely with himself. But this action has a permanent effect on his character, and thus determines the quality of the next action. This new action is also originated absolutely by the free agent, but the agent himself is modified, conditioned, limited, by the previous action. The agent has thus his freedom limited and defined, and increasingly so with every fresh action, but he is limited by that of which he is himself the absolute originator. He is finite (limited, conditioned) and at the same time infinite (unlimited, unconditioned), because he is self-conditioned. *SEE LIBERTY.*

It is in this sense, rather than in that of infinite magnitude, that infinity is an attribute of God. *SEE THEISM.*

**IV.** *Relation to the Finite.* — It follows from what has been said above

**(a)** that, although the essence of infinity is the transcendence of every limitation, yet that the finite and limited, even when excluded (I and II), is postulated as a condition of infinity, and that in the higher forms of infinity the limit is included, or, rather, imposed from within. Even in the sense of the indefinite residuum of thought, definite thinking is presupposed as the condition of our becoming-conscious of the vague element beyond. The serial infinite, again, as the mere process of transcending every given term, postulates the perpetual recurrence of terms to transcend: ἄπειρον, says Aristotle, μέν οὖν ἐστὶν οὐ κατὰ ποσὶν λαμβάνουσιν αἰεὶ τι λαβεῖν ἔστιν ἔξω (*Phys. Ausc.* 207, a. 7) — “The quantitative infinite is that which always has something outside it, i.e. a term ‘not yet reached.’” The spiritual infinite, lastly, as the self-determination of thought and volition, is, *ex vi termini*, a process of generating at every step the finite and limited.

**(b)** On the other hand, it would be a reversal of the true order to conceive the infinite to be, as its etymology suggests, the mere negation of the finite, and, as such, a secondary and derived idea. On such a supposition it becomes impossible to explain how we become conscious of limitation at



all. How, it may be asked, do we know that thought is finite if we know nothing first of the infinite? How is the consciousness of limitation possible except as the negation of what is unlimited? The infinite is thus, as the condition of the finite, prior and positive; the finite, as the limit excluded, included, self-imposed by the infinite, posterior and negative.

The relation of GOD, as the Infinite, to the world and the soul, as finite, is considered elsewhere. But, unless (a) be borne in mind, the logical result is deism, and if (b) be neglected, pantheism.

**V.** *Infinity as symbolized in the Imagination.* — We find the attempt to picture the infinite to the imagination among non-European nations in the form of a state of vacancy immediately preceding creation. The constituents of the image are generally air and water. The image of mere air or mere water would be no realizable image at all, because involving no distinction. But in the contrast of the two we get that minimum of definiteness which renders the image possible. A beautifully pure representation of the imagined infinite is found in the sacred books of the aborigines of Guatemala (Max Miller's *Chips*, 1, 333). It is as follows: "There was a time when all that exists in heaven and earth was made. All was then in suspense; all was calm and silent. All was immovable, all peaceful, and the vast space of the heavens was empty. There was no man, no animal, no shore, no trees; heaven alone existed. The face of the earth was not to be seen; there was only the still expanse of the sea and the heaven above. Divine beings were on the waters like a growing light. Their voice was heard as they meditated and consulted, and when the dawn arose man appeared." Here we have as the constituents of the image "empty heaven," or space, and—which is introduced as if not at all contradictory to the statement that "heaven alone existed" the "still expanse of the sea." [Compare this with the account in holy Scripture, where the constituents of the image are (1) "darkness upon the face of the abyss," and (2) the surface of the waters, with the Divine Spirit hovering between the two, and calling light into being.] In the Hindu account the creative spirit is represented as rowing about in a boat upon the ocean.

We have substantially the same image of the infinite lying at the back of the Greek mind. But there are two differences.

- (1) The double image is dismembered. The symbol of Thales is water alone; of Anaximander, the void in suspense; of Anaximenes, the atmosphere of Xenophanes, the globe of the sky.

(2) The infinite is not pictured as preceding the emergence of finite things, but as underlying the process of nature, as it is ordinarily known.

The Egyptian symbol of the serpent with his tail in his mouth approaches the mathematical representation of infinite length. — Blunt, *Theol. Dict.* 1, 346 sq. See *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, July, 1870.

### Infirmerer

is the name of the person who “had the care of the sick-house, in which Lent and fasts were not observed, had charge of the burial of the dead, provided physicians and attendance, and flesh-meat.” Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, p. 329.

### Infralapsarians

*SEE SUBLAPSARIANS.*

### Infula

(otherwise called *mitra*, *στέφανος*, *corona*, *κίδαρις*, *diadema*, and *τίαρα*, *tiara*) is a cap worn, since the 16th century, by the bishops of the Roman Catholic and Greek churches, as one of the insignia of their episcopal office. *SEE MITRE.*

### Ingathering, Feast of

*SEE FESTIVALS; SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.*

### Ingelheim

is the name of a place at which a church council (*Concilium Igelheimense*) was held June 27. 948, under the presidency of the Roman legate Marinus, and in the presence of the German emperor Otho I and king Louis Outremer. The principal business of the council was the punishment of Hugo, count of Paris, whom it excommunicated. It also decided that no layman should present a clerk to a church, or dispossess him, without the consent of the bishop; that the whole of Easter week be kept as a festival, and the three days following Whitsunday; that St. Mark's day be kept with fasting on account of the great litany, as was done on the rogation days preceding the feast of the Ascension: and that all differences

as to tithes be settled in an ecclesiastical synod, instead of granting this power to the civil courts. — Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 267.

## Ingen

is the name of a deified Japanese, who is said to have arrived about 1653 in Japan, whither his zeal for the religion of Siaka had led him. He was at first regarded by the Japanese only as a saint, but at a season of an excessive drought they came to him and besought his prayers (kitu) to avert the judgment of heaven; and the rain descending in mighty torrents shortly after the offering tip of Ingen's prayer, the people thought him no longer earthly, and deified him. Kaempfer, *Hist. Japan*, Append.; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* 1, 533.

## Ingham, Benjamin

was born at Ossett, Yorkshire, June 11, 1712. He received a liberal education, first at Batley school, and afterwards at Queen's College, Oxford, where, in 1733, he joined himself with Charles and John Wesley, the founders of Methodism. In 1735 he received episcopal ordination, and in the same year embarked with Mr. Wesley for Georgia. He remained in Georgia about two years, visited Carolina and Pennsylvania, and then returned to England, where, soon after his arrival, he accompanied Wesley to Herrnhut, the seat of the Moravians, and so strong became his sympathies with this excellent people that he could not sacrifice his attachment to them when the Methodists revolted from the disorders of the Fetter-lane society. He went into Yorkshire, and with incredible itinerant labors, assisted by Moravian companions, he founded there what may be called a Moravian form of Methodism. Preaching stations were established 'throughout the county and in neighboring shires. At Birstal he took Nelson publicly by the hand, and gave him liberty to speak in all his chapels. The Wesleys, Whitefield, Madan, and Romaine often preached for his societies, and they seem to have been generally recognized by the Methodistic leaders as a legitimate branch of the great revival, notwithstanding Wesley's people in Yorkshire experienced many vexations from the eccentricities of individual preachers, who retained some of the London Moravian follies. Within a few years, the number of "Inghamite" societies reached eighty-four. In 1741, Mr. Ingham married Lady Margaret Hastings, sister to the earl of Huntingdon, (on which he removed his residence from Ossett to Abberford, where he continued to reside till his

death. After forming this connection, he was so far from relaxing in his exertions to preach the Gospel that he greatly extended the sphere of his operations, and, in process of time, may be said to have evangelized all the surrounding country. Ingham was admitted to Wesley's Conference in Leeds, but the precise relation of his societies to the Wesleyan body was never defined. He had his own Conferences also, and at one of them was elected a *general overseer*, or bishop. Lady Huntingdon, who could not approve all the disciplinary features of his 'societies, attempted to promote a union of them with Wesley, and she sent Whitefield to Newcastle-upon-Tyne to meet the Wesleys for consultation on the subject. Charles assented, but John declined the overture, very wisely, as events demonstrated. In 1759, Ingham read "Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspasio," and "Glas's Testimony of the King of Martyrs." These works produced such an impression on his mind that he deputed two of his preachers to Scotland to learn more fully the views of their authors. At Edinburgh they met Sandeman, and Glas at Dundee. They returned converts to the Sandemanian principles, and immediately spread discontent and disputes among the societies. Ingham's authority could not control the partisan violence which soon broke out. He called in the assistance of his friends. The countess of Huntingdon wrote them letters. Whitefield used his influence to save them. Romaine hastened into Yorkshire, but could not restrain them. Ingham attempted to excommunicate the disturbers, but it was an endless task. The whole order was wrecked and sunk. Thirteen societies only remained from more than eighty which had flourished with all the evidences of permanent prosperity. Ingham seems to have remained a Sandemanian (q.v.), and developed his views in a *Treatise on the Faith and Hope of the Gospel* (1762). He died in 1772. Some of his societies came to the Wesleyan Church; others united with the Daleites (q.v.), a class of Scotch Independents. See Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 1, 390 sq.; Tyerman, *Oxford Methodists*, p. 57-154.

## Inghamites

SEE INGHAM.

## Inglis, Charles, D.D.

was born in Ireland about the year 1733. Emigrating to America, he took charge of the Free School at Lancaster, Pa., previous to 1759, and, having decided to enter the ministry, he went to England for ordination. The

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appointed him their missionary at Dover, Del., his field embracing the whole county of Kent, including three churches. In 1765 he became assistant minister of Trinity, N. Y., and catechist to the Negroes. He received the honorary degree of A.B. from King's College, N.Y., in 1767, and those of A.M. and D.D. from Oxford some years later. 'In the progress of the Revolution he took part with the Tories, and in 1775 replied to Paine's *Common Sense* by a pamphlet which was so offensive to the "Sons of Liberty" that they committed it to the flames. When preaching before Washington, in the same year, he refused to omit the prayer for the king and the royal family. After the Declaration of Independence he caused his church to be closed, and took refuge in Flushing, then in possession of the Royalists. He was chosen rector of Trinity, N. Y., in 1777. In consequence of many losses during the Revolution and political differences, he found it necessary finally to leave the country. In 1783 he sailed for Nova Scotia, of which province he was appointed- bishop in 1787, as the first colonial bishop of the Church of England. He resided at Halifax till his death, Feb., 1816. He published *Two Sermons*; and a *Letter* in "Hawkins's Historical Notices." — Sprague, *Annals*, 5, 186; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 932.

### Inglis, John, D.D.

a Scotch divine, was born about 1763. He was at one time minister at the Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh. He died in 1834. Inglis is known as the author of a *Defense of Ecclesiastical Establishments, and a Vindication of the Christian Faith* (Edinb. 1830, 8vo.). — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 932; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 25:109.

### Ingraham, Ira

a Congregational minister, was born at Cornwall, Vt., Dec. 1, 1791, and educated at Middlebury College, where he graduated in 1815. After teaching for a time in the Southern States, pursuing also his theological studies, he was licensed to preach by the Addison Association, Addison, Vt., June 3, 1819. May 1820, the Congregational church in Orvill was offered him, and he was there ordained June 20, 1820. He left this charge in 1822, and after supplying several pulpits, and acting for a brief period as agent of the "Presbyterian Education Society," he was installed over the Congregational church at West Bradford, Mass., Dec. 1, 1824. In 1830 he removed to Brandon, Vt., and in 1834 left that place to assume the duties

of secretary of the Vermont Domestic Missionary Society. In 1839 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Lyons, N. Y. In 1848 he returned to the church at Brandon, but declined to be reinstalled, and finally accepted the position as agent of the "Society for the promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West," making Western New York his field of labor. He retired from this and all other active work five years after, and only preached at intervals. He died April 9, 1864. Ingraham published five sermons (1826, 1843, 1844, 1847, and 1848). — *Congregational Quarterly*, 1864, p. 300.

### Ingram, Robert

an English divine, was born at Beverley, in Yorkshire, March 9, 1726-7. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, and took his degrees in arts. His first preferment was to the perpetual curacy of Bridhurst, in Kent, next the living of Orston, in Nottinghamshire, and afterwards the vicarages of Wormington and Boxted, in Essex. He died in 1804. Mr. Ingram wrote *A View of the Great Events of the Seventh Plague, or Period when the Mystery of God shall be finished: Accounts of the Ten Tribes of Israel being in America*; originally published by Manasseh ben-Israel: — *A Complete and Uniform Explanation of the Prophecy of the Seven Vials of Wrath*. See Hook, *Eccles. Biography*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 871. (J. N. P.)

### Ingulphus

the celebrated abbot of Croyland. long considered the author of the *Historia Monasterii Croylandensis*, is supposed to have been born at London about A.D. 1030. According to the account of his life in his history, he was educated at the University of Oxford. He was a great favorite of Edgitha, the wife of Edward the Confessor, and visited duke William of Normandy at his own court in 1051. About 1064 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On his return he entered the monastery of Fontanelle, in Normandy, and there remained till 1076, when he was invited to England by the Conqueror, and made abbot of Croyland. He died Dec. 17, 1109. The *Historia Monasterii Croylandensis* was printed by Savile (in the collection *Script.*) at London in 1596, and in a more complete edition by Gale (*Rer. Angl. Script. Vet.*), at Oxford, in 1684. An English translation of it was furnished by Riley in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. "Some writers, even, of the last century questioned the entire

genuineness of the book, though skepticism did not often proceed further than the hypothesis of interpolations by a later writer; but in 1826, the late Sir Francis Palgrave, in an article in the *Quarterly Review*, endeavored to prove that the whole so-called history was little better than a novel, and was probably the composition of a monk in the 13th or 14th century. His conclusions have been, on the whole, almost universally adopted.” See Chamber’s *Encyclopedia*, 5, 579; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 625 sq.

## Inheritance

(frequently **ql j eche’lek**, a “portion” or providential bestowment; but properly and usually some form of the verbs **vryj**; *yarash*, to possess; **l j n**; *nachal*, to possess; **κληρονομέω**, to get by lot). God, as the creator of the earth, gave it to man to be held, cultivated, and enjoyed (<sup><0028></sup>Genesis 1:28 sq.; <sup><0356></sup>Psalms 115:16; <sup><0169></sup>Ecclesiastes 5:9); not to any favored portion of our race, but to the race itself—to man as represented by our great primogenitor, to whom the use of the divine gift was first graciously vouchsafed. The impression which the original gift of the earth was calculated to make on men, the Great Donor was pleased, in the case of Palestine, to render, for his own wise purposes, more decided and emphatic by an express re-donation to the patriarch Abraham (<sup><0134></sup>Genesis 13:14 sq.). Many years, however, elapsed before the promise was fulfilled. Meanwhile the notices which we have regarding the state of property in the patriarchal ages are few and not very definite. The products of the earth, however, were at an early period accumulated and held as property. Violence invaded the possession: opposing violence recovered the goods. War soon sprang out of the passions of the human heart. The necessity of civil government was felt. Consuetudinary laws accordingly developed themselves. The head of the family was supreme. His will was law. The physical superiority which he possessed gave him this dominion. The same influence would secure its transmission in the male rather than the female line. Hence, too, the rise of the rights of primogeniture. In the early condition of society which is called patriarchal, landed property had its origin, indeed, but could not be held of first importance by those who led a wandering life, shifting continually, as convenience suggested, from one spot to another. Cattle were then the chief property (<sup><0235></sup>Genesis 24:35). But land, if held, was held on a freehold tenure; nor could any other tenure have come into existence till more complex and artificial relations arose,



resulting, in all probability, from the increase of population and the relative insufficiency of food. When Joseph went down into Egypt, he appears to have found the freehold tenure prevailing, which, however, he converted into a tenancy at will, or, at any rate, into a conditional tenancy. Other intimations are found in Genesis which confirm the general statements which have just been made. Daughters do not appear to have had any inheritance. If there are any exceptions to this rule, they only serve to prove it by the special manner in which they are mentioned. Thus Job is recorded (<sup><08215></sup>Job 42:15) to have given his daughters an inheritance conjointly with their brothers. How highly the privileges conferred by primogeniture were valued may be learned from the history of Jacob and Esau. In the patriarchal age doubtless these rights were very great. *SEE BIRTHRIGHT*. The eldest son, as being by nature the first fitted for command, assumed influence and control, under his father, over the family and its dependents; and when the father was removed by death, he readily, and as if by an act of Providence, took his father's place. Thus he succeeded to the property in succeeding to the headship of the family, the clan, or the tribe. At first the eldest son most probably took exclusive possession of his father's property and power; and when, subsequently, a division became customary, he would still retain the largest share—a double portion, if not more (<sup><02725></sup>Genesis 27:25, 29, 40). That in the days of Abraham other sons partook with the eldest, and that, too, though they were sons of concubines, is clear from the story of Hagar's expulsion: "Cast out (said Sarah) this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac" (<sup><02110></sup>Genesis 21:10). The few notices left us in Genesis of the transfer of property from hand to hand are interesting, and bear a remarkable similarity to what takes place in Eastern countries even at this day (<sup><02200></sup>Genesis 21:2-2 sq. 23:9 sq.). The purchase of the Cave of Machpelah as a family burying-place for Abraham, detailed in the last passage, serves to show the safety of property at that early period, and the facility with which an inheritance was transmitted even to sons' sons (comp. <sup><01429></sup>Genesis 49:29). That it was customary, during the father's lifetime, to make a disposition of property, is evident from <sup><01235></sup>Genesis 24:35, where it is said that Abraham had given all he had to Isaac. This statement is further confirmed by <sup><02505></sup>Genesis 25:5, 6, where it is added that Abraham gave to the sons of his concubines "gifts, sending them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country." Sometimes, however, so far were the children of unmarried females from being dismissed with a gift, that they shared, with



what we should term the legitimate children, in the father's property and rights. *SEE CONCUBINE*. Thus Dan and Naphtali were sons of Bilhah; Rachel's maid, whom she gave to her husband, failing to bear children herself. So Gad and Asher were, under similar circumstances sons of Zilpah, Leah's maid (<sup><030B></sup>Genesis 30:2-14). In the event of the eldest son's dying in the father's lifetime, the next son took his place; and if the eldest son left a widow, the next son made her his wife (<sup><030E></sup>Genesis 38:7 sq.), the offspring of which union was reckoned to the first-born and deceased son. Should the second likewise die, the third son took his place (<sup><030I></sup>Genesis 38:11). While the rights of the first-born were generally established and recognized, yet were they sometimes set aside in favor of a younger child. The blessing of the father or the grandsire seems to have been an act essential in the devolution of power and property-in its effects not unlike wills and testaments with us; and instances are not wanting in which this (so to term it) testamentary bequest set aside consuetudinary laws, and gave precedence to a younger son (<sup><0485></sup>Genesis 48:15 sq.). Special claims on the parental regards were acknowledged and rewarded by special gifts, as in the case of Jacob's donation to Joseph (<sup><0482></sup>Genesis 48:22). In a similar manner bad conduct on the part of the eldest son (as well as of others) subjected him, if not to the loss of his rights of property, yet to the evil influence of his father's dying malediction (<sup><049B></sup>Genesis 49:3); while the good and favored, though younger son, was led by the paternal blessing to anticipate, and probably also to reap, the richest inheritance of individual and social happiness (<sup><049B></sup>Genesis 49:8-22). *SEE HEIR; SEE ADOPTIOS*.

The original promise made to Abraham of the land of Palestine was solemnly repeated to Isaac (<sup><023B></sup>Genesis 26:3), the reason assigned being because "Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws," while it is expressly declared that the earlier inhabitants of the country were dispossessed and destined to extermination for the greatness of their iniquity. The possession of the Promised Land was embraced by Isaac in his dying benediction to Jacob (<sup><023B></sup>Genesis 28:3, 4) to whom God vouchsafed (<sup><0235></sup>Genesis 28:15; see also 35:10, 11) to give a renewed assurance of the destined inheritance. That this donation, however, was held to be dependent for the time and manner of its fulfillment on the divine will, appears from <sup><0238></sup>Genesis 33:18, where Jacob, on coming into the land of Canaan, bought for a hundred pieces of money "a parcel of a field, at the hand of the children of Hamor." Delayed though the execution of the promise was, confidence never deserted the

family of Abraham, so that Joseph, dying in the land of Egypt, assured his brothers that they would be visited by God and placed in possession of Canaan, enjoining on them, in this conviction, that, when conducted to their possession, they should carry his bones with them out of Egypt (<sup>(-0815)</sup>Genesis 50:25). A promise thus given, thus repeated, and thus believed, easily, and indeed unavoidably, became the fundamental principle of that settlement of property which Moses made when at length he had effected the divine will in the redemption of the children of Israel. The observances, and practices too, which we have noticed as prevailing among the patriarchs, would, no doubt, have great influence on the laws which the Jewish legislator originated or sanctioned. The land of Canaan was divided among the twelve tribes descended through Isaac and Jacob from Abraham. The division was made by lot for an inheritance among the families of the sons of Israel, according to the tribes, and to the number and size of families in each tribe. The tribe of Levi, however, had no inheritance; but forty-eight cities with their suburbs were assigned to the Levites, each tribe giving according to the number of cities that fell to its share (<sup>(-0831)</sup>Numbers 33:50; 34:1; 35:1). The inheritance thus acquired was never to leave the tribe to which it belonged; every tribe was to keep strictly to its own inheritance. An heiress, in consequence, was not allowed to marry out of her own tribe, lest property should pass by her marriage into another tribe (<sup>(-0816)</sup>Numbers 36:6-9); This restriction led to the marriage, of heiresses with their near relations: thus the daughters of Zelophehad “were married unto their father’s brother’s sons,” “and their inheritance remained in the tribe, of the family of their father” (ver. 11, 12; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 4, 7, 5). In general cases the inheritance went to sons, the first-born receiving a double portion, “for he is the beginning of his father’s strength.” If a man had two wives, one beloved, the other hated, and if the firstborn were the son of her who was hated, he nevertheless was to enjoy “the right of the first-born” (<sup>(-0815)</sup>Deuteronomy 21:15). If a man left no sons, the inheritance passed to his daughters; if there was- no daughter, it went to his brothers; in case there were no brothers, it was given to his father’s brothers; if his father had no brothers, it came into possession of the nearest kinsman (<sup>(-0878)</sup>Numbers 27:8). The land was Jehovah’s, and could not, therefore, be permanently alienated. *SEE HUSBANDRY*. Every fiftieth year, whatever land had been sold returned to its former owner. The value and price of land naturally rose or fell in proportion to the number of years there were to elapse prior to the ensuing fiftieth or jubilee year. If he who sold the land, or a kinsman, could redeem the land before the year of

jubilee, it was to be restored to him on his paying to the purchaser the value of the produce of the years remaining till the jubilee. Houses in villages or unwalled towns might not be sold forever; they were restored at the jubilee, and might at any time be redeemed. If a man sold a dwelling-house situated in a walled city, he had the option of redeeming it within the space of a full year after it had been sold: but if it remained unredeemed, it belonged to the purchaser, and did not return to him who sold it even at the jubilee (<sup><4825B></sup>Leviticus 25:8, 23). The Levites were not allowed to sell the land in the suburbs of their cities, though they might dispose of the cities themselves, which, however, were redeemable at any time, and must return at the jubilee to their original possessors (<sup><48276></sup>Leviticus 27:16). *SEE LAND.*

The regulations which the laws of Moses established rendered wills, or a testamentary disposition of (at least) landed property, almost, if not quite unnecessary; we accordingly find no provision for anything of the kind. Some difficulty may have been now and then occasioned when near relations failed; but this was met by the traditional law, which furnished minute directions on the point (Mishna, *Baba Bathra*, 4:3, c. 8. 9). Personal property would naturally follow the land, or might be bequeathed by word of mouth. At a later period of the Jewish polity the mention of wills is found, but the idea seems to have been taken from foreign nations. In princely families they appear to have been used, as we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 16,1; 17:3, 2; *War*, 2, 2, 3); but such a practice can hardly suffice to establish the general use of wills among the people. In the New Testament, however, wills are expressly mentioned (<sup><4815></sup>Galatians 3:15; <sup><8917></sup>Hebrews 9:17). Michaelis (*Commentaries*, 1, 431) asserts that the phrase (<sup><4072></sup>2 Samuel 17:23; <sup><4210></sup>2 Kings 20:1) “set thine house in order” has reference to a will or testament, but his grounds are by no means sufficient, the literal rendering of the words being, “give commands to thy house.” The utmost which such an expression could inferentially be held to comprise in regard to property is a dying and final distribution of personal property; and we know that it was not unusual for fathers to make, while yet alive, a division of their goods among their children (<sup><4852></sup>Luke 15:12; Rosenmüller, *Morgan*. 5, 197). *SEE HERITAGE.*

### Inhibition

(Lat. *inhibitio*, from *inhibeo*, restrain) is in some churches “a writ by which an inferior is commanded by a superior ecclesiastical authority to stay the proceedings in which it is engaged. Thus, if a member of a college appeals

to the visitor, the visitor inhibits all proceedings against the appellant until the appeal is determined. When the archbishop visits, he inhibits the bishop of the diocese; when the bishop visits, he inhibits the archdeacon; which inhibitions continue in force until the last parish is visited. If a lapse happens while the inhibition is in force against the bishop, the archbishop must institute; institution by the bishop would be void, as his power is suspended.”

## Iniquity

(prop. ἠϞ; ἀδικία; but represented in the A. Vers. by several other words) means in Scripture not only sin, but, by metonymy, also the *punishment* of sin, and the expiation of it: “Aaron will bear the iniquities of the people;” he will atone for them (<sup><1238></sup>Exodus 28:38). The Lord “visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children” (<sup><1215></sup>Exodus 20:5); he sometimes causes visible effects of his wrath to fall on the children of criminal parents. “To bear iniquity” is to endure the punishment of it, to be obliged to expiate it. The priests bear the iniquity of the people; that is, they are charged with the expiation of it (<sup><1238></sup>Exodus 28:38; <sup><13017></sup>Leviticus 10:17). *SEE SIN.*

## Initiation

a common term in the early Church for baptism, having reference to the full instruction in the mysteries of Christianity which was given to the baptized, but withheld from the unbaptized. The baptized were thus called *initiati*, οἱ μεμνημένοι, μυσται, or μυσταγώγητοι; and it is very common to find the fathers using the expression “the initiated will understand” in their preaching to mixed congregations, especially when they were speaking of anything which belonged to the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. This expression is said by Casaubon to occur fifty times in the sermons of St. Chrysostom alone. — Blunt, *Theolog. Dict.* 1, 348. Several other names were given to these persons, such as πιστοί, *fideles*, φωτιζόμενοι, etc. The word has sometimes been employed with reference to the supposed duty of *reserve* in communicating divine knowledge, as though the holy Scriptures justified the withholding instruction in Christianity from persons in an early stage of their Christian course. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 1, ch. 4:§ 2. *SEE DISCIPLINA ARCANI.*

## Injury

a violation of the rights of another. “Some,” says Grove, “distinguish between *injustitia* and *injuria*. Injustice is opposed to justice in general, whether negative or positive; an injury, to negative justice *alone*. **SEE JUSTICE**. An injury is willfully doing to another what ought not to be done. This is injustice too, but not the whole idea of it; for it is injustice also to refuse or neglect doing what ought to be done. An injury must be willfully committed; whereas it is enough to make a thing unjust that it happens through a culpable negligence.

**1.** *We may injure a person in his soul* by misleading his judgment, by corrupting the imagination, perverting the will, and wounding the soul with grief. Persecutors who succeed in their compulsive measures, though they cannot alter the real sentiments by external violence, yet sometimes injure the soul by making the man a hypocrite.

**2.** *We may injure another in his body* by homicide, murder, preventing life, dismembering the body by wounds, blows, slavery, and imprisonment, or any unjust restraint upon its liberty; by robbing it of its chastity, or prejudicing its health.

**3.** *We may injure another in his name and character* by our own false and rash judgments of him; by false witness; by charging a man to his face with a crime which either we ourselves have forged, or which we know to have been forged by some other person; by detraction or backbiting; by reproach, or exposing another for some natural imbecility either in body or mind; or for some calamity into which he is fallen, or some miscarriage of which he has been guilty; by innuendoes, or indirect accusations that are not true. Now if we consider the *value* of character, the *resentment* which the injurious person has of such treatment when it comes to his own turn to suffer it, the *consequence* of a man’s losing his good name and, finally, the *difficulty* of making reparation, we must at once see the injustice of lessening another’s good character. There are these two considerations which should sometimes restrain us from speaking the whole truth of our neighbor, when it is to his disadvantage.

**(1.)** That he may possibly live to see his folly, and repent and grow better.

(2.) Admitting that we speak the truth, yet it is a thousand to one but when it is bandied about for some time it will contract a deal of falsehood.

4. *We may injure a person in his relations and dependencies.* In his servants, by corrupting them; in his children, by drawing them into evil courses; in his wife, by sowing strife, attempting to alienate her affections.

5. *We may be guilty of injuring another in his worldly goods or possessions:*

(1.) By doing him a mischief without any advantage to ourselves, through envy and malice.

(2.) By taking what is another's, which is theft." See Grove, *Mor. Philippians ch. 8*, p. 2; Watts, *Sermons*, vol. 2, ser. 33; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 42.

## Ink

(/yD] deyo', so called from its *blackness*, <sup><2668></sup>Jeremiah 36:18; Gr. μέλαν, *black*, <sup><4088></sup>2 Corinthians 3:3; <sup><6012></sup>2 John 1:12; <sup><6013></sup>3 John 1:13). The most simple, and hence probably the most ancient mode of preparing ink was a mixture of water with charcoal powdered, or with soot, to which gum was added. The Hebrews made use of different colors for writing, as did also the ancient Egyptians, and some of the books of the former are stated by Josephus to have been written in gold. The mode of writing mentioned in Numbers 5, 23, where it is said that "the priest shall write the curses in a book and blot them out with the bitter water," was with a kind of ink prepared for the purpose, without any calx of iron or other material that could make a permanent dye; these maledictions were then washed off the parchment into the water, which the woman was obliged to drink: so that she drank the very words of the execration. The ink still used in the East is almost all of this kind; a wet sponge will completely obliterate the finest of their writings. The ancients used several kinds of tinctures as ink; among them that extracted from the cuttle-fish, called in Hebrew תִּלְכָּתִי *tekeleth*. Their ink was not so fluid as ours. Demosthenes reproaches AEschines with laboring in the grinding of ink, as painters do in the grinding of their colors. The substance found in an inkstand at Herculaneum looks like a thick oil or paint, with which the manuscripts had been written in a sort of relieve, visible in the letters when a leaf is held to the light in a horizontal

direction. Such vitriolic ink as has been used on the old parchment manuscripts would have corroded the delicate leaves of the papyrus, as it has done the skins of the most ancient manuscripts of Virgil and Terence in the library of the Vatican; the letters are sunk into the parchment, and some have eaten quite through it, in consequence of the corrosive acid of the vitriolic ink with which they were written. *SEE WRITING.*

## Ink-horn

### Picture for Ink-horn 1

### Picture for Ink-horn 2

(**tsq**, *ke'seth*, a round vessel, an inkstand. worn in the girdle (<sup><300></sup>Ezekiel 9:2, 3,11). This implement is one of considerable antiquity; it is common throughout the Levant, and is often seen in the houses of the Greeks. To one end of a long brass tube for holding pens is attached the little case containing the moistened sepia used for ink, which is closed with a lid and snap, and the whole stuck with much importance in the girdle. This is, without doubt, substantially the instrument borne by the individual whom Ezekiel mentions as “one man clothed in linen, with a writer’s inkhorn by his side.” We find the Egyptian scribes had likewise a cylindrical box for ink, which was probably carried in a similar manner. Besides these, the modern Egyptians have a regular inkstand for more extensive writing. The ancient Egyptians had writing-tablets, which are square pallets of wood; with longitudinal grooves to hold the kash or small reeds used for writing; the well, for color, in some is in the usual form of an oval or signet; towards the upper end of the pallet on others is inscribed the name of the owner. In bronze, there are cylindrical boxes for ink, with a chain for the pen-case, the whole similar to the hieroglyphical symbol for scribe or writing. The monuments likewise represent scribes with inkstands in their left hands, containing two bottles for different colored inks (Wilkinson, 2, 176). *SEE WRITING.*

## Inn

### Picture for Inn

(**/l m**; *mnaldn*, <sup><1427></sup>Genesis 42:27; 43:21; <sup><1024></sup>Exodus 4:24, a lodging-place, as elsewhere rendered; **κατάλυμα**, <sup><1007></sup>Luke 2:7, a place for loosing the beasts of their burden, rendered “guest-chamber,” <sup><1144></sup>Mark 14:14;



<sup><0231></sup>Luke 23:11; πανδοχείον, <sup><0234></sup>Luke 10:34, a place for *receiving all* comers). Inns, in our sense of the term, were, as they still are, unknown in the East where hospitality is religiously practiced. The khans, or caravanserais, are the representatives of European inns, and these were established but gradually. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to them in the Old Testament. The halting-place of a caravan was selected originally on account of its proximity to water or pasture, by which the travelers pitched their tents and passed the night. Such was undoubtedly the “inn” at which occurred the incident in the life of Moses narrated in <sup><0024></sup>Exodus 4:24. It was probably one of the halting-places of the Ishmaelitic merchants who traded to Egypt with their camel loads of spices. Moses was on his journey from the land of Midian, and the merchants in Genesis 37 are called indiscriminately Ishmaelites and Midianites. At one of these stations, too, the first which they reached after leaving the city, and no doubt within a short distance from it, Joseph’s brethren discovered that their money had been replaced in their wallets (<sup><0427></sup>Genesis 42:27).

Increased commercial intercourse, and, in later times, religious enthusiasm for pilgrimages, gave rise to the establishment of more permanent accommodation for travelers. On the more frequented routes, remote from towns (<sup><3802></sup>Jeremiah 9:2), caravanserais were in course of time erected, often at the expense of the wealthy. The following description of one of those on the road from Baghdad to Babylon will suffice for all: ‘It is a large and substantial square building, in the distance resembling a fortress, being surrounded with a lofty wall, and flanked by round towers to defend the inmates in case of attack. Passing through a strong gateway, the guest enters a large court, the sides of which are divided into numerous arched compartments, open in front, for the accommodation of separate parties and for the reception of goods. In the center is a spacious raised platform, used for sleeping upon at night, or for the devotions of the faithful during the day. Between the outer wall and the compartments are wide vaulted arcades, extending round the entire building, where the beasts of burden are placed. Upon the roof of the arcades is an excellent terrace, and over the gateway an elevated tower containing two rooms, one of which is open at the sides, permitting the occupants to enjoy every breath of air that passes across the heated plain. The terrace is tolerably clean, but the court and stabling below are ankle-deep in chopped straw and filth’ (Loftus, *Chaldea*, p. 13). The great khans established by the Persian kings and great



men, at intervals of about six miles on the roads from Baghdad to the sacred places, are provided with stables for the horses of the pilgrims. "Within these stables, on both sides, are other cells for travelers" (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 478, note). The "stall" or "manger," mentioned in <sup><1000></sup>Luke 2:7, was probably in a stable of this kind. Such khans are sometimes situated near running streams, or have a supply of water of some kind, but the traveler must carry all his provisions with him (Ouseley, *Trav. in Persia*, 1, 261, note). "At Damascus the khans are, many of them, substantial buildings; the small rooms which surround the court, as well as those above them which are entered from a gallery, are used by the merchants of the city for depositing their goods (Porter's *Damascus*, 1, 33). The *weklehs* of modern Egypt are of a similar description (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 2, 10). In some parts of modern Syria a nearer approach has been made to the European system. The people of es-Salt, according to Burckhardt, support four taverns (*Menzel* or *Medhale*) at the public expense. At these the traveler is furnished with everything he may require, so long as he chooses to remain, provided his stay is not unreasonably protracted. The expenses are paid by a tax on the heads of families, and a kind of landlord superintends the establishment (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 36). Usually, however, in Syrian towns, where there is no regular khan, the *menzel* or public house is part of the sheik's establishment, with a keeper who makes a moderate charge for catering to his guests in addition to the cost of provisions. **SEE CARAVANSERAI.**

"The house of paths" (<sup><1000></sup>Proverbs 8:2, ἐν οἴκῳ διόδων, *Ven. Vers.*), where Wisdom took her stand, is understood by some to refer appropriately to a khan built where many ways met and frequented by many travelers. A similar meaning has been attached to <sup><1000></sup>μημκæwrge *geruith Kimham*, "the hostel of Chimham" (<sup><2417></sup>Jeremiah 41:17) beside Bethlehem, built by the liberality of the son of Barzillai for the benefit of those who were going down to Egypt (Stanley, *Sin. and Palest.* p. 163; App. § 90). The Targum says, "which' David gave to Chimham, son of Barzillai the Gileadite" (comp. <sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 19:37,38). With regard to this passage, the ancient versions are strangely at variance. The Sept. had evidently another reading with **b** and **g** transposed, which they left translated <sup><1000></sup>γαβηραχαμάα, Alexand. <sup><1000></sup>γηβηρωθαμάαμ. The Vulgate, if intended to be literal, must have read <sup><1000></sup>mkæjmyrge *peregrinantes in Chanaam*. The Arabic, following the Alexandrian MS., read it ἐν γῆ <sup><1000></sup>Βηρωθαμάαμ, "in the land of Berothchamaam." The Syriac has *bedre*,

“in the threshing-floors,” as if **t/nrḡB]** *begornoth*. Josephus had a reading different from all, **t/rnḡgB]** *begidroth*, “in the folds of” Chimham; for he says the fugitives went “to a certain place called Mandra” (**Μάνδρα λεγόμενον**, *Ant.* 10, 9, 5), and in this he was followed by Aquila and the Hexaplar Syriac.

The **πανδοκεῖον** (**ⲡⲓⲛⲉⲕⲉⲓⲟⲛ** Luke 10:34) probably differed from the **κατάλυμα** (**ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲗⲩⲙⲁ** Luke 2:7) in having a “host” or “innkeeper” (**πανδοκεύς**, **ⲡⲓⲛⲉⲕⲉⲓⲟⲩ** Luke 10:35). who supplied some few of the necessary provisions, and attended to the wants of travelers left to his charge. The word has been adopted in the later Hebrew, and appears in the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, 16:7) under the form **qdnwp**, *pundak*, and the host is **yqdnwp**, *punddki*. The Jews were forbidden to put up their beasts at establishments of this kind kept by idolaters (*Aboda Zara*, 2, 1). It appears that houses of entertainment were sometimes, as in Egypt (Herod. 2, 35), kept by women, whose character was such that their evidence was regarded with suspicion. In the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, 16, 7) a tale is told of a company of Levites who were travelling to Zoar, the city of Palms, when one of them fell ill on the road and was left by his comrades at an inn, under the charge of the hostess (**tyqdnwp**, *pundekith* = **πανδοκευτρία**). On their return to inquire for their friend, the hostess told them he was dead and buried, but they refused to believe her till she produced his staff, wallet, and roll of the law. In **ⲓⲟⲩⲁ** Joshua 2:1, **hnwz**, *zonah*, the term applied to Rahab, is rendered in the Targum of Jonathan **atyqdnyp**, *ipundekitha*, “a woman who keeps an inn.” So in **ⲓⲟⲩⲁ** Judges 11:1, of the mother of Jephthah; of Delilah (**ⲓⲟⲩⲁ** Judges 16:1) and the two men who appealed to Solomon (**ⲓⲟⲩⲁ** 1 Kings 3:16). The words, in the opinion of Kimchi on **ⲓⲟⲩⲁ** Joshua 2:1, appear to have been synonymous. **SEE KHAN**.

Inner (i.e. DOMESTIC, or “Home”) Missions is the name given, in the Protestant churches of Germany, to any association of evangelical Christians for the purpose of relieving the spiritual and temporal wants of the community by disseminating the Gospel truth, and affording help in temporal concerns.

**I. Origin and Organization.** — Christianity commands that faith should manifest itself in deeds of love; hence, as early as the apostolical times, we see deacons and deaconesses appointed to attend to the poor and the sick, distribute alms, etc. This was continued in later days by Origen, St.

Anthony, etc. When, in the 4<sup>th</sup> century; Christianity became the religion of the state, the clergy assumed this office, which, from the abundance of means in the Church, had become a very important one. In subsequent times we find Francis of Assisi, Elizabeth of Thuringia, Francis of Sales, and a number of religious orders, hospitallers, sisters of charity, etc., devoting themselves to the care of the poor, the aged, and the sick. Hospitals, houses of refuge, orphan asylums, etc., were established for these purposes. The Protestant Church, in consequence of its subjection to the state, could exert itself but little in that direction, being oftentimes even prevented by law from the care of the poor. Still efforts were made by private individuals, such as August Hermann Francke, whose orphan asylum at Halle became a model which was imitated in other places; Biblical, missionary, and tract societies were established in Germany, and a number of houses of refuge and infant schools established. In modern times a fresh impulse was given to this evangelical movement by England. The attempts of Howard, Wilberforce, and Buxtoni were continued on an enlarged scale by lord Ashley, the duke of Argyle, Elizabeth Fry, etc. City missions, Magdalen and night asylums, Sabbath and ragged schools, were established. Chalmers, first in the Presbyterian and then in the Free Church of Scotland, restored the diacony and care of the poor on an ecclesiastical basis. Similar efforts were made in France, among the Romanists, by the Sisters of St. Mary and St. Joseph, and St.Regis.

**II. Sphere.** — *The German inner missions endeavor to promote infant, secular, and Sunday school associations, institutions of refuge, intercourse with the families, etc. They at the same time take part in the social questions of the day, and labor to systematize the aid given to the poor, to promote personal intercourse between the giver and the receiver, the purification of morals; and for these purposes they have established female benevolent associations, diaconies, nurseries, labor societies, etc. The influx of communistic ideas they seek to counterbalance by establishing schools for apprentices and adults, societies for the education of servants, both male and female, and for the propagation of good books. They oppose unchristian and unecclesiastical tendencies by promoting the study of the Scriptures, establishing family worship, awakening religious feelings in the families, organizing book and tract societies, sending out colporteurs and street preachers, and opposing prostitution, drunkenness, and all other immorality. They discountenance revolution as subversive of political organization, and as the enemy of religion and of morality: in this*

department they act through political speeches and the press, in raising the standard of popular literature, and especially by their influence over the rising generation. They also attend to the prisons, trying to promote Christian love in the hearts of the officers entrusted with their charge, and forming persons for that office in their institutions. Aside from the protective associations for culprits who have finished their time of imprisonment, they endeavor also to establish asylums for them.

**III. Extent.** — In Germany the inner missions embrace some eleven to twelve million Protestants, not regularly connected with any Church, the floating population, the workmen's associations, which are often a prey to atheism and communism, travelers and strangers, etc. In this manner they become a friendly ally of the government, of which all they require is the protection of their associations and freedom of worship. With regard to the Church, they labor for the evangelizing of the masses according to a truly Christian spirit, but without entering into any of the disputes of the different confessions, and without seeking to gain proselytes. Their agents are women as well as men; for instance, Elizabeth Fry, Sarah Martin, Amelia Sieveking, etc. The absolute necessity of such an association was shown by statistical statements of the wants of the population, which were especially collected by Wichern. From this starting-point the institution in question developed its labors. Aside from the organization of societies, which were soon propagated throughout the country, it directed its attention to the establishing of houses of refuge, to which that established by Wichern at Horn, near Hamburg, served as model, and of which, in 1858, there were some 140 in existence in Germany. For the care of the poor it was difficult to do much, as the inner missions could not well associate themselves with the municipal organizations for that purpose, yet in some places, as at Erlangen and at Ansbach, the voluntary system of relief has produced good results. The inner missions also labor to promote the observance of the Sabbath, and to distribute Bibles. Their most important results, so far, in Germany, are the establishing of Bible depots, of associations to meet the wants of the ignorant, the improvement of the prison systems, which has been adopted in a number of countries, etc.

The interest of Germany in the cause of inner missions has of late greatly increased. The *Congress for Inner Missions*, which in 1848 was organized in connection with the *Church Diet (Kirchentag)*, has ever since held annual or biennial general meetings in connection with the sittings of the Church Dict. At these meetings reports are made on the condition of

religious life in Germany, and the proper remedies for the existing evils are discussed. The establishment of houses of refuge and of Christian lodging-houses, the care of the poor and of discharged prisoners, the solution of the social question, the extension of Young Men's Christian Associations, and of Bible and other religious societies, are the chief subjects which engage the attention of every congress. In addition to the General Congress for Inner Missions, a number of provincial associations for the same purpose have been organized. Thus a *South-western Conference for Inner Missions* was established in 1865; a central association for the inner mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the kingdom of Saxony in 1868. The *Central Committee for Inner Missions*, which is elected at every meeting of the Congress for Inner Missions, and is composed of some of the most prominent clergymen and laymen of Germany, endeavors to carry out the resolutions of the congresses, and to invoke the proper legislation of the state government for the suppression of vice and immorality, especially of prostitution. Germany has a number of papers advocating the cause of inner missions, the most important of which, the *Flieggende Blätter für innere Mission*, is published by Wichern (established in 1850). See also Merz, *Armuth u. Christenthum* (1841); Wichern *Denkschrift* (1849); Braune, *Fünf Vorlesungen* (1850); Buss (Roman Catholic), *Die Volksmissionen* (1851); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 8:919. For a fuller account of the subject, especially with regard to America, Eng. land, and other countries, *SEE MISSIONS, HOME*.

## Innocent

(prop.  $\gamma\alpha\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega\varsigma$ ). The Hebrews considered innocence as consisting chiefly in an exemption from external faults committed contrary to the law hence they often join innocent with hands (<sup><01372></sup>Genesis 37:22; <sup><12041></sup>Psalms 24:4). "I will wash my hands in innocency" (<sup><12016></sup>Psalms 26:6); "Then have I cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency" (<sup><1207313></sup>Psalms 73:13). Josephus admits of no other sins than those actions which are put in execution (*Ant.* 12:7, 1). Sins in thought, in his account, are not punished by God. This is a very different standard of morality from that of the Gospel (<sup><120133></sup>Matthew 5:28; <sup><120135></sup>John 3:15), or even of the O.T. (<sup><120516></sup>Psalms 51:6). To be innocent is used sometimes for being exempt from punishment. "I will not treat you, as one innocent" (<sup><1204638></sup>Jeremiah 46:28); literally, 'I will not make thee innocent; I will chastise thee, but like a kind father. Jeremiah (49:12), speaking to the Edomites, says, "They who have

not (so much) deserved to drink of the cup of my wrath, have tasted of it.” <sup>(340B)</sup>Nahum 1:3 declares that “God is ready to exercise vengeance; he will make no one innocent; he will spare no one;” (<sup>(1347)</sup>Exodus 34:7, Heb.), “Thou shalt make no one innocent;” no sin shall remain unpunished. “With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure” (<sup>(1985)</sup>Psalms 18:26); thou treatest the just as just, the good as good; thou never dost confound the guilty with the innocent.

## Innocent I, St.

a native of Albano, near Rome, became pope April 27, 402, as successor of Anastasius I, St. Chrysostom had just been driven from Constantinople and exiled to Bithynia in consequence of his zeal against the Arians, and of his attacks against the empress Eudoxia. Innocent I at once actively took his part, and sought to have the affair referred to a council of the joint bishops of the Eastern and Western churches. Failing in this, he next attempted an arrangement with the emperor, but his envoys were ill-treated, and accomplished nothing. ‘St. Chrysostom died in the meantime, but Innocent resolved to cease all intercourse with Constantinople until justice was done to his memory. The Western Church was itself in a state of great disturbance; in Africa the Donatists (q.v.) were giving much trouble, and Innocent ‘finally caused them to be condemned by the Council of Carthage (405); in Rome Vigilantius opposed the abuses introduced into the Church, such as the celibacy of the priests, the worship of images, and monastic life. At the same time Alaric was marching with the Goths against Rome: the Christians fled to their churches, and Innocent permitted the heathen to offer up sacrifices to their gods; but prayers and sacrifices proved in vain, and the pope was obliged to pay to Alaric the ransom of the city, which was nevertheless taken by the barbarians Aug. 24, 410, and sacked. It was retaken, but plundered the following year by Astolf, Alaric’s brother-in-law. After the Gothshad left the neighborhood of Rome, Innocent I, who had sought refuge with the emperor at Ravenna, returned to the city, and by his efforts to restore its prosperity gained a great many heathens to the Church. He commanded that Sundays should be considered fast days as well as Fridays, enjoined celibacy on the priests, and took repressive measures against the Macedonians. His course against the Pelagians seems to have been variable. Schaff says that he commended the Africans, who had condemned Pelagianism in two synods (Carthage and Mileve, now Melas), for having addressed themselves to the Church of St. Peter to obtain an approval for their acts, but that he refrained from giving

judgment. He died March 12. 417, was canonized, and ranks among the highest saints of the Roman Catholic Church. He is commemorated on July 28. His decretals are to be found in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, and the most complete collection of his letters in Schonemann's *Pontificum Romanorum epistole genuince*. Labbe, *Concil.* 2, 1245-1308, gives thirty of his letters. Gennadio, in *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, ch. 3, ascribes to him the *Decretum occidentalium et orientalium ecclesiis adversus Pelagianos datum*, published during the reign of his successor, Zozimus I. See Bruys, *Hist. des Papes* (1735, 5 vols. 4to), 1, 160; Labbe and Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia* (1671, 15 vols. fol.), 2, 1241-1553; Baronius, *Annales*, 6, 401-632; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, 5, ch. 21; Vossius, *Histor. Pelag.*; H. de Noris (Norisius), *Histoire du Pelagianisme*; Alletz, *Hist. des Papes*, 1, 95; Anastasius, *Vitae Roman. Pontificum*, 1, 275; Ciaconius, *Vite et res geste Pontificum Romanorum*, 1, 63; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 662; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. 2; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 886; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 2, 170, 299, 585:587; Schaff, *Church History*, 3:797 sq.

## Innocent II, Pope

(*Gregorio Papareschi*), was born at Rome as one of the family of the Guidoni. He became successively abbot of the Benedictine convent of St. Nicholas at Rome, cardinal-deacon in 1118, and was finally elected pope by one party of the cardinals in 1130, as successor of Honorius II.:The other party elected Peter Leonis, under the name of Anacletus II. Innocent fled to France, where Bernard de Clairvaux caused him to be acknowledged as pope by Louis VI and by the Council of Etampes; he was soon after recognized also-by Henry II of England, by Lotharius, king of Germany, and even by the Synod of Pisa in 1134. In 1136 he returned to Rome with the emperor, and, after the death of Anacletus in 1138, was universally acknowledged as pope. He drove Arnold of Brescia out of Italy, and put king Roger under the ban, but, having taken the field against the latter, he was made prisoner at Galleccio in 1139. He was afterwards released by abandoning Sicily, Apulia, and Capua to Roger. He had also some severe conflicts with the king of France, and the Romans, having revolted against his government, re-established the senate, and declared themselves independent. In the midst of these troubles Innocent died, Sept. 23, 1143. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. et.* 4, 33; Lannes, *Pontificat du Pape Innocent II* (Paris, 1741, 8vo);



Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 12, pt. 2, ch. 2; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 4, 75, 144, 255.

### Innocent III

(a) (*Lothario Conti*), by far the greatest pope of this name, was born of a noble family of Rome at Anagni in 1161. After a course of much distinction at Paris, Bologna, and Rome, he was made cardinal; and eventually, in 1198, was elected, at the unprecedented early age of thirty-seven, a successor of pope Celestine III. While at the high schools of Rome, Paris, and Bologna, he had greatly distinguished himself in the studies of philosophy, theology, and the canon law, and also by several written compositions, especially by his treatise *De Miseria Conditionis Humance*. “The gloomy ascetic views which he took in this work of the world and of human nature show a mind filled with contempt for all worldly motives of action, and not likely to be restrained in forwarding what he considered to be his paramount duty by any of the common feelings of leniency, conciliation, or concession, which to a man in his situation must have appeared sinful weaknesses. His ambition and haughtiness were apparently not personal. His interest seems to have been totally merged in what he considered the sacred right of his see, ‘universal supremacy,’ and the sincerity of his conviction is shown by the steady, uncompromising tenor of his conduct, and by a like uniformity of sentiments and tone throughout his writings, and especially his numerous letters.” The external circumstances of his time also furthered Innocent’s views, and enabled him to make his pontificate the most marked in the annals of Rome; the culminating point of the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see. “The emperor Henry VI, king of Italy, and also of Sicily, had lately died, and rival candidates were disputing for the crown of Germany, while Constance of Sicily, Henry’s widow, was left regent of Sicily and Apulia in the name of her infant son Frederick II Innocent, asserting his claim of suzerainty over the kingdom of Sicily, confirmed the regency to Constance, but at the same time obtained from her a surrender of all disputed points concerning the pontifical pretensions over those fine territories. Constance dying shortly after, Innocent himself assumed the regency during, Frederick’s minority. At Rome, availing himself of the vacancy of the imperial throne, he bestowed the investiture on the prefect of Rome, whom he made to swear allegiance to himself, thus putting an end to the former, though often eluded claim of the imperial authority over that city. In like manner, being favored by the people, ever jealous of the dominion of foreigners, he drove



away the imperial feudatories, Such as Conrad, duke of Spoleti and count of Assisi, and Marcualdus, marquis of Ancona, and took possession of those provinces in the name of the Roman see." He likewise claimed the exarchate of Ravenna; but the archbishop of that city asserted his own prior rights, and Innocent, says the anonymous biographer, 'prudently deferred the enforcement of his claims to a more fitting opportunity.' The towns of Tuscany, with the exception of Pisa, threw off their allegiance to the empire, and formed a league with Innocent for their mutual support. It was on this occasion that Innocent wrote that famous letter in which he asserts that, 'as God created two luminaries, one superior for the day, and the other inferior for the night, which last owes its splendor entirely to the first, so he has disposed that the regal dignity should be but a reflection of the splendor of the papal authority, and entirely subordinate to it.'" It was in the affairs of Germany, however, that Innocent's position most clearly manifested the greatness of the papal power over the destinies of the world. Setting himself up as supreme arbitrator between the two claimants who were contending for the imperial crown, he decided (in 1201) in favor of Otho because he descended from "a race (welf) devoted to the Church," with the condition that the disputed-concession of the countess Mathilda be wholly resigned to the decisions of the holy see; and, as a natural consequence, he proceeded at the same time to excommunicate Otho's rival, Philip. In spite of a determined resistance of Philip and his friends, which for a time seemed almost to prove successful, but which finally ended in the assassination of Philip, Innocent's triumph in Germany was complete, and his vassal emperor Otho was made temporal lord of the West. But a further triumph crowned the efforts of Innocent in Germany only a short time after. Otho, incurring the displeasure of the pope by his estrangement from the papal see, was excommunicated and deposed in 1210, and Innocent's own ward, Frederick of Sicily, was brought forward as a candidate for the vacated throne, and finally crowned emperor at Aix-la-Chapelle, with the approval of the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215). "For the second time Innocent was triumphant in Germany. Twice he had decided an imperial election. Against one of the emperors whom he supported he had made his sentence of excommunication and deposition valid; the other he had put forward, intending him to be a mere puppet and instrument in his own hands" (Reichel). But, if Innocent proved himself a great statesman, it must be conceded also that he was very much unlike many of his predecessors, very strict and uncompromising in his notions of discipline and morality. Irregularity and venality were repressed

everywhere as soon as discovered. Thus he excommunicated Philip Augustus of France because he had repudiated his wife Ingerburga of Denmark, and had married Agnes de Meranie. "The interdict was laid on France: the dead lay unburied the living were deprived of the services of religion. Against an antagonist armed with such weapons, even Philip Augustus, brave and firm though he 'was, was not a match. The idea of the papal power had too firmly taken hold of men's minds; the French would gladly have remained true to their king; they dared not disobey the vicar of Christ. Besides, as in the case of Nicholas I's intervention with Lothair, Innocent's power was exercised on behalf of morality. Philip was obliged to take back his divorced wife, not yielding, as one of his predecessors, Robert I of France (996-1031), had done, to a feeble superstition; not subdued, like 'Henry IV, by internal dissensions, but vanquished in open fight with an opponent stronger than himself.'" As we have already said, the external circumstances of that day seem to have favored Innocent, and enabled him "to assert without concealment the idea of papal theocracy;" that the pope was "the vicegerent of God upon earth;" that to him "was entrusted by St. Peter the government not only of the whole Church, but of the whole world." "*Next* to God, he was to be so honored by princes that their claim to rule was lost if they failed to serve him; princes might have power on earth, but priests had power in heaven; the claim of princes to rule rested 'on human might, that of priests on divine ordinance.' In short, all the prerogatives which had once attached to the emperors were wrested from them, and transferred, with additions, to the popes" (Reichel). The same fate that had befallen Philip Augustus threatened king Leon of Spain for a marriage of his own cousin, the daughter of the king of Portugal. Not willing to submit to the pope's decision against such a marriage, and supported in his resolution by his father-in-law, excommunication was first resorted to, followed by an interdict on both kingdoms. Not more successful, though engaged in a much better cause, was John, king of England. John having appointed John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, to the vacant see of Canterbury, Innocent would not approve the selection, and bestowed the canonical investiture upon Stephen Langton; and the monks of Canterbury, of course, could and would receive no other archbishop. E In a fit of rage, John drove away the monks and seized their property, for which the whole kingdom was laid under an interdict; and, as John continued refractory, the pope pronounced his deposition, released his vassals from their oath of allegiance, and called upon all Christian princes and barons to invade England and dethrone the impious tyrant, promising

them the remission of their sins. By the consequent preparation of Philip Augustus of France to carry out the pope's invitation, John was not only forced to yield the point in dispute, agreeing to submit to the pope's will and pay damages to the banished clergy, but he even took an oath of fealty to the Roman see, and at the same time delivered to the papal envoy a charter testifying that he surrendered to pope Innocent and his successors forever the kingdom of England and lordship of Ireland, to be held as fiefs of the holy see by John and his successors, on condition of their paying an annual tribute of 700 marks of silver for England and 300 for Ireland. Nor were England and Sicily the only countries over which Innocent acquired the rights of a feudal suzerain. "In order to make his crown independent of his powerful vassals, and to baffle the claim to supremacy of the king of Castile, Peter II of Aragon voluntarily made himself tributary to the pope, binding himself and his successors to the annual payment' of 200 pieces of gold. In return, he was crowned by Innocent at Rome, and took an oath to the pope as his feudal suzerain. From Innocent, too, as his liege lord, John, duke of Bavaria, accepted the kingly crown. Denmark looked to him, and obtained from him justice and redress for the injury inflicted on her royal daughter; and his legate was dispatched to Iceland, to warn the inhabitants not to submit to the excommunicated and apostate priest Severo. Perhaps it was well that in those ages there should be some recognized tribunal and fountain for royal honor; and in times of turbulence princes probably gained more than they lost by becoming the vassals of the pontiffs. Still, such power vested in the hands of an ecclesiastic was a new thing in the Church, and placed beyond dispute the greatness which the papal power had reached" (Reichel). If, as we have seen, Innocent III would admit of no compromises with immorality and irregularity, he was certainly stern and even more unflinching in his dealings with all those who separated themselves from the body of the Romish Church. "To him, every offence against religion was a crime against society, and, in his ideal Christian republic, every heresy was a rebellion which it was the duty of the rulers to resist and repress." To extirpate this, "the deadliest of sins," he sent two legates, with the title of inquisitors, to France. One of them, Castelnau, having become odious by his severities, was murdered near Toulouse, upon which Innocent ordered a crusade against the Albigenses (q.v.), excommunicated Raymond, count of Toulouse, for abetting them, and bestowed his domains on Simon, count of Montfort. He addressed himself to all the faithful, exhorting them "to fight strenuously against the ministers of the old serpent," and promising them the kingdom of heaven in reward.

He sent two legates to attend the crusade, and their letters or reports to him are contained in the collection of his "Epistles" (especially *Epistola* 108 of B. 12, in which the legate Anmaldus relates the taking of Beziers, and the massacre of 30,000 individuals of every age, sex, and condition). Innocent, however, who did not live to see the end of the conflagration he had kindled, can hardly be held responsible for the fearful excesses into which it ran. In 1215 he convened a general council at the Lateran, in which he inculcated the necessity of a new crusade, which he regarded not merely as lawful, but even a most glorious undertaking in behalf of religion and piety. He also launched fresh anathemas against heretics, determined several points of doctrine and discipline, especially concerning auricular confession, and sanctioned the establishment of the two great mendicant monastic orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former to extirpate heresy, and the latter to preach sound doctrines; and to assist the parochial clergy in the execution of their duties. For if ever watchfulness was required by the clergy, it was at this time. "It was in this very century that the darkness of the Middle Ages began to disappear. It was during this very reign of Innocent III that the gray dawn of twilight gave the first promise of modern intelligence and modern independence. Nothing could be more evident than that this spirit of independence, that was everywhere raising its menacing front... if not either subjugated or controlled, would revolutionize the whole structure of society, both feudal and ecclesiastical. To control or subjugate the new spirit was therefore the great problem presented to the Church of the 13th century" (Prof. C. K. Adanis, in the *New-Englander*, July, 1870, p. 376). But if, by establishing these mendicant orders, Innocent III had provided himself with willing minions to spread over Europe, and to purify the Church from "modern intelligence" and "modern independence," he had certainly, at the same time, created for himself an opposition which afterwards became a still greater danger to the hierarchy itself, by the opposition which these mendicant orders created among the laity against the parochial clergy (compare Reichel, p. 576 sq.). It remains for us only to add one of the greatest achievements of Innocent's day, undertaken by him, no doubt, that nothing might be wanting to the completeness of his authority throughout the then known world, viz. the establishment of the Latin kingdom at Jerusalem, and the Latin conquest of Constantinople, which Ffoulkes (*Christendoms's Divisions*, 2, 226), while yet a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church, does not hesitate to pronounce "one of the foulest acts ever perpetrated under the garb of religion in Christian times; a

sorry connection, unquestionably, for one of his high position and commanding abilities.” At the very commencement of his pontificate, Innocent began writing epistles (209 of B. 11) to the patriarch of Constantinople, and other letters to the emperor Alexius, with the view of inducing the former to acknowledge the supremacy of the see of Rome; and although he failed in this, he had, soon after, by an unexpected turn of events, the satisfaction of consecrating a prelate of the Western Church as patriarch of Constantinople; but this by no means resulted, as Innocent most probably desired, in a reunion of churches or Christians; it was only followed by an increase of Church revenues. The Crusaders, whom Innocent had sent forth, as he thought, for the re-conquest of the Holy Land, after taking Zara from the king of Hungary, for which they were severely censured by the pope, proceeded to attack Constantinople, and overthrew the Greek empire. All this was done without Innocent’s sanction; but when Baldwin wrote to him acquainting him with the full success of the expedition, Innocent, in his answer to the marquis of Montferrat, forgave the Crusaders in consideration of the triumph which they had secured to the holy Church over the Eastern empire. Innocent sent also legates to Calo Johannes, prince of the Bulgarians, who acknowledged his allegiance to the Roman see (Innocentii III *Epistolce*). One year after the Lateran Council, “one of the latest acts, and by far the most momentous in the pontificate of Innocent,” he was seized with a fatal illness, and died July 16, 1216, in the very prime of life, broken down by overwork, for “the work of the whole world was upon him, as may be seen from his letters, not one of which exhibits the impress of any other mind than his own.” In Innocent III the Romish Church lost one of the most extraordinary characters, and in several respects the most illustrious, as he was certainly one of the most ambitious she has ever honored with the pontifical dignity. His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman see. At his death, “England and France, Germany and Italy, Norway and Hungary, all felt the power of Innocent; Navarre, Castile, and Portugal acknowledged his sway; even Constantinople owned his supremacy, and owned it to her cost” (Reichel 247; compare Hallam, *Middle Ages*, vol. 2, pt. 1, ch. 7:p. 199). His works, consisting principally of letters and sermons, and the remarkable treatise *On the Misery of the Condition of Man*, above alluded to, were published in two vols. folio (Par. 1682). See Baronius, *Annales*; Pagi, *Breviarium Histor. — criticum*; Lannes, *Histoire du Pontificat du Pope Innoc. III* (Paris, 1741, 12mo); Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. alt. 4*, 93 sq.; *History*

of the *Christ. Church*, in *Encyclop. Metrop.* vol. 3:ch. 1; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 12:pt. 2, chap. 2; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 4,-43, 75, 173, 199, 207, 268, 269, 270, 272, 306, etc.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25:890; Bohringer, *Kirche Christi in Biographien*, 2, 2, 321; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages* (Lond. 1870, 8vo), p. 242 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* (see Index); Bower, *History of the Popes*, 6:183 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 631 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Hurter, *Geschichte Inn. III u. seiner Zeitgenossen* (Hamburg, 1834-42, 4 vols.; 3rd ed. 1845 sq.).

### Innocent III

**(b).** Under this name we also find an anti-pope in the Roman Church. He was a descendant of the Frangipani family, and is distinguished from the eminent pope of that name by the surname *Landus*. After the death of Hadrian he contested the succession of Alexander II, who succeeded in securing his person, and Innocent was imprisoned in the monastery Cava. Thus ended a schism which had lasted twenty years, under four successive rivals for the papal throne. (J. H. W.)

### Innocent IV

(*Sinibaldo de' Fieschi*, of Genoa) was elected as the Successor of Celestine IV in the year 1243. In the preceding bitter quarrels between Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II, cardinal Sinibaldo had shown himself rather friendly towards the emperor; and the imperial courtiers, on receiving the news of his exaltation, were rejoicing at it; but the experienced Frederick checked them by remarking, "I have now lost a friendly cardinal, to find another hostile pope: no pope can be a Ghibelline." Anxious, however, to be relieved from excommunication, Frederick made advances to the new pope, and offered conditions advantageous to the Roman see; but Innocent remained inflexible, and, suddenly leaving Rome, went to Lyons, and there summoned a council in 1245, to which he invited the emperor. Thaddeus of Sessa appeared before the council to answer to the charges brought by the pope against Frederick; and, after much wrangling, Innocent excommunicated and dethroned the emperor, on the ground of perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and defiance of the Church, commanded the German princes to elect a new emperor, and reserved the disposal of the kingdom of Sicily to himself. In Italy the only consequence was that the war which already raged between the Guelphs

and Ghibellines continued fiercer than before; in Germany a contemptible rival to Frederick was set up in the person of Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, who was defeated by Conrad, Frederick's son. Frederick's sudden death in Apulia, A.D. 1250, led Innocent to return to Italy, and to offer the crown of Sicily to several princes, one of whom, Richard of Cornwall, observed that the pope's offer "was much like making him a present of the moon." Conrad, the son of Frederick, who had so valiantly and so successfully defended his cause, was excommunicated; but he gave little heed to this act of Innocent's, and even went into Italy in 1252, and took possession of Apulia and Sicily. Two years after he died, and his brother Manfred, who became regent, in a like manner baffled both the intrigues and the open attacks of the court of Rome. Innocent himself died soon after, at the end of 1254, at Rome, leaving Italy and Germany in the greatest confusion in consequence of his outrageous tyranny. and his unbending hostility to the whole house of Swabia. He was succeeded by Alexander IV. He wrote *Apparatus super decretales* (fol., often reprinted): — *De Potestate Ecclesiasticum et Jurisdictione Imperii*: — *Officium in octavis festi Nativitatis B. Marie*: — *Interpretationes in Vetus Testamentum*. Nineteen letters of his are given by Labbe, *Concil. 11*, 598-632; forty-eight by Ughelli, *Italica Sacra*; and five by Duchesne, *Historice Francorum Scriptores*, 5, 412, 861. See Labbe and Cossart. *Sacrosancta Concilia*, 11, 597-716; Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, 3, 199; Fleury. *Histor. Ecclesiasticum*; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 3, 589-592; Ph. de Mornay, *Hist. de la Popaute*, p. 376-404; Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum*, 2, 99; Paolo Panza, *Vita del gran Pontefice Innocenzio Quarto* (Naples, 1601, 4to); Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages* (London, 1870, 8vo), p. 264 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:906; *Engl. Cyclop.*; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 13:pt. 2, chap. 2; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 4, 76, 183; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 6:668.

## Innocent V

(*Peter of Tarantasia*, also called *Peter of Champagni* or of *Champagniac*) was born at Moustier, in Savoy, in 1225. He was elected pope January 20, 1276, as successor of Gregory X. He was a member of the order of Preaching Friars, into which he had entered quite young, and where he had acquired a great reputation. He succeeded Thomas Aquinas as professor of theology in the University of Paris; was made archbishop of Lyons in 1272, and afterwards bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary. As

soon as he became pope he applied himself to the task of restoring peace to Italy, which was then divided into two contending factions, under the leadership of the Guelphs and the Ghibellines (q.v.), and in this he measurably succeeded. He was also on the eve of inducing the Greek emperor, Michel Palaeologus, to confirm the act of union between the Greek and Roman churches, drawn up in the Council of Lyons, when he died June 22, 1276, having occupied the papal throne only five months. He wrote commentaries *Super iv libros Sententiarum* (Toulouse, 1652, 3 vols. fol.): — *Super Pentateuchum; super Lucam; super Epistolas Pauli* (Cologne, 1478; Antw. 1617, fol.); and various treatises: *De Unitate Forme; De Materia Caeli; De Alernitate Formae; De Intellectu et Voluntate*; and some other MS. works, the titles of which are given by Quetif, *Scriptores Ordinis Preadicatorum* (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Labbe, *Concilia*, 11, 1007: Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum*, 2, 203; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, 1. 18:chap. 86; Duhesne, *Hist. des Papes*, 2, 208; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 3, 605; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 6, 301, 302; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 669; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 908; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. 13:pt. 2, ch. 2.

## Innocent VI

(*Etienne d'Albert* or *Aubert*), a Frenchman, succeeded Clement VI in 1352. He resided at Avignon, like his immediate predecessors; but, unlike them, he put a check to the disorders and scandals of that court, which have been so strongly depicted by Petrarch, Villani, and other contemporary writers. He reformed the abuses of the reservations of benefices, and enforced the residence of bishops on their sees. His immediate predecessors having lost their influence in the States of the Church, Innocent VI determined on re-conquering these territories, and successfully reoccupied, with the assistance of the warlike cardinal Egidius Albornoz, the various provinces of the papal state which had been seized by petty tyrants. He then sent back to Rome the former demagogue Cola di Rienzo, who, being still dear to the people, repressed the insolence of the lawless barons, but who, becoming himself intoxicated with his power, committed acts of wanton cruelty, upon which the people rose and murdered him in 1354. In 1358 the emperor Charles IV was crowned at Rome by a legate deputed by pope Innocent for the purpose. Innocent died at Avignon, at an advanced age, in 1362. It was during his pontificate that the mendicant orders were persecuted in England, and declined to be an



unchristian order by Richard, archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland, in a book which he published in defense of the curates or parish priests, entitled *Defensorium Curatorum*. Of course Innocent rallied to the defense of the mendicants. He reprimanded the archbishop, and confirmed anew all the privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to men of that order. A letter of his is given by Labbe, *Concilia*, 11, 1930; four by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*; and two hundred and fifty by Martene, *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, 2, 843-1072. See Duchesne, *Hist. des Papes*, 2, 261; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, I. 20, chap. 86; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, 10:397-596; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 6, 670; *Engl. Cyclop.*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25:910; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, 5, 44; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 14:pt. 2, ch. 2; Schlosser, *Weltgesch.* bk. 4:ch. 1, 408, 618; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 6:482 sq.

## Innocent VII

(cardinal *Cosmo de Migliorati*, of Sulmona), who had been appointed archbishop of Ravenna and bishop of Bologna by Urban VI, was elected by the *Italian* prelates as the successor of Boniface IX in 1404. At this time “the great Western schism” agitated the Romish Church, the French cardinals supporting a rival pope, Benedict XIII (q.v.), who held his court at Avignon, acknowledged by a part of Europe. After the election of Innocent, a tumult broke out in Rome, excited by the Colonna and by Ladislaus, king of Naples, which obliged the pope to escape to Viterbo. Ladislaus, however, failed in his attempt upon Rome; and Innocent, having returned to his capital, excommunicated him. Innocent died Nov. 6, 1406, after having made his peace with Ladislaus. Some think that he was poisoned. He is spoken of as a man who possessed great learning and virtue, and as governed by the purest motives in all his acts; hostile to all luxury, avariciousness, and simony-evils which were one and all possessed by his rival Benedict, and by his own predecessor Boniface (comp. Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 446 sq.). The charge which some lay to him that he did not keep the promise which he gave on his accession to the papal see that he would, if his rival: should be declared the proper incumbent, vacate the-papal throne, seems not well founded. It is true Benedict proposed a conference for the alleged purpose of restoring peace and union to the Church of Rome, which Innocent did not agree to, but this was done because Innocent knew that Benedict did not earnestly desire it. He wrote *Oratio de Ecclesiastica Unione; Approbatio regule patrum et sororum de penitentia ordinis S. Dominici*; and a letter of his is published

by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, 1, 1381. See Labbe, *Concilia*, 11, 2082; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, 1. 20:ch. 99; Duchesne, *Hist. des Popes*, 2, 299; Sismondi, *Histoire des Francais*, 12, 211; Maimbourg, *Hist. du grand Schisme d'Occident*; Bruni d'Arezzo, *De Rebus Italicis*, and *Epistolce Familiares*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 671; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 15, pt. 2, ch. 2; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 6, 748 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 911; Neander, *Hist. of the Christ. Religion and Church*, 5, 70, 247; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 7:91 sq. (J H.W.)

## Innocent VIII

(cardinal *Giovanni Battista Cibo*), a Genoese of Greek descent, was during his youth in the service of Alfonso of Aragon, king of Naples, but subsequently entered the Church, Paul II giving him the bishopric of Savone. His conduct was disgracefully irregular; he had seven illegitimate children by different women, and was, besides, married when he took orders. At the death of Sixtus IV serious troubles broke out in Rome. The election was warmly contested, and among the chief agitators was chancellor Borgia, who afterwards attained an unenviable celebrity as Alexander VI; but the maneuvers in favor of Cibo proved at last successful. Innocent had bought the tiara by means of benefices, legations, palaces, and large sums of money, and was elected Aug. 24, 1484. His first undertaking was to conciliate the Italian princes, and to reconcile to the papal see all those whom his predecessor had alienated. Frightened at the advance of Bajazet with his Turks, Innocent wrote to the Christian princes for help in men or money to resist the invasion. Immense sums were at once forwarded to Rome from divers countries; but the pope, pretending that he could not act without the assistance of the German princes (who were then divided by the quarrels between Mathias, king of Hungary, and emperor Frederick, Albert of Brandenburg and Otho of Bavaria, etc.), used the funds thus obtained to war against Ferdinand I, king of Naples, who refused to pay him the usual tribute. The pope favored the revolted Neapolitan barons against Ferdinand I of Naples, in consequence of which the troops of Ferdinand ravaged the territory of Rome; but through the mediation of Lorenzo de Medici and of the duke Sforza of Milan, peace was re-established between the two parties. The Turks were still threatening war. Jem, in order to shun the enmity of his brother Bajazet, had fled to Rhodes, where he was seized by the grand master of the order of St. John, D'Aubusson, and delivered up to the pope in exchange for the cardinal's hat. The pope received Jem with great honor, but took care to

secure his person, as he would be an important hostage. In this he was not mistaken, for Bajazet feared the power of his brother, and, to secure his throne, he sent an ambassador to Rome to offer Innocent a large sum if he would keep Jem in prison. The pope accepted the dishonorable bargain, although the sultan of Egypt, who desired Jem, as commander in chief of his forces, to march against Bajazet, offered, on condition of his release, to restore Jerusalem to the Christians, and was even ready to pledge himself to surrender to the pope all the territory that should be taken from the Turks. Under Innocent's successor, the depraved Alexander VI, Jem was poisoned *by order of the pope* (comp. Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 530). Bajazet, of course, showed himself very generous towards his accomplice, Innocent VIII. On May 29, 1492, he sent him the iron of the spear with which, he asserted, Christ was pierced on the cross, and which was among 'he booty taken by Mohammed II after the downfall of Constantinople. The relic (although received with great ceremony) was, unfortunately, the third of the kind in Europe, for the emperor of Germany claimed to have the holy lance at Nuremberg, and the king of France in the Holy Chapel at Paris. Innocent VIII died July 25, 1492., Among the principal acts of his administration are the confirmation, in 1485, of the order of the Conception, founded at Toledo by Beatrix of Sylva; the canonization of Leopold of Austria in 1485; the condemnation of the propositions of Mirandola in 1487; the union under the crown of Spain of the three military orders of Calatrava, St. James, and Alcantara, in 1488; and the confirmation of the Brotherhood of Mercy, instituted at Rome for the benefit of condemned criminals. Two letters of Innocent are published by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, 1, 710; 5, 948. Roman Catholic writers endeavor to free Innocent VIII from the charge of gross immorality by asserting that he had *only* two illegitimate children, and that they were born before he was made pope; but" the success of Innocent VIII in increasing the population of Rome was a favorite topic with the wits of the day" (Innocuo priscos aquum est debere Quirites. Progenie exhaustam restituit patriam. — Salnazarii *Epigram*. lib. 1), and he was graced with "*the epitaph which declared that filth, gluttony, avarice, and sloth lay buried in his tomb*" (Marultus, *Epigram*. lib. 4). But the conduct of Innocent VIII can hardly compare with the career of his successor, Alexander VI," the most depraved of all the popes, uniting in himself all the vices of Innocent VIII and the unscrupulous family ambition of Sixtus IV." Indeed, all the latter half of the 16th century scarcely saw a supreme pontiff without the visible evidences of human frailty around him, the unblushing acknowledgment of

which is the fittest commentary on the tone of clerical morality (Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 358, 39). See Labbe, *Concilia*, 13:1465; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, lib. 23, ch. 15; Duchesne, *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, 2, 350; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*; Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum*, 3:90; F. Serdonati, *Vita e Fatti d'Innocenzo VIII* (Milan, 1829, 8vo); Comines, *Memoires*, lib. 7:ch. 1; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 672; *Engl. Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:912; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, 1, 43, 296; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* p. 436; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 7, 317 sq.; Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 641 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:460 sq.

### Innocent IX

(Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti), born at Bologna in 1519, had distinguished himself as papal legate at Trent, afterwards as the papal nuncio at Venice, and as president of the Inquisition. He was elected pope after the death of Gregory XIV, in Oct. 1591. He bore a good reputation for learning and piety, but he was too old and feeble for the papal chair, and constantly confined to his bed by illness, and was even obliged to give his audiences there. Notwithstanding these difficulties, however, he took an active part in the affairs of France, favoring the party of the League and of Spain, as his predecessor Gregory had done. A letter of his is still extant (in Cayet, *Chronologie novenaire*), in which he urges Alexander Farnese to hasten the equipment of his troops, to invade France, and to relieve Rouen, all which that general forthwith executed with so much success and skill. He died Dec. 30, 1591, after a short reign of only two months, and was succeeded by Clement VIII. See Labbe, *Concilia*, 15, 1430; Duchesne, *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, 2, 457; Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* 1. 26, chap. 179; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, 21:124; B. Justiniani, *Oratio habita in fanere Inocentii IX* (Rome, 1592, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6:673; *English Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25; 914; Ranke, *History of the Popes of the 16th and 17th Cent.* 3, 231, 232; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. 16, sec. 3, pt. 1, ch. 1.

### Innocent X

(cardinal Giovanni Battista Panfil), born at Rome in 1572, was elected in Sept. 1644, after the death of Urban VIII. He was then seventy-three years of age, and wholly under the control of his sister-in-law, Donna Olimpia

Maidalchini Panfili, who appears to have been an unprincipled woman, very fond of money, and anxious to aggrandize her relatives. Innocent, however, displayed in several instances much firmness, justice, and prudence, and a wish to protect the humble and poor against the oppressions of the great. He diminished the taxes, which had been very heavy under his predecessor, Urban VIII, and at the same time embellished Rome. The people of Fermo, on the Adriatic, revolted against their governor, being excited by the local nobility and landholders, who were irritated against him for having by an edict of annona kept the price of corn low; the governor and other official persons were murdered. Innocent sent a commissioner with troops, and the guilty, without distinction of rank, were punished, some being executed, and others sent to the galleys. The district of Castro and Ronciglione, near Rome, was still in possession of the Farnese dukes of Parma, notwithstanding the efforts of Urban VIII to wrest it from them. Disputes about jurisdiction were continually taking place between the officers of the duke and those of the pope. Innocent having consecrated a new bishop of Castro who was not acceptable to the duke, the latter forbade his entering his territories, and as the bishop elect persisted, he was murdered on the road. The pope immediately sent troops to attack Castro, which being taken, he ordered the town to be razed to the foundations, and a pillar erected on the site, with the inscription "Qui fu Castro." He showed the same resolution against the Barberini, who had opposed his election, and was a steadfast enemy of cardinal Mazarin, the supporter of the Barberini. The French prelate, however, outwitted the pope, and obliged him to yield by threatening to take Avignon. Innocent also took an active part in the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. As early as 1650, Hubert, bishop of Vabres, had denounced to the pope five propositions ascribed to Jansenius (q.v.), which, in the preceding year, had been referred to the theological faculty. Innocent established a special congregation to examine them, April 20, 1651. De Saint Amour and some other theologians sent by the Jansenists were heard May 19, 1653, but P. Annat, a Jesuit, informs us that the affair had already been judged and decided in advance. Finally a bull was issued. *Cum occasione*, May 30, 1653, condemning the five propositions. It was received in France, and published by order of Louis XIV. Innocent died soon after, Jan. 6, 1654. His anxiety to further the interests of Rome throughout the world is manifest by the pecuniary assistance which he afforded the Venetians and Poles in their wars against the Turks, by his opposition to the peace of Westphalia, fearing that it endangered the

Romish tenets, and even the pontifical chair, and especially by the assistance which he gave to the Irish to combat the English, and, if possible, to regain the English territory for his Church. In Germany) also, he secured, by his undaunted efforts, the conversion of several princes and noblemen of influence. He built two beautiful churches in Rome, and left a well-filled treasury, which proved very useful to his successor, Alexander VII. See Bruys, *Hist. des Popes*, 5. 253; Duchesne, *Historic Francorum Scriptorum*, 2, 532; Ciaconius, *Vite et res geste Pontificum Romanorum*, 4, 642; Sismondi, *Hist. des Francais*, 24:78; *Relation des deliberations du clerge de France sur la Constitution et sur le Bref de N. S. P. le pape Innocent X* (Paris, 1656, fol.); De Lalane, *Defense de la Constitution du pape Innocent X*, etc. (1655, 4to); *Vie de Madame Olympe Madachini, qui a gouverne Eglise pendant le pottificat d'Innocent X* (Amst. 1666, 18mo); *Memoires du Cardinal de Retz*, L 3; L de Saint Amour, *Journal de ce qui s'est fait a Rome dans l'affaire des cinq propositions* (Paris, 1662, fol.); J. C. Rosstenschner, *Historia Innocentii X* (1676, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 6, 673; *Enyl. Cyclop.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 915; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 182, 242; Mosheim, *Ch. list. cent.* 17, sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:462 sq.

## Innocent XI

(cardinal *Benedetto Odescalchi*), born at Como in 1611, succeeded Clement X in 1676. It is said by some that he was a soldier in his younger days, though this has been denied by others (Count Torre Rezzonico, *De Suppositis Militaribus Stipendiis Benedetto Odescalchi*). He was a man of great firmness and courage, austere in his morals, and inflexible in his resolutions, and withal one of the most distinguished popes of the 17th century. He inaugurated many reforms, reduced very materially the pomp and luxury of the papal court, and suppressed various abuses. His administration was entirely free from the weakness of nepotism which had so greatly sullied the fame of many of the pontiffs who had preceded him. His own nephew he obliged to live at Rome, under his pontificate, in a private character; and in this respect, certainly, he has had few equals in the pontifical chair. Indeed, his austerity was so great that it made him many enemies, and oftentimes estranged even some who would gladly have offered him their friendship. His greatest enemies, no doubt, were the Jesuitical order, which he was determined to crush out. The principal event of his pontificate, however, was his quarrel with the imperious Louis XIV of France, particularly provoked by the question of the immunities enjoyed

by the foreign ambassadors at Rome, an event which exhibits more clearly than any other act of his both his own character and that of the times, and deserves a few words of explanation. By an old usage or prescription, the foreign ambassadors at Rome had the right of asylum, not only in their vast palaces, but also in a certain district or boundary around them, including sometimes a whole street or square, which the officers of justice or police could not enter, and where, consequently, malefactors and dissolute persons found a ready shelter. These "quartieri," or free districts, were likewise places for the sale of contraband articles and for defrauding the revenue. The abuse had become contagious: several of the Roman princes and cardinals claimed and enforced the same rights and immunities, so that only a small part of the city was left under the sway of the magistrates. The classical advocates for this absurd custom quoted the example of Romulus, who made his new town a refuge for all the lawless persons of the neighborhood. Innocent determined to put a stop to the abuse, and to be master in his own capital; he, however, proceeded at first calmly and with sufficient caution. He would not disturb the present possessors of those immunities, but he declared and made it officially known that in future he would not give audience to any new ambassador who did not renounce for himself and his successors these abusive claims. All the great powers of Europe took umbrage at this very reasonable determination; but the question was not brought to a crisis until the death of the marechal d'Estrees, the French ambassador at Rome. Just before Louis XIV had appointed the new ambassador, the pope repeated in a bull, dated May 1687, his previous resolve. In view of this action of the pope, which Louis was determined not to observe, he instructed his minister "to maintain at Rome the rights and the dignity of France;" and in order to support this resolve, he gave him a numerous retinue of military and naval officers, who were to frighten the pope in his own capital. Lavardin's entrance into Rome under such an escort resembled that of a hostile commander. He had also been preceded by several hundred French under-officers, who had entered Rome as private travelers, but who took their quarters near the ambassador's palace, ready for any mischief. Innocent, however, remained firm; he refused to receive the new ambassador, and all the anger of Louis, who seized upon Avignon, and threatened to send a fleet with troops on the Roman coast, had no effect upon him. Lavardin, having remained eighteen months at Rome, unable to see the pope, was obliged to return to France with his credentials unopened. The quarrel was not adjusted till the following pontificate; but the distinct immunities of the foreign

ambassadors at Rome continued, after various modifications, until the beginning of the 19th century. This quarrel was, however, not the initiative to a misunderstanding between the two sovereigns. It had been previously opened by the right which Louis XIV claimed to possess, in virtue of the *Droit de Regne*, to appoint to vacant benefices in his kingdom, and to collect the revenues. This right of the French king Innocent XI disputed. Louis. XIV issued edict after edict, the pope bull after bull against them; finally, the French clergy demanded that a council should be assembled. This was done, and on Feb. 3, 1682, the council declared that the French clergy indorsed the action of the king, and that the pope should be notified of their decision. While awaiting his answer, the assembly continued its sittings, intending to put an end to all further papal encroachments by establishing firmly the doctrines of the Galliean Church concerning the temporal power of the popes, their infallibility, and the independence of the king. The result of their deliberation was the famous four propositions promulgated March 16, 1682. *SEE GALLICAN CHURCH*. Innocent XI, in a solemn consistory, condemned the: propositions and the bishops who had voted them, and April 11, 1682, issued a brief annulling the proceedings of the French council. In 1686 he also condemned the doctrines of Molinos (q.v.), who was obliged to make a public recantation, September 3, 1687, besides suffering for the remainder of his life close confinement in the prisons of the Inquisition. At the close of 1676 Innocent took a threatening attitude towards the Jesuits, forbidding them, among other things, to receive any novices into their order. They retorted by calling the pope a Jansenist, offered prayers for his conversion, and entered into an alliance with the French king. Innocent XI, however, died only a few years after, August 21, 1689. It was during his pontificate that James II of England became a Romanist, and endeavored, by a succession of bold attempts, not only to give Romanism toleration, but even make it a Church establishment of his country. (Compare Fox, *James II*, p. 332; Hallam, *Constit. Hist.* 2, 212; Mackintosh, *Hist. of Revolution*, ch. 5; ‘Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England* [Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo], vol. 2, chap. 8.) Stoughton claims that these efforts accorded, however, only “with the daring policy of the Jesuits, who were masters at court, but not with the more cautious measures of the papacy.” No doubt this is true in a measure. Innocent XI was evidently unwilling to become master of the English ecclesiastical establishment if to be secured by the aid of an order which he abhorred, and which he was determined upon extinguishing; and this our supposition is strengthened by the demand which James II made upon Rome for a red hat for a Jesuit



named Petre. *SEE JAMES II*. Two letters of this pope are published by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, 4, 513; 10:53. He wrote also *Breve ad Franciscum episcopum Apamiensem* (Paris, 4to): — *Decretum de sacrce communionis usu datum* (Paris, 1679, 4to). See Palatius, *it. Intocentius XI*, in the 5th vol. of the *Gest. Pontif. Romans vita. d’Innocenzo XI* (Venet. 1690); Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, 5, 360; Sismondi, *Hist. des Franacis*, 25:311; J. A. Costa (R. Simon), *Hist. de l’Origine des Revenus ecclesiastiques* (Francfort, 1684, 12mo); De Larroque, *Nouveau Traite de la Regale* (1685, 12mo); Bayle, *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (1686); Heidegger, *Historia Papatus* (Amst. 1698, 4to), pt. 2; De La Luzerne, — *Sur la Declaration de l’assemblee du clergg de France en 1682* (Par. 1821, 8vo); F. Buonamici, *De Vita et Rebus gestis Innocentii XI* (Rome, 1776, 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6:675; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, s.v., 919 Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 273, 279; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 17:sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:464 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Papes*, 7:486 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

## Innocent XII

(cardinal *Antonio Pignatelli*) was born at Naples March 13, 1615, and succeeded Alexander VIII in July, 1691. He had a serious dispute with the emperor Leopold I, who, attempting to revive in Italy the rights of the empire over the former imperial fiefs, which had, during the wars and vicissitudes of ages, become emancipated, published an edict at Rome in June, 1697, enjoining all the possessors of such territories to apply to the emperor for his investiture within a fixed time, or they would be considered as usurpers and rebels. This measure, if enforced, would have affected the greater part of the landed property of Italy, and also the sovereignty of its governments, and of the Roman see among the rest. The pope protested against the edict, and advised the other Italian powers to resist such obsolete pretensions, and, with the support of France succeeded in persuading Leopold to desist from them. He also succeeded in putting an end to the difficulties existing between France and the see of Rome on the question of investiture, *SEE INNOCENT XI*, and obtained from the French clergy an address which amounted almost to a recantation of the four articles of the Galliean Church. The question of Quietism then reappeared. Bossuet accused Fenelon of favoring that tendency in his *Explication sur a vie interieure*. The book was *moderately* condemned by the pope, in accordance with the report of the Congregation of the Index (q.v.), and

Fenelon (q.v.), as is well known, submitted (see vol. 3:p. 529-530). Innocent built the harbor of Ponto d'Anzo on the ruins of the ancient Antium; he constructed the aqueduct of Civita Vecchia; the palace of the Monte Citorio at Rome, for the courts of justice; and the fine line of buildings at Ripagrande, on the north bank of the Tiber, below the town, where vessels which ascend the river load and unload. He also built the asylum, school, and penitentiary of San Michele, and other useful works. Innocent was of regular habits, attentive to business, a lover of justice, and averse to nepotism. He died Sept. 27, 1700, and was succeeded by Clement XI. See Bruys, *Hist. des Popes*, 5, 454; Sismondi, *Hist. des Franvais*, 26,69; De Prades, *Abrige de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 2, 338; N. P. Giannetasio, *Panegyricus in funere Innocentii XII* (Naples, 1700, 8vo); Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 6:676; *English Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:923; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 281-313; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 1, chap. 2 Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 466 sq.

### Innocent XIII

(cardinal *Michel Angelo Conti*), born at Rome May 15,1655, succeeded Clement XI May 8,1721. He had previously been papal nuncio for a number of years at different courts, and was made cardinal in 1707, legate at Ferrara in 1709, and bishop of Viterbo in 1712. When he ascended the papal throne, the discussion concerning the constitution *Unigenitus* was in progress with great eagerness on all sides. On June 9, 1721, seven French bishops wrote to Innocent to obtain its withdrawal. Cardinal Althan complained also, in the emperor's name, of the trouble it was creating in Germany. The pope, however, referred the matter to the inquisitors, who condemned the letter of the bishops as injurious to the memory of Clement XI, and disrespectful towards the Holy See. Innocent XIII was a man of prudence and experience of the world, and less willful and headstrong than his predecessor. The most discreditable event of his reign was his giving the cardinal's hat to Dubois (q.v.). He was on the eve of suppressing the order of Jesuits when he died, March 7, 1724. 'Some think he was poisoned. See Bruys, *Hist. des Popes*, 5, 489; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, 27:442; De Piosseus, *Memoires de la Regence du duc d'Orleans* (1742, 3 vols. 12mo); A. Tricaud, *Relation de la Mort d'Innocent XIII* (Nancy, 1724, 12mo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 677; *English Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:925; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 3, p. 485; Guamacci, *Vit. Ponti.* 2, 137 sq., 381 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 467.

## Innocent

a Russian prelate, born in 1800 at Sievsk. At school he distinguished himself by his superior ability over his fellow-students, especially displaying great oratorical talent. When twenty-four years old, in accordance with the Russian custom of the better class of society destined for the service of the Church, he entered the monastic order. Two years after, he was called as an officer to the theological academy of St. Petersburg, and in 1830 was made rector of the high school at Kief. After filling various positions of great eminence in his Church, he was made a member of the "Holy Synod" in 1856. He died at Odessa May 6, 1857. His works are, *The last Days of Christ's terrestrial Life* (1828):- *The Life of the Apostle Paul* (eod.): — *Discourses and Sermons* (1843,3 vols.): — *Of Sin and its Consequences* (1844); etc. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé* 25, 927.

## Innocent, Gizel

a Russian prelate, was born in Prussian Poland, of Lutheran parents, at the commencement of the 17th century. He joined the Greek Church while yet young, and became a monk. Distinguished for great ability and learning, he was selected for a professor's chair at Kief. He died at that place Feb. 24, 1684. He published *On the Peace between God and Man* (Kief, 1669), which, by a ukase of the Synod of 1766, was put in the *Index:-Instructions on the Sacrament of Penitence* (Kief, 1671); and left in MS. a work on *The true Faith* (written in Polish), which aims to refute a work on the Supremacy of St. Peter, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit. He also published a synopsis of Russian history, which has been extensively circulated. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:926.

## Innocentiae Portus

(*gate of innocence*) is one of the names given to the rite of baptism, aiming more directly at a description of its end or efficacy. **SEE BAPTISM.**

## Innocentium Festum

**SEE INNOCENTS DAY.**

## Innocents, Massacre of, by Herod

(<sup>4126</sup>Matthew 2:16). It has been thought strange that Josephus should not mention this atrocity (see Volborth, *Veram esse Infanticidii Bethlehem.*

*hait.* Göttingen, 1788); but it was one only, and that a local one, of his many acts of tyranny and cruelty. *SEE HEROD THE GREAT.*

## Innocents' Day

(*Festum Innocentium*, ἡμέρα, τῶνἀγίων ἰδ' χιλιαδων νηπίων), set apart by the Greek, Roman, and English churches to commemorate the slaughter of the children by Herod shortly after our Savior's birth, is celebrated in the Western Church on Dec. 28, and in the Eastern Church Dec. 29. Ancient ecclesiastical writers speak of these children as Christian martyrs. Cyprian says, "The nativity of Christ began" (*a martyriis infantium*) "with the martyrdom of those infants that from two years old and under were slain for his name" (*Epist.* 56, *ad Thibar.* p. 123). Augustine says, "These infants died for Christ, not knowing it; their parents bewailed them as dying martyrs; they could not yet speak, but, nevertheless, they confessed Christ: Christ granted them the honor to die for his name" (*De Symbol.* 3:4, p. 303; *De Lib. Arbit.* 3:23). So Prudentius (*Cath. Hymn. de Epiph.*),

*“Salvete, flores martyium,  
Quos Incis ipso in limine  
Christi ilusecutor sustulit,  
Ceu turbo nascentes rosas!*

*Vos prima Christi victimla,  
Grex immolatorum tener,  
Aram sub ipsam simplices  
Palma et corona luditis.”*

“Hail, ye flower of martyrs, whom the enemy of Christ cut off in your very entrance upon the light, as the tempest does roses in the bud! First victims for Christ, tender flock of sacrifices, ye play innocently with your crowns and garlands before the very altar.” It was a popular superstition in the old Church that Innocents' Day (or Childermass, as it was also called) is very unlucky to begin any work upon; and what day so ever that falls on, whether on a Monday, Tuesday, or any other, nothing must be begun on that day throughout the year. Though Childermass Day was reckoned unfortunate, nevertheless revels were held on it. The Society of Lincoln's Inn used to choose an officer at that season called the *King of the Cockneys*, who presided on the day of his appointment. But in the modern Church this feast is observed as a special holiday by the young, and many curious customs connected with it prevail in Catholic countries. Thus, in

private families, the children are on this day privileged to wear the clothes of the elders, and in some sort to exercise authority over the household in their stead. So, also, in communities of nuns, the youngest sister becomes for this day superioress of the house, and exercises a sort of sportive authority even over the real superior. In Church, the priest celebrating mass on this day wears a *blue* gown. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 20:cap. 7:§ 12; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten a.'der christl. Archaöl.* (Lips. 1817), 1, 304 sq.

### Innovatio Beneficii

is the technical term for any *change* to be effected *in a benefice*; it may have regard either to the position itself, or only to the revenues accruing therefrom.

### In partibus infidelium

(i.q. *in heathen countries*), EPISCOPUS, *episcopus titularis*, *episcopus suffraganeus*. All these expressions, sometimes used promiscuously, have, when closely examined, different significations. As bishops, on account of the great variety and number of duties devolving on them, are unable to perform them all in person, they are allowed the use of assistants, such as archdeacons, coadjutors, etc. For such functions, however, as can only be performed by a bishop, since there can be but one in a diocese (c. 8, *Conc. Niccen.* a. 325), the bishop unable to perform them was formerly obliged to call in the aid of a neighboring bishop. In after times, the bishops driven out of their dioceses were especially entrusted with these functions, being considered as still belonging *dejure* to their diocese. The Roman Church was thus led never to give up, in principle, any place where it had once obtained a footing, even when it did lose it in fact; and thus, when its bishops were driven from a place, their connection with their *cathedra* did not therefore cease. In the 9th century a number of bishops were driven out of Spain by the Arabs, and sought refuge at Oviedo (Africa), waiting to resume their sees; and when one of them died, another was at once elected in his stead. While thus waiting they acted as assistants to the bishops of Oviedo, according to the express definition: “Ut episcopi, qui ditione carerent, Ovetensi praesuli vicariam operam exhiberent, cura in multos partita, ejusque redivitibus alerentur” (see Thomassin, *Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina de beneficiis*, pt. 1, lib. 1, cap. 27, no. 8; Vinterim, *Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten d. christkath. Kirche*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p.

379, 380). We next find instances of such *vice-episcopi*, *vices gerentes in pontificalibus*, *vicarii in pontificalibus*, in Germany, and they grew more numerous after the 12th century in consequence of the schism of the Eastern Church. It then became the practice to appoint for such dioceses as had formerly been Christian, but had now fallen into the hands of infidels (*in partibus infidelium*), bishops called *episcopi titulares*, who were used as assistants to other bishops in their strictly episcopal functions. The practice soon led to abuses, monks especially using every exertion to obtain such appointments. Clement V therefore decreed at Vienna in 1311 that no such bishops should thenceforth be appointed without the special authorization of the 'pope, and that no monks could be raised to that office without the consent of their superiors (cap. 5, Clement. *De electione*). Other restrictions were also enacted at Ravenna in 1311, 1314, etc., but the practice was not abolished. Thus, at the Synod of Cologne in 1322, we find the bishop of Liege represented by a titular bishop (*episcopus ecclesie Henner's*) (Hartzheim, *Concilia Gernmaniae*, 4:284). We find also mention made in the synod of Salzburg, in 1420, of *episcopi titulares* (Hartzheim, 5, 179), and in that of Passau, in 1470 (can. 7, 8), of *surcaganei*, whose functions were to consecrate priests and churches. They received the name of *suffraganei* because they were to support the bishops by deed and word (*suifagio*). Leo X, in the fifth Lateran Council, 1514 (Sess. 9), granted also to the cardinals the privilege of having *vicarii seu suffraganei*. The Council of Trent (Sess. 6:cap. 5, *De re. form.*; Sess. 14, cap. 2, 8:*De reform.*) sought to remedy the still existing abuses, for sometimes titular bishops endeavored to establish separate bishoprics for themselves in the dioceses of the bishops whom they were to assist. On this and subsequent decisions (see Benedict XIV, *De synodo diocesana*, lib. 2, cap. 7; lib. 13, cap. 14; Ferraris, *Bibl. Canonica*, s.v. Episcopus, art. 7. no. 21 sq.) is based the existing practice of creating bishops- of the title of dioceses which have passed from the rule of the Romish Church. Hence, in the bull *De salute animarum* of 1821 to Prussia, it is enacted that the confirmation of existing suffraganeatus, as also the restoration of those of Treves and Cologne, shall be performed in the usual manner ("servatis consueta formis de episcopatu titulari in partibus infidelium"). This consecration differs from that of the other bishops only in making the recipient simply an adjunct of the regularly located bishops, without separate jurisdiction. When they confer orders without the consent of their bishops, or otherwise overstep their duties, they are punished by being suspended for one year. The *episcopi in partibus*, as simple titular bishops,

are revocable papal delegates. So also when they are missionary bishops. Suffragan bishops are in a more secure position, “cum assuetas congrume adsignatione provideatur,” as says the bull *De salute*. See A. H. Andreucci, *De episcopo titulari seu in partibus infidelium* (Romans 1732); Thomassin, *Vetus ac nova ecclesie disciplina de beneficiis*, pt. 1, lib. 1, cap. 27, 28; F. A. Dtirr, *De suffraganei seu vicariis in pontificalibus episcop.* German. (Mogunt. 1782); J. H. Heister, *Suffraganei Colonienses extraordinarii sive de sacree Colon. ecclesie pro episcopis*, etc. (Mogunt. 1843). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4, 103.

## Inquisition

(INQUISITIO HERETIC, *Sanctum Officium*) is the name given to a tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, whose function is to seek out and punish heretics and unbelievers. It is a degenerated and perverse form of the old Church discipline, originally in the hands of the rural bishops, on whom devolved the duty of checking false doctrines, and who, for the purpose of spying out rising heresies, made frequent visits to the churches of their diocese. Upon such heretics, when discovered, they inflicted several punishments, the severest of which, however, was only excommunication. Another punishment frequently resorted to was banishment; but capital punishment on account of one's faith was not inflicted by Christians until the 4th century. The first instance of legally enforcing the death-penalty against Christians occurred under the emperor Theodosius the Great (382), who opposed and aimed at uprooting all heresy, especially that of Manichaeism (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 141 sq.). Under this emperor, and under Justinian, judges (*inquisitores*) were first appointed to examine heretics with a view to enforcing upon them punishments, if found guilty; and, in order to enable the ecclesiastical officers to execute their functions, the civil authorities surrendered for this purpose to the bishops the right of exercising the requisite jurisdiction in their several dioceses. Most frequently the ban only was pronounced by the ecclesiastics, leaving it to the civil officers to add other and more severe punishments. In the 8th century the rights of the ecclesiastics in exterminating heresy were put on a firmer basis by synodal courts, but it was not until the 12th century that it became a general institution in the Christian Church.

*Establishment of the Inquisition in France.* — At the synod of Verona. in 1184, certain directions were given to the bishops “concerning heretics,”

who at this time formed a very formidable enemy of the Romish Church, more especially in the south of France. The sects had become so numerous that some of them, such as the Cathari (q.v.), the Albigenses (q.v.), and the Waldensians (q.v.), threatened the very existence of the papal hierarchy, and this led Innocent III (q.v.) in 1198 to dispatch ‘the Cistercians Raineri and Guido, and in 1206 Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, as papal legates to France, to *assist* the bishops and the civil authorities in punishing all heretics with the utmost rigor. But, to efface forever the last vestige of heresy, Innocent III determined to make a permanent institution of the Inquisition, “the most formidable of all the formidable engines devised by popery to subdue the souls and bodies, the reason and the consciences of men, to its sovereign will.” Accordingly, the fourth Lateran Council (1215) made the persecution of heretics the chief business of synodal courts, in the form that every archbishop or bishop should visit, either personally, or through the archdeacon, or some other suitable person, the parish in which, according to rumor (*in qua fama fuerit*), there were heretics, and put under oath two or three of the inhabitants of irreproachable character, or, if necessary, all the inhabitants, to point out those who were known as heretics or those who held secret meetings, or departed from the faithful in their walk and conduct. The refusal to take oath justified the suspicion of heresy, *haereticae pravitatis*; the careless bishop was deposed (comp. Biener, *Beitrag z. d. Gesch. des Inquisitionsprozesses* [Lpz. 1827], p. 60 sq.). In name, the bishops still conducted the matter, but the legates had supervision over them and, in fact, conducted the persecution of heretics. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse confirmed this decision of the fourth Lateran Council, and published forty-five decrees to complete the institution of episcopal inquisition (see Mansi, 23, 192; Planck, *Gesch. d. Kirchl. Gessellshaftsverfassung*, 4, 2nd half, 463 sq.). It was decided that each bishop should appoint in each district one priest and two or three laymen in good standing, who should devote themselves exclusively to ferreting out heretics, and then deliver them up to the archbishops, bishops, or other authorities for punishment. Every one guilty of concealing a heretic forfeited thereby his land possessions or offices; the house in which a heretic was found was to be torn down. In case of sickness, however severe, no heretic or unbeliever was to be allowed the aid of a physician; penitents were to leave their home, to wear a peculiar dress, and could hold no office except by a special dispensation from the pope. But, notwithstanding these rigid and definite regulations, and notwithstanding the great zeal of the legates in urging the execution of the laws by the



bishops, the see of Rome did not even approach the desired end. To accomplish this more certainly, the affairs of the Inquisition were taken from the bishops, and made a papal tribunal, and the bishops themselves were subjected to it. Accordingly, Gregory IX appointed, in 1232, in Germany, Aragonia, and Austria, in 1233 in Lombardy and South France (see Beziers, anno 1233, in Mansi, 23, 269 sq.; Raynald, *Annal.* a. 1233, n. 59 sq.), the Dominicans (q.v.) permanent papal inquisitors (later also the Franciscans became such). "The solitude and retirement of which these monks made profession, but of which, as it appeared in the sequel, they soon began to tire, afforded them leisure to attend incessantly to this new calling. The meanness of their dress, the poverty of their monasteries, and, above all, the public mendicity and humility to which they bound themselves, could not fail to make the office of inquisitors one that flattered any relic of natural ambition which might yet lurk within their minds. The general renunciation which they made, even of the names of the families from which they sprang, must have gone a great way towards stifling those sentiments which the ties of kindred and civil connections generally inspire. Besides, the, austerity of their rules, and the severity which they were continually practicing upon themselves, were not likely to allow them to have much feeling for others. Lastly, they were zealous, as possessors of newly established religions commonly are; and they were learned, after the fashion of the times; that is to say, well versed in scholastic quibbles and in the new canon law. Moreover, they had a particular interest in the suppression of heretics, who were incessantly declaiming against them, and who spared no pains to discredit them in the minds of the people. On these monks, therefore, the pope conferred the office of inquisitors of the faith, and they acquitted themselves in such a manner as not to disappoint his expectations" (Shoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, 1, 103, 104). So much eagerness did they display in hunting up and prosecuting heretics, that a popular pun changed the name of Dominicans into *Domini canes* (the dogs of the Lord). To preserve the Church, however, from the charge of blood-guiltiness, the civil authorities were made the executioners of its judgments, and orders to that effect were caused to be issued in 1228 by Louis IX of France, in 1233 by Raymond of Toulouse, and in 1234 by Frederick II, the emperor of Germany. According to the regulations, the suspicion of heresy was sufficient cause for imprisonment; accomplices and culprits were deemed competent witnesses; the accused was never informed of his accusers, nor confronted with them; confession was extorted by torture, which, applied at first by

the civil authorities, was afterwards, for the sake of secrecy, entrusted to the inquisitors themselves. To enlarge also the sphere, and last, but hardly least, to increase the pecuniary income of the Inquisition, a very wide meaning was given to the word *heresy*. It was not confined to views which departed from the dogmas of the Church, or to sectarian tendencies, but was made to include usury, fortune-telling by the hands, signs: lots, etc., insulting the cross, despising the clergy, pretended connection with the leprosy, with Jews, demons and the devil, demonolatry, and witchcraft. The punishments were of three kinds: Upon those who recanted, besides penance in the severest form which the court might enact, was frequently inflicted even the deprivation of all civil and ecclesiastical rights and privileges, and the sequestration of goods; upon those not absolutely convicted, imprisonment for life; upon the obstinate or the relapsed, the penalty of death—death at the stake, death by the secular arm. “The Inquisition with specious hypocrisy, while it prepared and dressed up the victim for the burning, looked on with calm and approving satisfaction, as it had left the sin of lighting the fire to pollute other hands.” As if these horrible treatments of fellow-beings were not bad enough, pope Innocent IV in a bull (*De extirpanda*) in the year 1252, ordained that accused persons should be *tortured*, not merely to induce them to confess their own heresy, but also to compel them to accuse others. Such was the organization of the Inquisition in the 13th century — “a Christian code, of which the basis was a system of delation that the worst of the pagan emperors might have shuddered at as iniquitous; in which the sole act deserving of mercy might seem to be the Judas-like betrayal of the dearest and most familiar friend, of the kinsman, the parent, the child ... No falsehood was too false, no craft too crafty, no trick too base for this calm, systematic moral torture, which was to wring further confession against the heretic, denunciation against others. If the rack, the pulleys, the thumbscrew, and the boots were not yet invented or applied, it was not in mercy. Nothing that the sternest or most passionate historian has revealed, nothing that the most impressive romance-writer could have imagined, can surpass the cold, systematic treachery and cruelty of these so-called judicial formularies” (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 6:32, 33). The excessive cruelties, however, of the inquisitors, their knavery even in accusing the innocent and robbing them of their possessions, exasperated the people, and they rose up-against the inquisitors. At Toulouse and Narbonne the inquisitors were banished in 1235, and four of them killed in the former city in 1242, and the pope was finally obliged to suppress the tribunal at the

former place altogether. When at last restored, the inquisitorial tribunal resumed its former cruelty, until Philip the Fair (A.D. 1291) ordered the civil officers to exercise great caution in acting on the accusations made by the inquisitors. But what insurrections and royal edicts in France could not accomplish, ecclesiastico political events, such as the papal schism in the 14th, and the reformatory councils in the 15th century, were caused to bring about. The former crippled the power of the hierarchy with the latter, and limited thereby the power of the Inquisition, so that it now proceeded against secret or suspected heretics only on the accusation of sorcery and connection with the devil (compare the *Breve* of Nicholas V, in Raynald, a. 1451). In the 16th century, the time of the Reformation, the clergy, supported by the Guises, were able to rekindle violent persecutions against the Huguenots (q.v.), and endeavored to restore the Inquisition to its former power, but it had now lost its territory. Paul IV, it is true, published a bull (April 25, 1557) to re-establish it (Raynald, a. 1557, no. 29), and Henry II compelled Parliament to pass a corresponding edict; but Paul, who on his death-bed commended the Inquisition as the main support of the Romish Church (Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformations*, 3:248 sq.), died in 1559, and the new attempt to re-establish it failed; so that in France, where it took its rise first, it was also first discontinued, in spite of priest craft and Jesuitism. *The Inquisition in Germany*. — But from France the Inquisition soon cast its net over neighboring and distant countries, even beyond the ocean, by the aid of the Jesuits. Almost immediately after its firm establishment in France, the Inquisition spread to Germany. The first inquisitor was Conrad of Marburg, who organized the “holy office” with terrible severity during the years 1231-1233. The sentences of death which this new tribunal pronounced were not few in number, and of course they always obtained the approval of the emperor, Ferdinand II. But there was a higher power than that of the reigning prince, which had been lost sight of; and though the people’s voice was in those dark days not quite so powerful as in our own, it certainly sufficed to thwart the iniquitous designs of these “holy officers.” So energetically did the people and the nobles oppose the Inquisition, that it could carry out its sentences in a very few cases only. In 1233 the lower class of the people, always ready to execute judgment, took the law into their own hands, and Conrad of Marburg was slain in the streets of Strasburg. It was not really until the 14th century that the Inquisition can be said to have been properly established in Germany. It was at this time that the Beghards (q.v.) made their appearance. To suppress them, pope Urban V appointed in 1367 two

Dominicans as inquisitors, who engaged in a regular crusade against the new sect, and sustained by three different edicts of the emperor Charles IV, rendered in 1369, failed not to repeat in Germany the cruel practices of the French brethren of their order. Encouraged by their successes against the Beghards, and by the, to them, so favorable attitude of the emperor, pope Gregory XI increased in 1372 the number of the inquisitors to five, and in 1399 Boniface IX appointed no less than six of these “holy men” for such “holy” work for the north of Germany alone. But in proportion as the reformatory tendencies gained ground in Germany, the Inquisition lost its foothold. A desperate effort was made by Jacob Sprenger and Heinrich Kramer, two inquisitors appointed by Innocent VIII, under the plea of a prosecution of sorcerers and witches only. They even influenced the pope to publish the bull (*Sulmmis desiderantes affectibus*) in 1484 (Dec. 5) which reaffirmed the doctrines previously set forth concerning heresy in regard to sorcery and witchcraft, and the punishment by the Inquisition of those guilty of such crimes.’ To justify their harsh dealings as executors of the Romish dicta, and to hide their iniquitous work behind the screen of devotion to the cause of Christ, they published a code called “Hexenhammer” (*Malleus maleficorum*), in accordance with which the prosecution was to be carried on. In this way they proceeded to condemn and execute a large number of persons. The Reformation at last completely overthrew the power of the Inquisition in Germany, and the attempts-to re-establish it, made mostly by the Jesuits, with an endeavor to check the progress of evangelical truth, as in Austria, Bohemia, and Bavaria (where a tribunal of the Inquisition was formally established in 1599), proved ineffectual, and of short duration.

In *Italy* the Inquisition was introduced under the direction of the Dominicans in 1224, but it was not until 1235 that it was firmly established as a tribunal by pope Gregory IX. Just here it may not be amiss to state that Lacordaire, in his *Life of Dominic* (*Works*, 1, 95 sq.), seeks to relieve the memory of Dominic, and also the Dominican order, of the special odium which attaches to them from their agency in establishing and conducting the Inquisition (compare Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 284-292). The Dominicans certainly cannot be freed from this charge, which is too well founded, and the efforts of a Lacordaire even must prove to be in vain. But to return to the tribunal of Gregory IX. It was at this time intended especially against the Waldenses, who had fled from the south of France to Piedmont, and now threatened to infect all Italy with their

doctrines. Later its power was directed against other heretics; but the papal schism and the political commotions which agitated the country greatly weakened its power. The free states of which Italy was then composed neither could nor would long bear the arbitrary and vexatious proceedings” of the Inquisition; and “about the middle of the 14th century measures were generally adopted to restrain its exorbitant power, in spite of the opposition made by Clement VI and the censures which he fulminated. The right of the bishops to take part with the inquisitors in the examination of heretics was recognized; they were restricted to the simple cognizance of the charge of heresy, and deprived of the power of imprisonment, confiscation, fine, and corporal punishment, which was declared to belong solely to the secular arm” (M’Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 189; comp. Galluzzi, *Istor. del Granducato di Toscano*, 1, 142, 143). But such a mode of procedure the Church of Rome found to be ineffectual for suppressing free inquiry, and maintaining hierarchical authority, after the new opinions began to spread in Italy; and as in Germany and the south of France, so also here, the bishops in many instances having become lukewarm, some even dared to manifest a humane feeling towards those who chose to differ from them in religious views; the accused often suffered only very slight punishment, or were permitted to escape before the necessary orders for their arrest were issued. On these accounts pope Paul III finally resolved, at the instigation of cardinal John Peter Caraffa, to strengthen the power of the inquisitors by the establishment of the “Congregation of the Holy Office” (1534), with cardinal Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV) at their head, which the more zealous of the Romanists considered the only means of preserving Italy from being overrun with heresy. A constitution for a supreme and universal Inquisition at Rome was promulgated July 21, 1542, and operations commenced under it in 1543. Six cardinals now received the title and rights of inquisitors general, and authority was given them on both sides of the Alps “to try all causes of heresy, with the power of apprehending and incarcerating suspected persons and their abettors, of whatsoever estate, rank, or order, of nominating officers under them, and appointing inferior tribunals in all places, with the same or with limited powers” (M’Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 189 sq.; comp. Chandler’s Limborch, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, 1, 151; Llorente, *Histoire de Inqui.* 2, 78). But while the inquisitors were to extirpate heresy and punish heretics, the vicar of Christ reserved for himself the graces of reconciliation and absolution. In the arrogance which Rome has ever manifested, the power which belonged to the judge was withdrawn, and the power of life and death over

the subjects of the different governments of the world asserted to belong to the papal see. Of course the new cardinal inquisitors made full use of their powers, and soon became the terror not only of Rome and Italy, but of all the countries over which they could possibly exert any influence. The Inquisition was especially severe against the press. "Books were destroyed, and many more disfigured; printers were forbidden to carry on their business without licenses from the Holy Office." *SEE INDEX*. The terror-stricken people, however, soon gained their foothold again, and oppositions against the encroachments of Rome were everywhere manifest. The greatest resistance to it was offered in Venice. The republic refused to submit to an inquisitorial tribunal responsible solely to the pope, and, after long negotiations, permitted only the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal on condition that, with the papal officers, a certain number of magistrates and lawyers should always be associated, and that the definitive sentence should not, at least in the case of laics, be pronounced before it was submitted to the senate (Busdragi *Epistola: Scrinium Antiquar.* 1, 321, 326 sq.; Thuani. *Hist.* ad an. 1548). In Naples like difficulties between the government and the pope arose on the endeavor of the latter to establish the inquisitorial tribunal. Twice the Neapolitans had successfully resisted its establishment in their country at the beginning of the 16th century. In 1546, the emperor Charles V, with the view of extirpating the Lutheran heresy, renewed the attempt, and gave orders to set up that tribunal in Naples, after the same form in which it had long been established in Spain. The people rose in arms, and although Rome would have been only too glad to see this formidable tribunal established in Naples, yet, rather than to forego the introduction of an inquisitorial tribunal altogether, she took the part of the people against the government, and encouraged them in their opposition by telling them that they had reason for their fears, because the Spanish Inquisition (see below) was extremely severe. Here, it may be well to quote M'Crie (*Ref. in Italy*, p. 253 sq.) on the truth of this assertion, which many Protestant as well as Roman Catholic writers have not failed to repeat and urge in favor of the tendency to mercy at Rome. Says M'Crie: "Both the statement of the fact and the reasons by which it is usually accounted for require to be qualified. One of these reasons is the policy with which the Italians, including the popes, have always consulted their pecuniary interests, *to which they postponed every other consideration*. (Compare the opposition of the papacy to the Inquisition as a state institution in Portugal, below.) The second reason is that the popes, being temporal princes in the States of the

Church, had no occasion to employ the Inquisition to undermine the rights of the secular authorities in them, as in other countries. This is unquestionably true; and it accounts for the fact that the court of the Inquisition, long after its operations had been suspended in Italy, continued to be warmly supported by papal influence in Spain. But at the time of which I write, and during the remainder of the 16th century, it was in full and constant operation, and the popes found that it enabled them to accomplish what would have baffled their power as secular sovereigns. The chief difference between the Italian and Spanish Inquisitions at that period consisted in their respective lines of policy as to the mode of punishment. The latter sought to inspire terror by the solemn spectacle of a public act of justice, in which the scaffold was crowded with criminals. — The report of the autos da fe (q.v.) of Seville and Valasdolid blazed at once over Europe; the executions of Rome made less noise in the city because they were less splendid as well as more frequent, and the rumor of them died away before it could reach the ear of foreigners.” But all that Rome could accomplish in Naples, in spite of her cunning, was the establishment of an independent Inquisition, such as Venice had permitted. In Sicily, on the other hand, Spain furnished a general inquisitor, and, though abolished for a time, the office was restored in 1782, and remained in force until Napoleon, as king of Italy, did away with it throughout the realm in 1808. The fall of Napoleon, of course, at once enabled the papal see to re-establish the Inquisition, but, though Pius VII improved the opportunity (in 1814), it did not spread far, and met with great opposition. In Sardinia, where Gregory XVI restored it in 1833, it was not discontinued until the Revolution of 1848 again did away with it. “In Tuscany it was arranged that three commissioners, elected by the congregation at Rome, along with the local inquisitor, should judge in all causes of religion, and intimate their sentence to the duke, who was bound to carry it into execution. In addition, it (the Holy Office) was continually soliciting the local authorities to send such as were accused, especially if they were either ecclesiastical persons or strangers, to be tried by the Inquisition at Rome.” Everywhere within the territory persecution was let loose. Especially during the political reactions of 1849 the inquisitorial tribunal was perhaps nowhere so active and so severe in its dealings as in Tuscany (compare Ranke, *History of the Papacy*, 2, 156 sq.). It is only since the embodiment of that province with Italy (1859) that the country got rid of this great curse, from which all Italy suffered; and “popish historians” certainly “do more homage to truth than credit to their cause when they say that the erection of the Inquisition was

the salvation of the Catholic Church in Italy.” It certainly does not verify itself in our own days, though the tribunal of the Inquisition still exists at Rome, under the direction of a congregation, and though the last ecumenical council, which the landless pope, Pius IX, has just declared adjourned *sine die*, has but lately passed two canons (canon 6 and canon 12, *De Ecclesia Christi*) in its favor. Its action, by the circumstances of the day, is mainly confined to the examination of books, and to the trial of ecclesiastical offences and questions of Church law,-as in the late case of the Jewish boy Mortara; and its most remarkable prisoner in recent times was an Oriental impostor, who, by means of forged credentials, succeeded in obtaining his ordination as a bishop.

The Inquisition was introduced into *Poland* by pope John XXII in 1327, but it did not subsist there very long; and all attempts of Rome to introduce it into *England* were in vain.

*Spanish Inquisition.* — “The life of every devout Spaniard,” says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, 5, 239), “was a perpetual crusade. By temperament and by position he was in constant adventurous warfare against the enemies of the Cross: hatred of the Jew, of the Mohammedan, was the banner under which he served; it was the oath of his chivalry: that hatred, in all its intensity, was soon and easily extended to the heretic.” No wonder, then, that pope Gregory IX, after the Inquisition had assumed general form in France and Germany, introduced it into Spain, and that it proved to be a plant on a most congenial soil; for it was in Spain that “it took root at once, and in times attained a magnitude which it never reached in any other country.” It was first introduced into Aragon, where, in 1242. the Council of Tarragona gave the instructions which were to serve the “holy office” erected here as elsewhere by the Dominicans. “Accustomed, in the confessional, to penetrate into the secrets of conscience, they (the Dominicans) converted to the destruction of the bodies of men all those arts which a false zeal had taught them to employ for the saving of their souls. Inflamed with a passion for extirpating heresy, and persuading themselves that the end sanctified the means, they not only acted upon, but formally laid down, as a rule for their conduct, maxims founded on the grossest deceit and artifice, according to which they sought in every way to ensnare their victims, and by means of false statements, delusory promises, and a tortuous course of examination, to betray them into confessions which proved fatal to their lives and fortunes. To this mental torture was soon after added the use of bodily tortures, together with the concealment



of the names of witnesses” (M’Crie, *Ref. in Spain*, p. 85 sq.). The arm of persecution was directed with special severity, in the 13th and 14th centuries, against the Albigenses (q.v.), who, from the proximity and political relations of Aragon and Province, had become numerous in the former kingdom. Indeed, the persecutions appear to have been chiefly confined to this unfortunate sect, “and there is no evidence that the ‘holy office,’ notwithstanding papal briefs to that effect, was fully organized in Castile before the reign of Isabella. This is, perhaps, imputable to the paucity of heretics in that kingdom. It cannot, at any rate, be charged to any lukewarmness in its sovereigns, since they, from the time of St. Ferdinand, who heaped the fagots on the blazing pile with his own hands, down to that of John the Second, Isabella’s father, who hunted the unhappy heretics of Biscay, like so many wild beasts, among the mountains, had ever evinced a lively zeal for the orthodox faith.” Upon the whole, the progress of the Inquisition during the 14th century was steady, and its vigor and energy constantly on the increase. Its jurisdiction the inquisitors succeeded in enlarging, and they severally multiplied its ramifications; autos da fé (q.v.) were celebrated in a number of places, and its victims were not a few. “By the middle of the 15th century the Albigensian heresy had become nearly extirpated by the Inquisition of Aragon, so that this infernal engine might have been suffered to sleep undisturbed from want of sufficient fuel to keep it in motion, when new and ample materials were discovered in the unfortunate race of Israel.” “The ‘new Christians,’ or ‘converts,’ as those who had renounced the faith of their fathers were denominated, were occasionally preferred to high ecclesiastical dignities, which they illustrated by their integrity and learning. They were entrusted with municipal offices in the various cities of Castile; and as their wealth furnished an obvious resource for repairing, by way of marriage, the decayed fortunes of the nobility, there was scarcely a family of rank in the land whose blood had not been contaminated at some period or other by mixture with the *mala sangre*, as it came afterwards to be termed, of the house of Judah; an ignominious stain which no time has been deemed sufficient wholly to purge.” Many of these noble men, of a race that can lay claim to the highest nobility that exists among men, felt that the irksome task of dissimulation which they had undertaken was too much below the dignity of a true Israelite, and rather than enjoy the favors of a nation as apostates from a religion which they still held to be the only true one (and who would expect that Romish treatment and Romish Christian example could instill confidence and produce impressions

favorable to the cause of Christ?), preferred an open confession of the opinions which they cherished in their hearts, even at the expense of losing positions of prominence to which they were ably fitted, but from which, as is too often the case even in our own day, their religious convictions, if openly avowed, not only debarred them, but which even endangered their very life. But Romish priests could not, of course, be expected to tolerate *heresy* in any form, “especially the Dominicans, who seem to have inherited the quick scent for heresy which distinguished their frantic founder; they were not slow in sounding the alarm, and the superstitious populace, easily roused to acts of violence in the name of religion, began to exhibit the most tumultuous movements, and actually massacred the constable of Castile in an attempt to suppress them at Jaen, the year preceding the accession of Isabella” (Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, 1, 235 sq.). After the union of Spain under one kingdom, governed by Ferdinand and Isabella, towards the close of the 15th century, the Inquisition became general. It was at this time that the inquisitorial tribunal underwent “what its friends have honored with the name of a *reform*; in consequence of which it became a more terrible engine of persecution than before. Under this new form it is usually called the Modern Inquisition, though it may with equal propriety bear the name of the Spanish, as it originated in Spain, and has been confined to that country, including Portugal, and the dominions subject to the two monarchies.... The principles of the ancient and modern Inquisition were radically the same, but they assumed a more malignant form under the latter than under the former. Under the ancient Inquisition the bishops always had a certain degree of control over its proceedings; the law of secrecy was not so rigidly enforced in practice; greater liberty was allowed to the accused on their defense; and in some countries, as in Aragon, in consequence of the civil rights acquired by the people, the inquisitors were restrained from sequestering the property of those whom they convicted of heresy. But the leading difference between the two institutions consisted in the organization of the latter into one great independent tribunal which, extending over the whole kingdom, was governed by one code of laws, and yielded implicit obedience to one head. The inquisitor general possessed an authority scarcely inferior to that of the king or the pope; by joining with either of them, he proved an overmatch for the other; and when supported by both, his power was irresistible. The ancient Inquisition was a powerful engine for harassing and rooting out a small body of dissidents; the modern Inquisition stretched its iron arms over a whole nation, upon which it lay like a monstrous incubus, paralyzing its exertions, crushing its energies,

and extinguishing every other feeling but a sense of weakness and terror” (M’Crie, *Ref. in Spain*, p. 86, 103). Most prominent among those who were active in bringing about this new order of things were the archbishop of Seville, Petro Gonzalez de Mendoza, the Franciscan (afterwards cardinal) Ximenes, and the Dominican prior Torquemada. But to the credit of Isabella be it said, that it was only her zeal for the cause of her Church that led her, when misguided, to commit the unfortunate error; “an error so grave that, like a vein in some noble piece of statuary, it gives a sinister expression to her otherwise unblemished character” (Prescott). Indeed, it was only after repeated importunities of the clergy, particularly of those whom she believed to be sincere as herself in the zeal for the Romish religion, and only these when seconded by the arguments of Ferdinand, who, to his shame be it said, favored the project because he believed it likely to result in filling his coffer by means of confiscations, that she consented to solicit from the pope a bull for the establishment of the “holy office” in Castile. “Sixtus IV, who at that time filled the pontifical chair, easily discerning the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome, readily complied with the petition of the sovereigns, and expedited a bull bearing date Nov. 1, 1478, authorizing them to appoint two or three ecclesiastics inquisitors for the detection and suppression, of heresy throughout their dominions” (Prescott, 1, 248,249). The appointment of these officers was made Sept. 17, 1480, the clergy in confidence with the queen professing to have failed in their attempts “to illuminate the benighted Israelites by means of friendly exhortation and a candid exposition of the true principles of Christianity,” which Isabella had counseled before violent measures were resorted to January 2, 1481, the new inquisitors commenced their proceedings in the Dominican convent of St. Paul, at Seville. But the tribunal did not really assume a permanent form until two years later, when the Dominican monk Thomas de Torquemada, the queen’s confessor, subsequently raised to the rank of prior of Santa Cruz in Segovia, was placed at its head as inquisitor general first of Castile, and afterwards of Aragon. “This man, who concealed more pride under his monastic weeds than might have furnished forth a convent of his order, was one of that class with whom zeal passes for religion, and who testify their zeal by a fiery persecution of those whose creed differs from their own; who compensate for their abstinence from sensual indulgence by giving scope to those deadlier vices of the heart, pride, bigotry, and intolerance, which are no less opposed to virtue, and are far more extensively mischievous to society” (Prescott, 1, 247). Torquemada at

once set about his work, appointing his assessors, and erecting subordinate tribunals in different cities of the united kingdom. Over the whole was placed the *Council of the Supreme*, consisting of the inquisitor general as president, and three counselors, two of whom were doctors of law. His next employment was the formation of a body of laws for the government of his new tribunal. This appeared in 1484; additions to it followed from time to time; and as a diversity of practice had crept into the subordinate courts, the inquisitor general Valdes in 1561 made a revisal of the whole code, which was published in eighty-one articles, and continues, with the exception of a few slight alterations, to be the law to this day. They are substantially as follows: the accused was invited three times *edictaliter* to appear. If he did not come before the tribunal, he was excommunicated *il contumaciam*, and condemned to pay a fine, under reservation of more severe punishment if the Inquisition saw fit to apply such. Seldom did any one escape, for familiars, the holy Hermandad, and the Congregation of the Cruciada tracked mercilessly all who were denounced to the Inquisition. If the accused appeared before the court he was at once seized, and from that moment all his relations and friends were to abandon him as an outlaw, and he was not even permitted to give proofs of his innocence. The prisoner and his house were now thoroughly searched, especially for papers or books, a list taken of all his possessions, and in general, his goods sequestered at once, to provide beforehand for the expenses of his trial. His hair was cut to make his recognition more certain in case he should escape, and he was placed in a dark cell. If he confessed his real or imputed sin, he did indeed escape with his life, as his confession was considered a proof of repentance, but he and all his family were dishonored, and became incapable of holding any office. If he asserted his innocence, and there was not sufficient proof against him to condemn him, he was liberated, but carefully watched by *the familiares* as an object of suspicion, and generally was soon arrested a second time. Now commenced against him the real, slow trial of the Inquisition, conducted after the *Directorium Inquisitorium* of the grand inquisitor of Aragon, Nicolas Eymericus. When the prisoner refused for acknowledge his fault at the first interrogatory, he was remanded to prison; after many months he was again brought forth, and asked to swear before a crucifix that he would tell the truth. If now he did not confess, he was immediately considered guilty, otherwise he was plied with leading questions until thoroughly bewildered. The defender was not allowed to take his client's part, but only to invite him to declare the truth. Witnesses were not named, and their testimony the truth' of which they

were not required to prove, was only made known in disconnected fragments, and years after it had been given. Any sort of testimony was admitted. Two witnesses who would only testify of a hearsay were considered equivalent to an eye-witness. The accuser was examined as a witness. Friends and members of the family were also admitted to testify, but only against the prisoner, never in his favor. If the accused still persisted in asserting his innocence, he was now tortured by the whip, the water, and fire, under the direction of the inquisitors and the bishop of the diocese. If the prisoner then confessed, he was tortured a second time, to make him declare his motives, and afterwards a third time, to make him name his accomplices; and when the inquisitors had obtained from him all they wanted, they left him to his sufferings, without allowing a physician to assist him. After this confession the prisoner was considered penitent, yet recantation was still demanded of him *de levi*; if heresy or Judaism was his crime, *devehementi*; and when he became reconciled to the Church, *informa*, which latter included a free assent to all further punishments the Inquisition might yet see fit to inflict on the penitent. After that he was generally condemned to imprisonment for life, or sent to the galleys, his possessions sequestered, and his family dishonored. Those who confessed and recanted at once were punished only by having to wear for a certain time the *sanbenito* (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black underfrock (comp. *Encyclop. Britan.* 12, 390). The penitent (*sanbenitado*) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; when he had accomplished his penance, the *sanbenito* was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a statement of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a confession, the accused was put into a worse prison: if this did not succeed, the inquisitors tried the opposite plan: they made the accused comfortable, allowed his family and friends to have access to him, and led him to think that a confession of his fault and profession of repentance would procure his pardon. When one suspected of heresy died, or when such suspicion arose after his death, the trial was carried on notwithstanding. If forty years had elapsed between the death of the party and his accusation, his descendants were permitted to remain in their possessions, but were dishonored, and incapable of holding office. If the remains of the accused could be found, they were burnt; if not, then he was burnt in effigy. When a number of trials were concluded, an auto da fe took place, i.e. the condemned were, with great pomp and parade, publicly burnt. *SEE AUTO DA FE*. A very able article in the

*Galaxy* (May, 1870, p. 647 sq.), entitled *Ten Years in Rome*, the reader would do well to examine. It is written by one who has held high office under the present Roman pontiff, and who has enjoyed peculiar advantages for an extended examination of the authentic sources on the subject of the Inquisition. The position of subordinate member of the Inquisition (*familiare*), whose duties consisted in arresting the accused and taking them to prison, was much sought after, even by members of the highest families, on account of the privileges and indulgences attached to it. The tribunal of Madrid had branches in the provinces and colonies, each composed of three inquisitors, three secretaries, an alguazil, three receivers and assessors, familiars and jailers. Every one connected with the Inquisition had to submit to the *Casa limpia*, i.e. to prove his descent from honorable and orthodox parents, who had never been summoned before the Inquisition, and to take the oath of secrecy.

From the details of the proceedings of the inquisitorial tribunal which we have just enumerated, it clearly follows that “the Inquisition possessed powers which enabled it effectually to arrest the progress of knowledge, and to crush every attempt which might be made for the reformation of religion and the Church.” The terrors which Torquemada’s tribunal spread by imprisonment, tortures, etc., not only called forth complaints from the Cortes, but even provoked rebellions, followed by assassinations of the inquisitors (Llorente, 1, 187 sq., 211 sq.); but it still prosecuted its bloody work. The suspicion of belonging to Judaism or Islamism, of protecting Jews or Moors, of practicing soothsaying, magic, and blasphemy, caused an endless number of trials. Upon the inquisitor general’s advice, all Jews who would not become Christians were compelled (1492) to emigrate; a similar fate befell the Moors (1501). The number of victims, as stated by Llorente, the popular historian of the Inquisition, is positively appalling. He affirms that during the sixteen years of Torquemada’s tenure of office (1483-1498) nearly 9000 were condemned to the flames, 6500 were burned in effigy, and more than 90,000 were subjected to various penalties, besides a still larger number who were *reconciled*; “a term which must not be misunderstood by the reader to signify anything like a pardon or amnesty, but only the commutation of a capital sentence for inferior penalties, as fines, civil incapacity, very generally total confiscation of property, and not infrequently imprisonment for life” (Prescott, *Ferd. and Isab.* 1, 253; comp. also p. 267). His successor, Diego Deza, in eight years (1499-1506), according to the same writer, put above 1600 to a similar

death. Under the third general inquisitor, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros (1507-17), 2536 persons were killed, 1368 were burned in effigy, and 47,263 were punished in other ways (Llorente, 4, 252). Not much better are the records of the proceedings of the other successive inquisitors general. M'Crie (*Reform. in Spain*, p. 109) 'very rightly asserts that cardinal Ximenes, more than any other inquisitor general, contributed towards riveting the chains of political and spiritual despotism of Spain. "Possessed of talents that enabled him to foresee the dire effects which the Inquisition would inevitably produce, he was called to take part in public affairs at a time when these effects had decidedly appeared. It was in his power to abolish that execrable tribunal altogether as an insufferable nuisance, or at least to impose such checks upon its procedure as would have rendered it comparatively harmless. 'Yet he not only allowed himself to be placed at its head, but employed all his influence and address in defeating every attempt to reform its worst and most glaring abuses .. Ximenes had obtained the title of a great man from foreigners as well as natives of Spain. But in spite of the eulogiums passed upon him, I cannot help being of opinion, with a modern writer, that Ximenes bore a striking resemblance to Philip II, with this difference, that the cardinal was possessed of higher talents, and that his proceedings were characterized by a certain openness and impartiality, the result of the unlimited confidence which he placed in his own powers. His character was essentially that of a monk, in whom the severity of his order was combined with the impetuosity of blood which belongs to the natives of the South" (p. 110-112). Roman Catholics, of course, loudly protest against the credibility of these fearful allegations, assert that Llorente was a violent partisan, and allege that in his work on the Basque Provinces he had already proved himself a venal and unscrupulous fabricator; but they find it impossible to disprove his accuracy, and all that can possibly be done we see clearly in the efforts of one of the Catholic critics-Hefele, in his *Life of Cardinal Ximenes-who* produces many examples of Llorente's statements which he alleges are of a contradictory and exaggerated nature. Some Protestant historians, of course, fear that Llorente may have been too severe, as is apt to be the case with all apostates, and thus Prescott; in his *Ferdinand and Isabella* (3, 467-470), has pointed out many instances similar to those which Hefele produces, and Ranke does not hesitate (*Fuirsten und Vilker des Südl. Europas*, 1, 242) to impeach his honesty; Prescott even pronounces his 'computations greatly exaggerated,' and his "estimates most improbable" (3, 468). Still, with all the deductions which it is possible

to make, even Roman Catholics must acknowledge that the working of the Inquisition in Spain, and in its dependencies in the *New World* too, involves an amount of cruelty which it is impossible to contemplate without horror.

But, in spite of the terrors which it spread, voices were repeatedly heard in Spain to pronounce against it, especially when it developed all its power to crush out evangelical doctrines during the great Reformation of the 16th century. Hatred towards it had spread itself far through the country (M' Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, chap. 5); and when Charles V ascended the throne, the Cortes of Castile, Aragon, and Catalonia endeavored to bring to pass a reformation of the tribunal (Llorente, 1 376 sq.). Negotiations to accomplish this end were entered into with the papal chair, and concessions were made, but they were not carried out. It directed its power now against those who openly or secretly adhered to evangelical doctrines. It published annually an edict of denunciation, and convened its chief tribunals at Seville and Valladolid. But it also directed its power against such members of its own Church as did not accept the doctrines of the Council of Trent concerning justification. As, however, they succeeded in entirely suppressing Protestantism in Spain before the beginning of the 17th century, executions became rarer, and in the latter half of the 17th century the Inquisition abated its rigor, and was active principally in suppressing books and persecuting those who possessed or circulated forbidden books. Autos da fé were hardly ever heard of, and, as a result, the tribunal was less feared; and, finally, even Charles III forbade first the execution of capital punishment without royal warrant, and afterwards also set further limits to the power of the Inquisition, preventing it from rendering any final decision without the assent of the king, and also from making any new regulations. In 1762 the grand inquisitor was exiled into a convent for condemning a book against the king's will. In 1770 his minister Aranda circumscribed its power still further by forbidding the imprisonment of any royal subject, unless his guilt was well substantiated; and in 1784 followed the provision that the papers of every suit against a grandee, minister, or any other officer in the employ of the king, should always be presented to the sovereign for inspection before judgment could be pronounced; and although it afterwards regained ground for a while, public opinion proved too averse to it. Even the pope began to restrict its powers, and it was finally abolished in Madrid, Dec. 4, 1808, by an edict of Joseph Napoleon. Llorente calculates that from the time of its introduction into Spain (1481) to that date (1808), the Inquisition had condemned in



Spain alone 341,021 persons. Of these, 31,912 persons were burnt alive, 17,659 in effigy, and 291,456 others punished severely. When Ferdinand VII regained the throne of Spain in 1814, one of his first acts was the reestablishment of the Inquisition, but also one of the first acts of the Revolution of 1820 was the destruction of the palace of the Inquisition by the people, and the institution was suppressed by the Cortes. Yet, after the restoration, the apostolical party continued to demand its re-establishment; an inquisitorial junta was organized in 1825, and the old tribunal finally restored in 1826. The law of July 15, 1834, again suspended the Inquisition, after sequestering all-its possessions, and the Constitution of 1855 expressly declares that no one shall be made to suffer for his faith. Yet in 1857 the Inquisition showed itself still very vigorous in persecuting all persons suspected of Protestantism, and all books containing their doctrines. Such as were found with heretical books in their possession, or had read them, were severely punished. The great political changes which the last few years have wrought on all the civilized world have not been without marked effects on Spain, and have removed not only in a measure, but, we hope, altogether, the deplorable effects of the Romish spirit of unmitigated intolerance, which has ever been praised, preached, and imperatively enjoined as one of the highest of Christian virtues by the antichristian see of Rome. Indeed the Inquisition, not only in Rome, but in every land, the papacy considered its masterpiece, "the firmest and most solid support of its power, both spiritual and temporal. Hence it put all things under the feet of its tribunal in the countries subject to its authority. There the most extravagant maxims were held to be incontestable, and the most unfounded pretensions established beyond dispute. Thus the infallibility of the popes, their superiority to general councils, their dominion over the possessions of all the churches in the world, the power to dispose of them as they pleased, their pretended authority over the temporal concerns of sovereigns, the right which they claim of deposing them, of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance, and giving away their dominions, are maxims which none dared to doubt in the countries of the Inquisition, much less to contest them, lest they should expose themselves to all the horrors of that detestable tribunal. No wonder that the popes, in return, so warmly supported all its pretensions, and earnestly and incessantly labored to procure for it so extensive an authority, that it at length became formidable to the very princes by whom it was adopted" (Shoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*; 1, 113 sq.). These assertions, written (in 1844) long before the occurrence of the late so

auspicious events, deserve especial consideration, as among the first changes which the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy must inevitably bring is religious *freedom* all over the world. ((Comp. also Guettee, *The Papacy* [N. Y. 1867, 12mo], Introd. p. 4 sq.)

*Portugal.* — From Spain the Inquisition was introduced into the different countries over which it held its sway. Thus it was not really introduced into Portugal until ‘its union with Spain in 1557, and only then after much opposition. It is true, under king Joan III of Portugal, an effort was made to establish the tribunal against the New-Christians of that country, imitating the Spaniards in this respect, and Henrique, the bishop of Ceuta, a former Franciscan monk and fanatic, even took the law in his own hands, and executed five New-Christians, to ‘hasten the establishment of the Inquisition. Many reasons swayed in favor to tolerate the Jews in Portugal, and they, of course, were in that country the first against whom the tribunal was intended to direct the bloody work. In 1531 Clement VII was even persuaded to issue a breve (Dec. 17) to introduce the Inquisition, but already, in the year following (Oct. 17, 1532), he revoked this order (comp. Herculano, *Origem da Inquisicao em Portugal*, 1, 276 sq., et al.). But when the Inquisition, under Spanish influence, was at last introduced, as in Spain, it became also in Portugal a tribunal of the crown, and it is for this reason Roman Catholic writers argue that the see of Rome cannot be held responsible for the horrible deeds that it enacted in these two countries and in their dependencies. It is true, some of the popes protested against the establishment of the Inquisition *as a state tribunal*, but it must be remembered that the opposition was directed against it (as in Italy, above) not so much on account of its cruel measures, but because it chose to be independent of Rome. Indeed the popes, feeling their power insufficient to enforce obedience, found themselves compelled, from motives of prudence, to tolerate what they were powerless to suppress; i.e. unable to establish the Inquisition under their own immediate control, with the benefits accruing there from all flowing into their own treasury they yielded to a state tribunal, that gave them at least a part in the proceedings, as well as a part of the spoils. The highest tribunal of the Portuguese Inquisition was, of course, at Lisbon, the capital of the country, and the appointment of the grand inquisitor at the pleasure of the king, nominally also subject to the approval of the pope. When, finally, Portugal became again independent under the duke of Braganza as John IV (1640), an effort was made by the Royalists to abolish the Inquisition, and to deprive it of

the right of sequestration. But John' IV found too strong an opposition in the priesthood, especially in the ever-plotting Jesuits, and he was prevented from executing his intentions successfully. After his death he was himself put under the ban, and his body was only a long time after officially absolved from this, one of the grossest sins a son of Rome could possibly have permitted, the attempt to cleanse his Church from the sin of unrighteousness. In the 18th century the Inquisition was further restricted in its activity and privileges by Pedro II (1706),<sup>a</sup> and a still more decided step was taken by Pombal under his son and successor, Joseph I. The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and the inquisitorial tribunal was commanded by law to communicate to the arrested the accusations presented against him or them, the names of the accusers and witnesses, the right of an attorney to hold communication with the accused, and it was furthermore decreed that no sentence should be executed without the assent of the civil courts. At the same time, the auto da fe was also forbidden. After the fall of Pombal and the death of Joseph I the clergy regained their power for a season, but the spirit of enlightenment had made too great inroads not to conflict with the interference of the priests, and under king John VI (1818-26), when "this great engine for the coercion of the human mind, if worked with the unscrupulous, impassive resolution of Machiavellianism," could no longer be made to accomplish its purpose, it breathed its last, and the very records of its proceedings were condemned to the flames.

*Netherlands.* — From Spain the Inquisition was also introduced into the Netherlands as early as the 13th century, and from this time forward exerted in this country, next to Spain, her authority most unscrupulously. Especially active was its tribunal during the Reformation. After a severe edict by Charles V at Worms against the heretics (May 8, 1521), he appointed as inquisitors to the Netherlands his councilor, Franz von der Hulst, and the Carmelite Nicolas of Egmont. They at once set out to do their task, and to inflict the usual penalties on their victims—banishment, etc. — and found especial helpmeets in the regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria, in connection with the bishop of Arras, Granvella. The printing, sale, and possession of heretical books were strictly forbidden, and the magistrates were required, under penalty of loss of office, to be active in discovering heretics, and send a quarterly report of their labors to the regent; the informers to receive a considerable reward for any proof (Raumer's *Briefe*, 1, 164 sq.). Nevertheless, the Reformation spread, and

the Inquisition was not even able to prevent the rise of fanatical sects, as the Anabaptists (q.v.), etc. But Charles, determined to uproot the Reformation, issued a new mandate for the organization of the Inquisition after the Spanish form (April 20, 1550) (see Sleidani *Commentarii*, ed. chr. car. Am Ende: Fref. ad M. 1785, 3, 203; Gerdesii *Hist. Reformat.* 3, App. p. 122). But this attempt, like the former one, also failed. Maria, the widowed queen of Hungary, who in secret inclined to the Reformation, was now regent. Deputations of the citizens made her aware of the dangers which threatened her on that account; she went immediately to Germany to Charles, and was successful in effecting a change of the mandate in so far that in a new form of it (issued September 25, 1550) the words "Inquisition" and "inquisitors" were omitted. But it was still opposed, and could only be published in Antwerp on the condition of the municipal rights being preserved (Gerdesii, *ut sup.* 3, 216 sq.). That the Inquisition was very active up to this time in the Netherlands is certain; but the accounts that, under Charles V, 50,000, or even 100,000 persons lost their lives by it in that country (Sculteti *Annales*, p. 87; Grotii *Annales et Historiae de rebus Belgicis*, Amst. 1658, p. 12), seems to be exaggerated. When the Netherlands were placed under the government of Philip II a more severe policy was initiated, determined, if possible, not to modify the existing heresies, but to extinguish them altogether. The Inquisition was at once set in full motion, and a zeal was manifested by its tribunal worthy of a better cause. But the cruelties which followed a people determined to worship their God in the manner which seemed to them a plain duty could excite no fear, but rather added new fuel to the flame already confined to too narrow limits, and it at last burst forth in all its maddened fury. At first the cities Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp, and Herzogenbusch united in demanding the abolition of the Inquisition. Their example was imitated, and in February, 1556, a league of the nobility, called the Compromise, was formed, which energetically but humbly made the same request (Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 3, 390 sq.). After some delay this was accomplished in 1567. Shortly after, however, the terrible Alba was dispatched to the Netherlands with unlimited power. Margaret was forced to resign the regency, and he now proceeded with unheard-of cruelty against those who had become suspected, or whose riches attracted him. Upon the 16th of February, 1568, by a sentence of the holy office, *all the inhabitants* of the Netherlands were condemned *to death* as heretics. "From this universal doom only a few persons especially named were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition,

and ordered it to be carried into instant execution. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines" (Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, 2, 155). But even with these measures they failed in uprooting the Reformation as a dangerous heresy, and in 1573, when the provinces had almost become a waste, and depopulated by the emigration of hundreds of thousands and the execution of thousands of its most valuable citizens, Philip saw himself under the necessity of recalling the duke. The lesson that had been taught Spain was, however, insufficient to incline her to moderation. Philip now, as much as ever, was determined to uproot heresy by force, and these further attempts resulted finally in the independence of the northern provinces of the Netherlands, by a formidable union which they formed at Utrecht in 1579, and which the peace of Westphalia guaranteed to them. In the southern provinces the Jesuits continued to rule for a time, but soon there also the spirit of freedom abrogated their power, and the Inquisition, "all-seeing as Providence, inexorable as the grave; not inflicting punishment which the sufferer could remember but remorselessly killing outright; not troubling itself to ascertain the merits of a case, and giving the accused the benefits of a doubt, but regarding suspicion and certainty as the same thing," was driven from the land.

*Countries outside of Europe.* — The Inquisition was introduced into the transatlantic countries also by Portugal, and especially by Spain, to which "the see of Rome, in virtue of the universal authority which it arrogated, had granted all the countries which she might discover beyond the Atlantic," and the Spaniards, reflecting that they had expelled the Jews, the hereditary and inveterate enemies of Christianity, from their coasts, and overturned the Mohammedan empire which had been established for ages in the Peninsula, began to consider themselves as the favorites of Heaven, destined to propagate and defend the true faith, and "thus the glory of the Spanish arms became associated with the extirpation of heresy." In the New World the Inquisition established its power, especially in Mexico. It was also terribly severe in Carthagenia and Lima. By the Portuguese it was taken to East India, and had its chief seat at Goa. Under John VII of Portugal it was, after it had undergone several modifications, wholly abolished both in Brazil and East India.

*Literature.* — Nicol Eymericus, *Directorium inquisitorum* (Barcelona, 1503; Rome, 1578, etc.; with commentaries by Pegna, Venice, 1607); Ursini, *Hispan. inquisitionis et carnificinae secretiora* (Antw. 1611);

Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis* (Amst. 1692); Plüm, *Ursprung u. Absichten d. I.*; Maurique, *Sammlung d. Instructionen d. Spanischen L* (1630); Cramer, *Briefe 2. die I.* (Leipzig, 1784-85, 2 vols.); *Erzahlungen v. d. Stiftung, etc., der I.* (Cologne, 1784); Llorente, *Hist. critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (Par. 1815-17, 4 vols.); Ant. Puigblanch, *Die entlarvte I.* (Weimar, 1817)ᵑ; Sarpi, *Discorso dell Origine del' Uffzio dell' Inquisition* (1639), a very able, though short sketch; Rule, *Hist. of Inquisition* (ed. by Dr. Harris); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8, chap. 12, 13; 9, chap. 7, 8; 10, 99 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); M'Crie, *Hist. of the Reformation in Italy; Hist. of the Reformation in Sptin*; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy* (see Index); Schoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, 1, 102 sq.; Prescott, *Ferd. and Isabella* (see Index); *Philip II* (see Index); Motley, *Hist. of Dutch Republic* (see Index); Chambers, *Cyclop. s.v.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 677 sq.; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, 8, 271 sq.; *Quart. Rev.* 6, 313 sq.; 10, 204 sq.; *Blackwood's Mag.* 20, 70 sq.; *N. A. Rev.* 80, 504 sq.; Janus, *Pope and the Council*, p. 235 sq.; *English Rev.* 11, 438; *Contemp. Rev.* July, 1869, p. 455; *Method. Quart. Rev.* April, 1870, p. 309; *West. Rev.* 1856, p. 177; also *British Critic* of 1827, and *Museum of Foreign Lit. and Science* (Phila.) of the same year, in which appeared a critical survey of a number of works treating on the Inquisition; Rule, *The Brand of Doninic, of the Inquisition at Rome supreme and universal* (Lond. 1852, 12mo); (Roman Catholic), B. Vicufia Mackenna, *Francisco Moyen, or the Inquisition as it was in South America* (Lond. 1869, 8vo); Balmez, *Catholicism and Protestantism compared in Relation to Civilization*; Herculano, *Da origem e estabelecimento da inquisifao em Portugal* (Lissabon, 1854-1856, 2 vols.); Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 266 et al. (J. H.W.)

## Inquisitor

SEE INQUISITION.

## I.N.R.J.

are the initials for *Jesus Nazarenus Rex Judcorum* (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews), frequently met with as inscriptions. SEE CROSS OF CHRIST.

## Insabbatati

SEE WALDENSIANS.

## Insacrati

the name usually given in the ancient canons to the inferior clergy. The superior clergy are commonly called the ἱερούμενοι, *holy* or *sacred*; the others *insacrati*, unconsecrated. Different ceremonies were observed at their ordination: the higher orders were set apart at the altar by the solemn imposition of hands; the others had no imposition of hands. The superior orders ministered as priests, celebrating the sacraments and preaching in the church; the inferior performed some lower or ordinary duties, and generally attended upon the others in their sacred services. *SEE INFERIOR CLERGY.*

## Inscriptions

carved on stone have in all ages been regarded by cultivated, and sometimes even by rude nations, as the most enduring monuments of remarkable events. Thus the early patriarch Job would have his dying profession of faith “graven with iron in the rock forever” (~~1824~~ Job 19:24). Moses inscribed the law upon stones, and set them up permanently in Mt. Ebal (~~1820~~ Deuteronomy 27:2-8; ~~1880~~ Joshua 8:30). *SEE PILLAR.*

The oldest inscriptions now known to us are the Chinese, which profess to ascend to B.C. 2278. Those of India date only back to B.C. 315, the age of Sandracottus; but it has been thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions of Central America and of Mexico may prove to be of much older date than those of China even. The Egyptian inscriptions are generally acknowledged to be as old as B.C. 2000; next in order come the Assyrian and Babylonian, reaching nearly as high an antiquity and then follow the Persian, and Median, and Phoenician, ail of about B.C. 700, while the Greek date only to B.C. 500 and 600, and the Etruscan and Roman to no remoter date than the Indian. i.e. B.C. 400-300. The most remarkable of all the known inscriptions are the trilingual inscription of Rosetta, that of Shalmanezer on the obelisk of Nimrud, and the cylinder of Sennacherib; the trilingual inscription of Darius I on the rock at Behistun; the Greek inscription of the soldiers of Psammetichus at Ipsamboul, and of the bronze helmet dedicated by Hiero I to the Olympian Jupiter; the inscription on the coffin of the Cyprian king Asmumazer; the Etruscan inscription called the Eugubine Tables; that of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth, at Rome, and the will of Augustus at Ancyra; the inscription of the Ethiopian monarch Silco; the old monument of Yu, and the inscription of Se-gan-fu, recording the arrival

of Christianity in China (A.D. 631); the inscriptions of Chandra-gupta and Asoka in India.

## Picture for Inscriptions 1a

## Picture for Inscriptions 2a

**I. Egyptian Hieroglyphics.** — These are at once the most ancient, the most copious, and the most instructive of all relics of this description extant. The Egyptians used three modes of writing: (1) the *Enchorial* or *Demotic*, the common language of the country; (2) the *Hieratic*, peculiar to the priests; and (3) the *Hieroglyphic*. Hieroglyphics, again, are of three kinds: (1.) *Phonetic*, when the hieroglyphic stands for a letter; (2.) *Emblematic* or *Symbolic*, when it is an emblem or symbol of the thing represented; (3.) *Figurative*, when it is a representation of the object itself. The annexed engraving will give some idea of the four different kinds of Egyptian characters; by this it will be seen that in some cases the derivation of the demotic character is to be traced, through its various gradations, from the original pure hieroglyphic, while in others the resemblance is utterly lost. We illustrate this subject by a few examples, pointing out the various meanings attached to the Egyptian characters under different circumstances. The names of the gods were in general expressed by symbols and not by letters; “in the same manner, the Jews never wrote at full length the ineffable name of Jehovah, but always expressed it by a short mark, which they pronounced Adonai.” These representations were of two kinds: *figurative*, in which the name of the deity is implied by the form in which he was represented in his statue, and *symbolic*, in which a part of the statue, or some object having a reference to the deity, was employed, as for instance:

Dr. Young and Mr. Tattam have satisfactorily shown that all that has come down to us of the language and literature of ancient Egypt is contained in the Coptic, Sahadic, or Upper Country, and the Basmurico-Coptic dialects, and in the enchorial, hieratic, and hieroglyphic inscriptions and MSS.; and it is a point that cannot be too much insisted upon, that a previous knowledge of the Coptic is absolutely necessary to a correct understanding of the hieroglyphics. *SEE HIEROGLYPHICS.*

These inscriptions are found abundantly on the various monuments still remaining in Egypt, especially in the tombs and palaces of the several kings. They are found either alone, as documentary records, e.g. on the



obelisks and columns; or oftener in connection with pictorial representations of public or private scenes; very rarely, as in the famous Rosetta Stone, with interlinear translations in the corresponding Egyptian or a foreign language. *SEE EGYPT.*

**II. Assyrian Cuneatic.** — These characters, like the Egyptian hieroglyphics, are usually inscribed upon slabs containing likewise pictorial delineations of martial, hunting, or other scenes. *SEE CUNEIFORM.* The most noted places where they occur are at Behistun, Khorsobad, Kouvunjik, and Nimrud. See each in its order. All the great halls of the various palaces are surrounded in the interior with sculptured slabs set into the walls, and covered with representations of the great historical events of the reigns of the respective kings, such as battles, sieges of cities, the conquests of provinces, the building of towns, and of mounds for palaces and temples, processions of captives, caravans bearing tribute from subjected nations, or presents from vassal kings, or taxes from the various districts of the empire, etc. Several hundreds of these have been removed, taken down the Euphrates, and shipped to England and France, and set up in the British Museum, and that of the Louvre at Paris. These slabs vary in size from three to seven feet in breadth, and from five to eleven feet in height and a part even reach thirteen and fifteen feet. Some of them have been brought to our own country, and presented to Amherst and other colleges. These slabs become, as it were, leaves in the Assyrian history. Each chamber, in fact, is a volume; for not only do we have the sculptures, but also inscriptions in a cuneiform or wedge-form letter, which furnishes a commentary on the events represented by the artist. Great progress has already been made in deciphering this language, as we have stated elsewhere, and we have most wonderful and interesting additions to our knowledge of ancient Nineveh (q.v.).

**III. Phoenician Records.** — These are very fragmentary and widely scattered. They are in characters closely resembling the old Hebrew. Most of them have been diligently collected and expounded by Gesenius in his *Monumenta Phœnicia* (Lpz. 1837). *SEE PHOENICIA.* A very interesting inscription relating to the history of one of the early Moabitish kings has lately been discovered. *SEE AINSHA.*

## Picture for Inscriptions 4a

**IV. *Sinaitic Inscriptions.*** — Wady Mokatteb, the cliffs of which bear these inscriptions, is a valley entering wady Sheik, and bordering on the upper regions of the Sinai Mountains. It extends for about three hours' march, and in most places its rocks present abrupt cliffs twenty or thirty feet high. From these cliffs large masses have separated and lie at the bottom in the valley. The cliffs and rocks are thickly covered with inscriptions, which are continued, at intervals of a few hundred paces only, for at least the distance of two hours and a half. Burckhardt says that to copy all of them would occupy a skilful draughtsman six or eight days. The inscriptions are very rudely executed, sometimes with large letters, at others with small, and seldom with straight lines. The characters appear to be written from right to left; and, although not cut deep, an instrument of metal must have been required, as the rock is of considerable hardness. Some of them are on rocks at a height of twelve or fifteen feet, and must have required a ladder to ascend to them. The characters were not known. The superior of the Franciscans, who visited the place in 1722, observes: "Although we had among us men who understood the Arabian, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Turkish, English, Illyrian, German, and Bohemian languages, there was not one of us who had the slightest knowledge of the characters engraved in these hard rocks with great labor in a country where there is nothing to be had either to eat or drink. Hence it is probable that these characters contained some profound secrets, which, long before the birth of Jesus Christ, were sculptured in these rocks by the Chaldaeans or some other persons." This account excited profound attention in Europe; and it was thought by many that the inscriptions might have been formed by the Israelites during their stay in this region, and probably contained irrefragable evidence for the truth of the Mosaic history. Hence copies of them have been anxiously sought and secured; but, with the exception of a few in Greek, the character and language were still unknown. "Before they can be all deciphered," says Laborde, "greater progress than has yet been attained must be made in the paleography and ancient languages of the East. The most general opinion is that they were the work of pilgrims who visited Sinai about the 6th century." This seems to us very doubtful. The Greek inscriptions and the crosses, on which this conclusion chiefly rests, may indeed have been of that or a later age; but it does

not follow that those in the unknown characters necessarily were so too. — Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on <sup><1862></sup>Job 19:24. Rev. Charles Forster contends that they are records of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Palestine (*Sinai Photographed*, London, 1862, fol.). Better opportunities than had formerly been at the command of casual travelers were enjoyed by captain Palmer, a member of the expedition now employed in making a complete and exhaustive survey of the physical features and condition of the Sinaitic region. His collection of transcripts from wady Mokatteb and other localities exceeds 1500 in number, and he was much aided in the study of their meaning by finding several undoubted bilingual inscriptions where the Greek and Sinaitic characters occur together, and express the same meaning. The result of four months' steady devotion to this object has given a complete alphabet of the latter, so that captain Palmer can read and interpret any of the inscriptions with ease. Both the alphabet and language must have been employed by a late Shemitic people "in all probability a commercial community who inhabited, or at least colonized, the Peninsula for the first few centuries of the Christian era." That many of the writers were Christians is proved by the numerous Christian signs used by them; but it is equally clear, from internal evidence, that a large proportion of them were pagans. It is interesting to note that captain Palmer's researches were pursued without the knowledge of professor Beers's studies, though they mainly corroborate each other, and he bears testimony to the professor's acuteness and penetration. A writer in the *Princeton Review* (Oct. 1870), after giving the history of the discovery and decipherment of these inscriptions, thus concludes: "It seems to be ascertained that the writers were natives of Arabia Petraea, inclusive of the Sinaitic peninsula; and, whether they were subjects of the kingdom centering in Petra or not, they made use of the language and the mode of writing current there. They were neither Jews nor Christians, but worshippers of heathen deities, and particularly of the heavenly bodies. They were mostly pilgrims on their way to certain celebrated sanctuaries, which were for centuries resorted to at special seasons by the pagans resident in this region. The inscriptions in the old native character belong to the period immediately preceding and following the Christian era; and they come down to the time when the Gospel and the Christian Church penetrated these localities, supplanted heathenism, and suppressed its sanctuaries. They then yield to legends in Greek and Latin, and even

more recent tongues, the work of Christians, who, in imitation of their heathen predecessors, have left the record of their pilgrimage to hallowed spots graven on the same imperishable works.” Hence we find crosses and other marks of Christianity mingled in the pagan names and symbols. Similar inscriptions have been found scattered, but not so profusely, nor in such confusion in various other portions of the Sinaitic peninsula, and even in the outskirts of Palestine. (See the literature in the *Princeton Review*, ut sup.) *SEE SINAI*.

### Inscriptions, Christian.

There are but few Christian inscriptions that remain extant from an early date, but these few yet suffice to convey to us a pretty accurate idea of the history of the early Christian Church, and of the customs and belief of the first followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. “They express,” says Maitland, in his justly celebrated and now quite rare work on *The Church in the Catacombs* (Lond. 1846, 8vo, p. 13), “the feelings of a body of Christians whose leaders alone are known to us in history. The fathers of the Church live in their voluminous works; the lower orders are only represented by these simple records, from which, with scarcely an exception, sorrow and complaint are banished; the boast of suffering, or an appeal to the revengeful passions, is nowhere to be found. One expresses faith, another hope, a third charity. The genius of primitive Christianity, ‘to believe, to love, and to suffer,’ has never been better illustrated. These ‘sermons in stones’ are addressed to the heart, and not to the head, to the feelings rather than to the taste; and possess additional value from being the work of the purest and most influential portion of the ‘catholic and apostolic Church’ then in existence.” In the early years of the Christian Church the inscriptions were, with few exceptions, confined to the memory of deceased persons and to sacred objects.

**1.** The custom of *tombstone* inscriptions was borrowed by the early Christians from the Romans and Grecians; they simplified them, however, very much, and indicated the Christian knowledge, life, and rank of the deceased partly by significant symbols, partly by written signs, words, and expressions. These symbols, as they are found in Italy, France, and the countries on the Rhine, pertain partly to the designation of the Redeemer by means of pictorial representations, partly to the life after death, hope for the same through Christ and the cross. The name of Christ, their Lord and Master, is, as would be expected of his followers, everywhere the most

prominent, and is “repeated in an endless variety of forms, and the actions of his life are figured in every degree of rudeness of execution.” But remarkable it certainly is, that in the inscriptions contained in the Lapidarian Gallery, selected and arranged under papal superintendence, containing one of the largest, if not *the* largest collection of Christian inscriptions, there are no prayers for the dead (unless the forms “May you live,” “May God refresh you,” be so construed); no addresses to the Virgin Mary, nor to the apostles or earlier saints; and, with the exception of “eternal sleep,” “eternal home,” etc., no expressions contrary to the plain sense of Scripture. Neither is the second person of the Trinity viewed in the Jewish light of a temporal Messiah, nor is he degraded to the Socinian estimate of a mere example, but he is ever represented as invested with all the honors of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion as professed by the evangelical sects. On stones innumerable appears the good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, “sleeps in Christ;” another is buried with a prayer that “she may live in the Lord Jesus.” But most of all, the cross in its simplest form is employed to testify the faith of the deceased; and whatever ignorance may have prevailed regarding the letter of Holy Writ, or the more mysterious doctrines contained in it, there seems to have been no want of apprehension of that sacrifice’ whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven” (Maitland, *Church in the Catacombs*, p. 14,15). One of the principal signs used in referring to Christ is a monogram of the initial letters of the Greek name **Χριστός**. Most generally it is found to be composed of X and p, the latter placed in the heart of the former. Strange to say, we preserve in our own language a vestige of this figure in writing *Xmas* and *Xtian*, which can only be explained by supposing the first letter to stand for the Greek X.

**Picture for Inscriptions 1****Picture for Inscriptions 2****Picture for Inscriptions 3****Picture for Inscriptions 4****Picture for Inscriptions 5****Picture for Inscriptions 6**

This facsimile of a monogram of Christ's name is copied from Maitland, p. 166, and was originally taken from the Lapidarian Gallery. The *a* and *w* reversed in this epitaph refer to the well-known passages in the Apocalypse: their continued use proves the general reception of that book as a part of the inspired canon. The *a* and *o*, *SEE ALPHA*, are mentioned by Prudentius as well as by Tertullian, who regarded them as mysteriously containing the signification that in Christ rest the beginning and end of all spiritual life (*De monogram. c. s.*). From the ignorance of the sculptor, the entire symbol was sometimes inverted, as in the opposite figure (also from Maitland, p. 167). A change was afterwards made by the decussation (as it is technically termed) of the X, by which the figure of a cross was produced. Having once arrived at this happy coincidence, the monogram remained stationary. Its simple outline, thus chiseled on a gravestone (from the Lapidarian Gallery), or accompanied by the misplaced letters. or even converted into "Psr," as if for Psristos, Read: "To our great God-Eliasa to Soricius, in Christ." was in course of time ornamented with jewels; and the *monogramma, gemmatum* took its place as a work of art among Christian bas-reliefs of the 4th century. The best specimen in the Lapidarian Gallery Maitland asserts that he accurately copied, and it is here reproduced: the jewels are only in marble, but they represent the real gems often lavished upon the ancient cross.

It is asserted by some antiquarians that the monogram was not used until the time of the emperor Constantine, and that, as is generally believed, it was first seen by him in the so greatly celebrated miraculous vision, which resulted in his conversion to the Christian religion. An epitaph, such as the subjoined, discovered by Bosio, may be well assigned to that time, when the motto "In hoc vinces" might have become common:

## IN HOC VINCES

### Picture for Inscriptions 7

“In this thou shalt conquer — In Christ. Sinfonia, also for her sons. She lived forty-eight years, five months, and four days.”

The next is contained in Oderici:

### Picture for Inscriptions 8

which probably signified,

“Victrix [a woman’s name], victorious in Christ.”

But the epitaphs of Alexander and Marius, martyrs under Adrian and Antonine, also exhibit the monogram; “and though,” says Maitland, “they do not appear to have been executed at the time, they contain strong marks of belonging to a period of violent persecution.” Gaetano Marini, however, asserts that the earliest monogram belongs to the year 331, i.e. six years after the Council of Nice.

### Picture for Inscriptions 9

The only resemblance to the monogram used by the heathen was the ceraunium, or symbol of lightning. The Egyptian cross appears to be an abbreviation of the Nilometer.

### Picture for Inscriptions 10

Translate — “The mark of Christ. Celix and Cerealis to their deserving father,” etc.

For the assertion that the monogram was a symbol of martyrdom, and signified “for Christ,” there seems to be not the least authority. In many inscriptions we read, however, in

### Picture for Inscriptions 11

### Picture for Inscriptions 12

“Aselus sleeps [or is buried] in Christ.”

Prudentius informs us that the name of Christ, “written in jeweled gold, marked the purple labarum, and sparkled from the helmets” of the army of

Constantine; — but this is, in all probability, only a poetical fiction (Liber 1, *contra Symmachum*). Only in the-later inscriptions, as far down as the Middle Ages, as in a Cologne inscription (Centralm. 100), are found the words *initiums et finis*. The monogram with the two letters is there sometimes surrounded by a circle or a wreath. The symbols, however, were used more frequently than any other, and of these the fish (ἰχθύς), which is often found in different forms upon the same stone, was no doubt suggested by the initials which it contains of the formula Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour), a sentence which had been adopted from the Sibylline verses. “Moreover, the phonetic sign of this word, the actual fish was an emblem whose meaning was entirely concealed from the uninitiated—an important point with those who were surrounded by foes ready to ridicule and blaspheme whatever of Christianity they could detect. Nor did the appropriateness of the symbol stop here. The first,’ observed Tertullian, ‘seems a fit emblem of him whose spiritual children are, like the offspring of fishes, born in the water of baptism.’” Sometimes the word ἰχθύς was expressed at length, as in the two following (Lapidarian Gallery):

ΙΚΟΨΧ  
 BONO ET INOCENTI FILIO  
 PASTORI ρ̄ QV ρ̄ X ρ̄ Ᾱρ̄ N ρ̄ III  
 NNIS X  
 ΙΕΟΨΧ

The first contains the mistake of K for X. At other times the fish itself was figured, as recommended by Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagog.* 3, 106), who, besides the fish, proposed as Christian emblems for signets fishermen, anchors, ships, doves, and lyres.

### Picture for Inscriptions 13

In a metrical Grecian inscription at Antrim, Christ himself, at the supper, is called ἰχθύς. Usually, however, it is the fisherman, who is Christ himself; he who also called the apostles to become the fishers of men (<sup><4049></sup>Matthew 4:19; <sup><4017></sup>Mark 1:17). Clement observes that it refers to the apostle Peter, and the boys who were drawn out of the water (of baptism). To these the anchor is added, which, as early as the letter to the Hebrews (<sup><3069></sup>Hebrews 6:19), is made the symbol of hope resting in the centre of holiness (comp. Mai, *Inscip. Chr.* p. 375, 4; 415, 9; 424, 7; 430,10; 449,4; 460,6). Less frequently we find the sailing ship, e.g. upon an inscription of Firmia



Victoria, in the porch of Maria in Trastevere, in Rome, and (Mai, *Inscrip. Chr.* p. 430, 6) upon the tombstone of a certain virgin named Serenila. The same is also found in the Vatican. Clement calls it **ναῦς οὐρανοδρομοῦσα**, “the ship hastening heavenwards.” The *lyre*, as far as we know, does not occur on tombstones. The lyre is perhaps an ideal picture of the harmony which reigns in the Christian soul, or is used instead of Orpheus, by whom also Christ was represented. The *clove*, also specified by Clement, and the *olive branch*, are more numerous, as the signs of love and peace. The word *peace* is added to this facsimile from the Lapidarian Gallery.

### Picture for Inscriptions 14

### Picture for Inscriptions 15

The substitution of *botis*. and *birgini* for *votis* and *virgini*: the *b* and *v* are sometimes as absurdly reversed.

### Picture for Inscriptions 16

DECEMBER S EVIVO FECIT SIBI BISOMVM.

### Picture for Inscriptions 17

### Picture for Inscriptions 18

### Picture for Inscriptions 19

Clement, among other things, forbids Christians to carry pitchers and swords upon their rings. *The pitcher*, with or without handle, does occur, however, frequently in Rome, Trier, and elsewhere, on Christian graves, usually between two doves. Whether this symbol refers to the doves drinking from a bowl, or whether it points to the water of life which is to refresh the thirsty soul, is not known. Instead of the sword, the *axe* occurs a few times on Christian tombstones: thus in Rome, at the church Nereo ed Achille, in the Palazzo Guilelmi, several times at Aringhi, etc. They are most probably a concealed representation of the cross, whose form they somewhat resemble. The Christians could use this symbol more readily, because it was also used by the heathens as *dedicatio sub ascia*. In addition to these, we find the *seven-armed candlestick*, which occurs in the cloister of St. Paola at Rome and elsewhere upon Jewish tombstones, but also upon Christian basilisks of Rome; not so frequently on graves, e.g. Mai,

*Inscript. Chr.* p. 408, 4. The *lamb* occurs seldom, e.g. Mai, *Inscript. Chr.* p. 401, 3; the same, between two doves, p. 363, 5. The *balance* occurs twice at Aringhi; and upon private sarcophagi, representations of the good shepherd, Old and New Testament histories, etc. Besides these, there are also occasionally met with the anchor, “understood to signify the close of a well-spent life: the conclusion of a successful is cast. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that the Church was often represented by a ship sailing heavenward: ἡ ναῦς οὐρανοδρομουσα of Clement: in later times steered by Sts. Peter and Paul.” This symbol may help to explain the expression used by Peter, “So shall an entrance be ministered unto you abundantly,” generally referred to the prosperous entrance of a vessel into port. “The ignorance displayed by the sculptor is scarcely to be accounted for, excepting by the circumstance that the traffic on the Tiber was confined to barges, unprovided with masts and sails, and towed by horses. The peacock is said to have been used as an emblem of immortality. This idea was borrowed from the pagans, who employed it to signify the apotheosis of an empress: for this purpose it was let fly from the funeral pile on which her body was consumed. The phoenix was also adopted by the Christians with the same intention; so, also, the crowned horse, as a sign of victory.” The supposed emblems of martyrdom, such as a figure praying, a crown, or a palm branch, which generally belong to this class, are borrowed from paganism, with additional significance in Christian cases, especially on account of the mention of it in the book of Revelation. “On the strength of some expressions there used, antiquarians of later times have taken it for granted that the early Church employed both crown and palm, or either separately, as emblems of martyrdom.” This supposition, though apparently reasonable, has been abandoned from want of proof; and such a fragment as the following, found in the cemetery of St. Priscilla (Lapidarian Gallery), is now only supposed to belong to the epitaph of an ordinary Christian:

NA VIBAS DOMINO E S V

## Picture for Inscriptions 20

The crown and palm conjoined are also met with: in the present example, from the Vatican library, they encircle the monogram, as represented below:

## Picture for Inscriptions 21

The extreme youth of the neophyte, while it proves the custom of infant baptism, makes the martyrdom of Jovina improbable. “The notice of death is various in the heathen inscriptions. Occasionally occurs D.M. (*dis manibus*); instead of that, also B. M., i.e. *bonae memoriae*. The beginning formula usually is *hic quiescit*, or *requiescit in pace*; in the Greek, ἐνθάδε κεῖται or κατακεῖται ἐν εἰρήνῃ; the latter also occurs on the Jewish inscriptions of St. Paola. Instead of this stands also *hic pausat in pace*, ἀνέπαυσεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *hi posita est, hic sepultus jacet, requiescit in somno pacis, dormit in pace, locus, κατάθεσις EN ΠΑΖΕ* (? *inpace Graecized*), ἐν εἰρήνῃ κοίμησις, τόπος ἀναπαύσεως, etc.; or simply the name of the deceased in the nominative or dative, with and without *in pace*, ἐν εἰρήνῃ.”

Quite remarkable, however, is the distinguishing feature of Christian inscriptions of the early centuries, and perhaps one in which more than in any other it differs from pagan inscriptions, viz in its use of names. “While the heathen name consisted of several essential parts, all of which were necessary to distinguish its owner, the Christians in general confined themselves to that which they had received in baptism.” But as some of the converts came from Roman families, it was quite natural for them to retain their Gentile and other names, yea, genuine heathen names, and thus even the names of heathen gods occur, e.g. Azizos, the name of a Syriac goddess, we find in Trier (Centralmus, 3:53) given as the name of a Syriac Christian. Also Artemia, Martinus, Mercurilis, Jovinus, Venerosa, Venerigina, Saturninus, names united with Sabbatia, Sabbatius, Nundinas, and Dominica, taken in a great measure from the names of the days of the week. But the desire to simplify names, and to give them an ethical signification, is none the less noticeable even among the Roman converts; for while it was at that time nothing unusual in the heathen world for a person to have six, eight, or ten names, in Christian inscriptions (the name given at the time of baptism being always preferred) but one or two names generally occur. The name was, as a rule, taken in view of facts universally believed to be good or desirable, e.g. with regard to *life*: Vitalis, Vitalio, Vitalinus, Vitalissimus, Viventius, Zoe, etc.; in view of *fortune*: Felicio. Fortunio, Fortunula, Felicissima, Faustina. Prosper, Successus, Eutyches, etc.; of *joy*: Gaudentius. Gaudiosus, Hilario, Hilarianus, Jucunda, Edone; of *victory*: Victor, Vincentius, Nike, Pancratir; of *strength*: Virissimus, Fortissima, Alcimus, Dynamiola; of *faith*: Theophistus, Fidelis; of *hope*:

Spes, Helpis, Elpidia; of *love*: Philetus, Philumena, Agape, Agapetus, Caritosa; of *spiritual blessing*: Dorotheus, Theodorus. Theodota, Theodulus, Timothea, Theophila, and various others. The kingdom of nature has also its part in Christian names, e.g. months: Januarius, Februarius, Aprilis, Decembrina; animals, plants, employments of rural life, etc. Of Old Testament names few are found, e.g. Susanna, Daniel, and Daniel; of New-Testament names, Maria, Petrus, Paulus. The consideration of national names is foreign to our purpose. After the name of the deceased there is frequently appended a short statement of his Christian position, views, or habits which distinguished him in civil life. He is called a neophyte (once *in albis*), a believer (*fidelis*), i.e. one who is really accepted: martyr, diacon, exorcista, subdiacon, etc.; child, virgin, man, wife; anima dulcis, mirae innocentiae anima or exemplum, dulcis aptissimus infans et visugrata et verbis dulcissima cunctis, filius innocentissimus. dulcissimus, bonus, sapiens, omnibus honorificentissimus et moneus, deo fidelis et dulcis marito, nutrix familiae, cunctis humilis, placata puro corde, amatrix pauperum, abstinens se ab omni maligna re, etc.; ‘the most common form is bene merens. Then follows the age, with a qui vixit or in’ sseculo, ἔζησεν, ζήσας, either with an accurate account of the years, months, and days, or merely about the time, with the additional statement plus minus, πλέον ἐλάττων. Then the day of burial, with a depositus or deposito, not seldom the *fasti* for the year; sometimes, also, the announcement of the person who erected the stone (titulum posuit or posuerunt), and of his suffering (dolens, contra votum, etc.). Of course this arrangement is not always followed. Sometimes we find following the name a motto, such as ζήσης, vivas in Christo, in deo vivas, vivas in domino, spes pax tibi, accepta sis Il u nnrsto. The language is largely corrupted, the Latin degenerating into the Roman, but for this reason is very important in grammar. Occasionally we find Latin words written in Greek letters, or mixed inscriptions in both languages. When written in poetry, the hexameter or distich measure is commonly used, and yet they are rhythmical rather than metrical. In such rhythmical inscriptions we find extension of thought not in the foregoing. The material upon which the inscriptions were made consists of small, plain marble slabs, either laid upon the grave or put into the coffin. Sometimes, to designate the death of martyrs, there occur vessels of blood and the instruments of death; also glasses, etc.

2. Besides the inscriptions on graves, which Rettberg first made useful to Church history, there are also sacred inscriptions, which we find partly upon glass, partly upon coins, gems, lamps, amulets, crosses, dishes, and other works of art. The more ancient Christian inscriptions have not yet been sufficiently sought for. In the collections of Fabretti, Reinesius, Gruter, Muratori, Donati, Castelli, Spon, Osann, Orelli, etc., they are badly injured. For descriptions of them, consult Franz, who speaks of the following: Bosio. *Roma sotterranea* (Rome, 1651); P. Aringhi, *Ronma subterranea novissima* (Rome, 1657; Paris, 1659), vols. 1 and 2; Boldetti. *Osservazioni sopra i ciniteri de' santi martiri ed antichi christiani* (Rome, 1720); Banduri, *Numismata in mpp. Rom. a Traiano Decio ad paleologos Augustos* (Paris, 1718), vols. 1, 2; Eckhel, *Doctr. Numm.* vol. 8; Bellori, *Lucernae veteres* (Col. 1702); Ficoroni, *Gemace ant. litt. Rome*; Buonaruoti, *Osservazioni sopra alcuni vast auntichi di vetro* (Firenz. 1716); Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'artpar les monuments*, etc. (Paris, 1823), vols. 1-4; Krebs, *Lipsanoteca Weilburgensis* (1820); *Memoires de l'nstitut Royal de France* (1837, 1838), vol. 3. The following are not mentioned by Franz; the treatise of Pellicia, *De re lapidaria et siglis yet. Christian.*, in his *Christianca ecclesie politia* (ed. Braun, Colonise, 1838), 3:111-297; Kopp, *Paleogr. Critic* (Mannhemii, 1829), vols. 3 and 4; Mai, or rather Marini, *Inscriptiones Christianme*, in Mai, *Script. veterum nova collectio* (Rome, 1831), vol. 5, a work that leaves untreated much to be wished for. Earlier undertakings are spoken of by Mai in his introduction, p. 8 to 15. For the inscriptions at Naples, consult the works concerning the Catacombs there found; for those at Milan, Givo, *Labus intorno alcuni monumenti epigrafici christiani scoperti in Milano l'anno MDCCCXIII nell' insigne basilica di san' Ambroqio* (Milan, 1824, fol.); and the same, *Intorno alcuni monumenti epi qrafici gentileschi e christiani scoperti nell' insigne basilica di S. Simpliciano* (in the *Giornale dell' J. R. Instituto Lombardo di Science, Lettere ed Arti*, vol. 3, Milan, 1842); for those at Verona, Maffei's *Miuseum Veronense* (Veronae, 1749), p. 178-184. For those at Autun, comp. Franz. *Das chrisfliche Denkilal* (Berl. 1841, 8vo), in German and French. For Treves, see the works of Lersch. especially his *Central Museum Rheinlandischer Inschriften* (Bonn, 1842), 3:29-48; Steiner, *Cod. inscrip. — Rhen*, No. 829-849; Wyttenbach, *Neue Beitrage z. antiken, heidnisch u. christl. Epigraphik* (Treves, 1833); and others. For later epigraphs of the Middle Ages, see Otte, *Abriss e. Kirchl. Kunst-Archaeol. d. Mittelalters* (Nordhausen, 1845), p. 71-92; Menti, in Didron, *Annales Archeologiques*, 1, 106. For inscriptions still

later, see Galletti, *Inscriptiones Romtance infimi cevi* (Rome, 1760), vols. 1-3; Morcelli, *Op. Fpigraph.* (Patavii, 1823), vols. 4 and 5; Hipsch, *Epigrammatographie* (Cologne, 1801), vol. 2. See Aschbach. *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:484 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites*, p. 315 sq.; and especially Maitland, *Church in the Catacombs* (London, 1846, 8vo), from which we have freely quoted.

## Insect.

The following is a complete list of all the specimens of entomology mentioned in the canonical Scriptures (including their products), together with their names in the original and in the A.V. *SEE ZOOLOGY.*

*Akkabish*’, “spider,” spider,  
*Akrdb*’, “scorpion,” scorpion.  
*Akris*, “locust,” locust.  
*Arbeh*’, locust,” locust.  
*Arb*’, “swarms,” gad-fly.  
*Ash*, “moth,” moth.  
*Chagcib*’, “grasshopper,”; locust.  
*Chanamnl*’, “frost,” ant? (destructive)  
*Chargol*’, “beetle,” locust (edible).  
*Chasil*’, “locust,” locust.  
*Deborah*’, “bee,” bee.  
*Gaznm*’, “palmer-worm,” locust (grub).  
*Geb, i*’ locust,” locust.  
*Gob*, “grasshopper,” locust.  
*Ken*, “lice,” gnat.  
*Kokkos*, “scarlet,” kermes (worm).  
*Konops*, “gnat,” fly (in wine).  
*Me’shi*, silk,” fine thread.  
*Nemalah*’, “ant,” ant.  
*Paresh*’, “flea,” flea.  
*Sas*, “moth,” moth.  
*Serikon*, ‘silk,” silk.  
*Ses*, “moth,” moth.  
*Skorpios*, “scorpion,” scorpion.  
*Solom*’, “bald locust,” locust (edible).  
*Tsaltscu*’, “locust,” cricket.  
*Tsirdh*’, “hornet,” hornet.

*Ye'lek*, {“caterpillar,” } locust (hairy).  
*Zebtib*, ‘fly,’ fly.

## Insermentes or Refractaires

a title of those of the French Roman Catholic clergy who were disloyal to the Revolution. August 10, 1789, the National Assembly proposed to appropriate the property of the Church, which then covered about one fifth of the surface of France, yielding an annual revenue of three hundred million francs, and by an act of Feb. 13, 1790, this became a law. Thus the great body of the clergy, who, patriotic in their aspirations, and suffering from the abuses of power, had hailed the advent of the Revolution with joy, now finding their dearest interests and privileges assailed, were forced into the position of reactionaries, and soon became the objects of suspicion and of persecution. To determine those who opposed the Revolution, the progressives devised a test-oath obligatory on all ecclesiastics, and lists were kept to distinguish between loyalists' and disloyalists. “Harmless as the oath was in appearance when it was tendered in Dec. 1790, five sixths of the clergy throughout the kingdom refused it. Those who yielded to the pressure were termed asserments, the recusants *insermentis* or *refractaires*, and the latter, of course, at once became the determined opponents of the new regime, the more dangerous because they were the only influential partisans of reaction belonging to the people. To their efforts were attributed the insurrections which in La Vendee and elsewhere threatened the most fearful dangers. They were accordingly exposed to severe legislation. A decree of Nov. 29, 1791, deprived them of their stipends and suspended their functions; another of May 27, 1792, authorized the local authorities to exile them on the simple denunciation of twenty citizens. Under the Reign of Terror their persons were exposed to flagrant cruelties, and a prefire refractaire was generally regarded, *ipso facto*, as an enemy of the Republic.”-Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotalism*, p. 547 sq.; Pressense, *Reign of Terror* (transl. by Prof. Lacroix), p. 60 sq.

## Insignia of Clergy

*SEE VESTMENTS.*

## Inspiration

(Lat. *a breathing into*), a term employed to designate the divine origin of Holy renilture (q.v.).



## I. Definition. —

1. The word “inspiration” “is sometimes used to denote the excitement and action of a fervent imagination in the poet or orator. But even in this case there is generally a reference to some supposed divine influence, to which the excited action is owing. It is once used in Scripture to denote that divine agency by which man is endued with the faculties of an intelligent being, when it is said ‘the inspiration (**ἠμῶν**) breath, as in Genesis 2, 7) of the Almighty giveth him understanding (<sup><8316></sup>Job 32:8). But the inspiration now to be considered is that which belonged to those who wrote the Scriptures, and which is particularly spoken of in <sup><816></sup>2 Timothy 3:16, and in <sup><6021></sup>2 Peter 1:21. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;’ ‘Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.’ These passages relate specially to the Old Testament, but there is at least equal reason to predicate divine inspiration of the New Testament.”

2. The Greek expression “**θεόπνευστος** (<sup><816></sup>2 Timothy 3:16) signifies a divine action on the perceptions (“Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit,” Cicero, *pro Archia*, c. 8). The breath of God is used as a material expression for his power (as in **δύναμις ὑψίστου** for **πνεῦμα ἅγιον**, Luke 1, 35; 24:49). In this sense, also, the classics speak of a **θεόπνευστος σοφίη** (Phocylides, 121), **θεόπνευστοι ὄνειροι** (Plutarch, *De plac. philos.* 5, 2; comp. **ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φέρομενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι**, <sup><6021></sup>2 Peter 1:21). The neutral form, in the sense of “God-inspired,” is used by Nonnus (*Paraphr. ev. Jo.* 1, 27), and applied to Scripture by Origen (*Hom.* 21, in *Jerem.* vol. 2, de la Rue: “Sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant”).

3. A psychological definition of the relation of this divine, consequently passively received perception to human spontaneity, is given by Plato in his doctrine of the divine **μανία**, the **ἔνθεος εἶναι**. This position is the root of the divinely implanted tendency to knowledge which has not yet attained a clear consciousness (Zeller, *Griech. Phil.* 2, 166, 275; Brandis, 2, 428). Of this, in so far as it includes the idea in the form of beauty, artists and authors say: **οὐ τέχνη ταῦτα τὰ καλὰ λέγουσι ποιήματα, ἀλλ' ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι** (*Ion.* 533). **Οὐ γὰρ τέχνη ταῦτα λεγουσιν, ἀλλὰ θεῖᾳ δυνάμει** (*ib.* p. 534). This gives rise to the **μαντική**, which requires the **προφήτης** for its interpreter (*Timceus*, 72). This doctrine of Plato concerning inspiration has had great influence on the Jewish and Christian doctrine. Philo admits it, and derives from it the incompatibility



of divine and human knowledge (*Quis reruza d. h.* 1, 511, Mang.); ὅτε μὲν φῶς ἐπιλάμψει τὸ θεῖον, δύεται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον: ὅτε δ' ἐκεῖνο δύει, τοῦτ' ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀνατέλλει. Yet he does not limit the divine influence to the inspiration of the sacred books, and does not hesitate to ascribe to himself an occasional θεοληπτεῖσθαι (*De Cherubim*, 1, 143). Some of the Greek fathers also describe the state of inspiration as purely passive (Justin, *Cohort.* c. 8: Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὔτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γίνωσκιν ἀνθρώποις δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγίους ἀνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούση δωρεᾶ, οἷς οὐ λόγιον ἐδέησε τέχνης, ἀλλὰ καθαρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνερ γείᾳ, ἵν' αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιδὸν πλήκτρον, σπερ ὄργανον, κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύφῃ γνῶσις: Athenag. *Legat.* c. 9: No, μίζω ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀνοήτους γεγονέναι οὔτε τοῦ Μωϋσέως οὔτε τοῦ Ἡσαίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, ο κατ' ἕκστασιν τῶν ἐκ αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος, ἀ ἐνηχοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν, συγγραφεαμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡσεὶ καὶ. ἀύλητῆς ἀύλων ἐμπνεῦσαι). We therefore find at an early time the notion of a *literal* inspiration (Iren. 3:16, 2: “Potuerat dicere Matthaeus: Jesu generatio sic erat. Sed previdens Spiritus S. depravatores et praemuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthaum ait: Christi generatio sic erat.” Clemens, *Cohort.* 1, 71, ed. Pott.: Ἐξ ὧν γραμμάτων [he means the ἱερὰ γράμματα, <sup>2</sup> Timothy 3:14] καὶ συλλαβῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκεκριμένας γραφὰς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως Ἀπόστολος θεοπνεύστους καλεῖ. Origen, *Hom. 21 in Jeremiah*: “Secundum istiusmodi expositiones decet sacras litteras credere nec unum quidem apicem habere vacuum sapientia Dei”). Yet all these expressions represent rather the general religious impression than the settled dogma; hence we find the ante-Nicene fathers recognizing some of the heathen books as inspired, e.g. the Sibyllian books (Theoph. *ad Autol.* 2, 9), whilst at the same time they expressed views excluding the idea of all parts of Scripture being *equally* inspired.

**4.** The definition which Dr. Knapp gives of inspiration is one which most will readily adopt. He says: “It may be best’ defined, according to the representations of the Scriptures themselves, as *an extraordinary divine agency upon teachers while giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught what and how they should write or speak.*” The nature, permanence, and completeness of this inspiration are matters upon which orthodox believers have differed. (See below.)

**II.** *The Fact of the Inspiration of the Bible.* — (On this point we condense the arguments of Dr. Leonard Woods in Kitto's *Cyclopeadia*, s.v., confining ourselves chiefly to the question of the inspiration of the *written* word.) To prove that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, we might with propriety refer to the excellence of the doctrines, precepts, and promises, and other instructions which they contain; to the simplicity and majesty of their style; to the agreement of the different parts, and the scope of the whole; especially to the full discovery they make of man's fallen and ruined state, and the way of salvation through a Redeemer; together with their power to enlighten and sanctify the heart, and the accompanying witness of the Spirit in believers. But the more direct and conclusive evidence that the Scriptures were divinely inspired is found in *the testimony of the writers themselves*. As the writers did, by working miracles and in other ways, sufficiently authenticate their divine commission, and establish their authority and infallibility as teachers of divine truth, their testimony, in regard to their own inspiration, is entitled to our full confidence. For who can doubt that they were as competent to judge and as much disposed to speak the truth on this subject as on any other? If, then, we admit their divine commission and authority, why should we not rely upon the plain testimony which they give concerning the divine assistance afforded them in their work? To reject their testimony in this case would be to impeach their veracity, and thus to take away the foundation of the Christian religion.

**1.** The prophets generally professed to speak *the word of God*. What they taught was introduced and confirmed by a "Thus saith the Lord;" or "The Lord spake to me, saying." In one way or another they gave clear proof that they were divinely commissioned, and spake in the name of God, or, as it is expressed in the New Testament, *that God spake by them*.

**2.** The Lord Jesus Christ possessed the spirit of wisdom without measure, and came to bear witness to the truth. His works proved that he was what he declared himself to be—the Messiah, the great Prophet, the infallible Teacher. The faith which rests on him rests on a rock. As soon, then, as we learn how *he* regarded the Scriptures, we have reached the end of our inquiries. His word is truth. Now every one who carefully attends to the four Gospels will find that Christ everywhere spoke of that collection of writings called the Scripture as the word of God; that he regarded the whole in this light; that he treated the Scripture, and every part of it, as infallibly true, and as clothed with divine authority--thus distinguishing it

from every mere human production. Nothing written by man can be entitled to the respect which Christ showed to the Scriptures. This, to all Christians, is direct and incontrovertible evidence of the divine origin of the Scriptures, and is by itself perfectly conclusive.

**3.** But there is clear concurrent evidence, and evidence still more specific, in the writings of the apostles. Particularly in one passage (<sup>STB16</sup>2 Timothy 3:16), Paul lays it down as the characteristic of “*all Scripture*” that it “*is given by inspiration of God*” (θεόπνευστος, “divinely inspired”); and from this results its profitableness. Some writers think that the passage should be rendered thus: *All divinely inspired Scripture, or, all Scripture, being divinely inspired, is profitable.* According to the common rendering, inspiration is predicated of all Scripture. According to the other, it is presupposed as the attribute of the subject. But this rendering is liable to insuperable objections. For θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος are connected by the conjunction καί, and must both be predicates, if either of them is; and unless one of them is a predicate there is no complete sentence. Henderson remarks that the mode of construction referred to ‘is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax, which requires that when two adjectives are closely joined, as θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος here are, if there be an ellipsis of the substantive verb ἐστί, this verb must be supplied after the former of the two, and regarded as repeated after the latter. Now there exists precisely such an ellipsis in the case before us; and as there is nothing in the context which would lead to any exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force.’ He adds that “the evidence in favor of the common rendering, derived from the fathers, and almost all the versions, is most decided.” It cannot for a moment be admitted that the apostle meant to signify that divine inspiration belongs to a part of Scripture, but not to the whole; or that he meant, as Semler supposes, to furnish a criterion by which to judge whether any work is inspired or not, namely, its *utility*. “That author proceeds fearlessly to apply this criterion to the books of the Old Testament, and to lop off eight of them as not possessing the requisite marks of legitimacy. Many of the German divines adopt Semler’s hypothesis.” But it is very manifest that such a sense is not by any means suggested by the passage itself, and that it is utterly precluded by other parts of the New Testament. For neither Christ nor any one of his apostles ever intimates a distinction between some parts of Scripture which are inspired and other parts which are not inspired. The doctrine which is plainly asserted in the text under consideration, and which is fully sustained

by the current language of the New Testament, is, that *all the writings denominated the Scriptures are divinely inspired.*

What particular books have a right to be included under this sacred designation in the general opinion of the Church is a question considered under the article CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

**III.** *The Manner of Inspiration--The interior process* of the Spirit's action upon the minds of the speakers or writers was of course inscrutable (~~RRR~~ John 3:8) even to themselves. That they were *conscious*, however, of such an influence is manifest from the *authority* with which they put forth their words; yet, when they sat down to write, the divine and the human elements in their mental action were perfectly harmonious and inseparable (Luke 1. 3).

As to the outward method, "God operated on the minds of inspired men in a variety of ways, sometimes by audible words, sometimes by direct inward suggestions, sometimes by outward visible signs, sometimes by the Urim and Thummim, and sometimes by dreams and visions. This variety in the mode of divine influence detracted nothing from its certainty. God made known his will equally in different ways; and, whatever the mode of his operation, he made it manifest to his servants that the things revealed were from him." All this, however, relates rather to *revelation* than simple inspiration, a distinction that is ably made by Prof. Lee in his work on the subject.

"But inspiration was concerned not only in making known the will of God to prophets and apostles, but also *in giving them direction in writing the sacred books.* In this, also, there was a diversity in the mode of divine influence. Sometimes the Spirit of God moved and guided his servants to write things which they could not know by natural means, such as new doctrines or precepts, or predictions of future events. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write the history of events which were wholly or partly known to them by tradition, or by the testimony of their contemporaries, or by their own observation or experience. In all these cases the divine Spirit effectually preserved them from all error, and influenced them to write just so much and in such a manner as God saw to be best. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write a summary record of larger histories, containing what his infinite wisdom saw to be adapted to the end in view, that is, the benefit of his people in all ages. Sometimes he influenced them to make a record of important maxims in common use, or to write new ones, derived

either from their own reason or experience, or from special divine teaching. Sometimes he influenced them to write parables or allegories, particularly suited to make a salutary impression of divine things on the minds of men; and sometimes to record supernatural visions. In these and all other kinds of writing the sacred penmen manifestly needed special divine guidance, as, no man could of himself attain to infallibility, and no wisdom, except that of God, was sufficient to determine what things ought to be written for permanent use in the Church, and what manner of writing would be best fitted to promote the great ends of revelation.”

“Some writers speak of different modes and different kinds, and even different degrees of inspiration. If their meaning is that God influenced the minds of inspired men in different ways; that he adopted a variety of modes in revealing divine things to their minds; that he guided them to give instruction in prose and in poetry, and in all the different forms of composition; that he moved and guided them to write history, prophecy doctrines, commands, promises, reproofs, and exhortations, and that he adapted his mode of operation to each of these cases—against this no objection can be made. The Scriptures do exhibit these different kinds of writing and modes of divine instruction. Still every part of what was written was divinely inspired, and equally so. It is all the word of God, and clothed with divine authority, as much as if it had all been made known and written in one way.” While this is true of the word as written or as originally uttered, it is not true that all the subject matter is equally revealed; for some of the facts, doctrines, and views were known to the writers in their ordinary intelligence, while others were specially communicated by immediate divine afflatus. In other words, all is *inspired*, but not all *revealed*.

**IV. Theories of Inspiration.** — These may be concisely stated thus:

(1.) The *orthodox*, or generally accepted view, which contents itself with considering Scripture to be inspired in such a sense as to make it infallibly *certain* when apprehended in its legitimate sense, and of absolute *authority* in all matters of faith and conscience. This theory has lately been, with great propriety, designated as the *dynamical*, purporting that the *power* or influence is from God, while the action is human.

(2.) The *mystical*, or, extremely strict view, thought to have been held by Philo, Josephus, and some of the primitive Christian fathers (but

condemned by the early councils as savoring of heathenish *μαντεία*), which regarded the sacred writers as wholly possessed by the Spirit, and uttering its dicta in a species of frenzy. This, in opposition to the former, has justly been characterized as the *mechanical view*, denoting the passivity of the inspired subject.

(3.) The *latitudinarian* view, entertained by ‘Rationalists of all orders, which deems inspiration but a high style of poetic or religious fervor, and not inconsistent with errors in fact and sentiment.

This last view is not to be confounded, however, with that of those who limit inspiration to such matters in holy Scripture as directly pertain to the proper material of revelation, i.e. to strictly *religious* truth, whether of doctrine or practice. Among English divines, those who have asserted this form of theory are Howe (*Divine Authority of Scripture*, lect. 8 and 9), Bp. Williams (*Boyle Lect.* serm. 4:p. 133), Burnet (*Article 6*:p. 157, Oxf. ed. 1814), Lowth (*Vind. of Div. Auth. and Inspir. of Old and New Testament*, p. 45 sq.), Hey (*Theol. Lect.* 1, 90), Bp. Watson (*Tracts*, 4:446), Bp. Law (*Theory of Religion*), Tomline (*Theology.* 1, 21), Dr. J. Barrow (*Dissertations*, 1819. 4th diss.), Dean Conybeare (*Theological Lectures*, p. 186), Bp. Hinds (*Inspiration of Scripture*, p. 151), Bp. D. Wilson (lecture 13 on *Evidences*, 1, 509), Parry (*Inquiry into the Nature of the Inspiration of the Apostles*, p. 26, 27), and Bp. Blomfield (*Lectures on Acts*, 5, 88-90). Others have even gone so far as to avow that the value of the religious element in the revelation would not be lessened if *errors* were acknowledged in the scientific and miscellaneous matter which accompanies it. Among those who have held this form of the theory are Baxter (*Method. Theol. Chr.* pt. 3, ch. 12:9, 4), Tillotson (*Works*, fol. 3:449, sermon 168), Doddridge (*On Inspir.*), Warburton (*Doctr. of Grace*, bk. 1, ch. 7), Bp. Horsley (serm. 39 on Ecclesiastes 12:7, *Works*, 3:175), Bp. Randolph (*Rem. on Michaelis’ Introd.* p. 15, 16), Paley (*Evid. of Christianity*, pt. 3, ch. 2), Whately (*Ess. on Dif. in St. Paul*, ess. 1 and 9; *Sermons on Festivals*, p. 90; *Pecul. of Christianity*, p. 233), Hampden (*Bampton Lect.* p. 301), Thirlwall (Schleiermacher’s *Luke*, Introd. p. 15), Bp. Hebef (*Barnpt. Lect.* 8:577), Thomas Scott (*Essay on Inspir.* p. 3), Dr. Pve Smith (*Script. and Geol.* p. 276, 237, 3rd ed.), and Dean Alford (*Proleg. to Gosp.* ed. L859, vol. 1, ch. 1, § 22). (For other Writers who have held the same views, see Dr. Davidson’s *Facts, Statements*, etc., in defense of his vol. 2 of *Horne’s Introd.* 1857.) The inadmissibility, however, of either of these limitations to inspiration is evident from two

considerations: 1st, That the sacred writers themselves make no such discrimination in their professions of divine sanction; and it would, in fact, be subversive of the above distinction between inspiration and revelation; and, 2ndly, The line of demarcation between what is important to religion and what is not is too fine, to be traced by any expositor, so that we would thus unsettle our whole confidence in the truthfulness of the Scriptures. We therefore are compelled by the necessity of the case, no less than the positive declarations of the Bible itself, to maintain that “all Scripture is divinely inspired,” and not some of its parts or statements alone. At the same time we may, without inconsistency—nay, we must, in the light of just criticism—admit that the *phraseology* in which these statements is couched is oftentimes neither elegant nor exact. Yet this does not impair their essential *truth*, as the testimony of an illiterate witness may be scrupulously truthful, although confused in order and unscientific in form. Provided the *facts* are substantially given, the want of logical, rhetorical, and grammatical precision is comparatively unimportant, and forms no ground of impeachment. The mental habits of the sacred writers must be taken into account in order to arrive at their *meaning*, and this last, indeed, in the case of any writer, is what the reader is in search of, and of which language, whether clear or obscure, is legitimately but the vehicle. The errors imputed to the Scriptures by certain scientific men have accordingly all been explained, sooner or later, as being merely apparent, and due to the popular style of the sacred writers. Even the most difficult instances of these, such as the omissions and general enumerations in the genealogies, *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST*, are susceptible of the same explanation, since these were evidently *copied faithfully* from public registers, which, however incorrect they may seem to us, were of unquestioned currency at the time. A nicety in stopping to rectify these (for, be it observed, no one was led into error by the transcription, since the writers, and, indeed, the whole public, were perfectly aware of the discrepancy) would have been a far greater piece of pedantry than for a modern divine to pause in the midst of a quotation of Scripture to correct an unimportant mistranslation in the Authorized Version. Just so when our Lord and the apostle Paul freely cite passages according to the inexact rendering of the Septuagint, and sometimes even make them the point of an argument; it is no disparagement either to their intelligence or inspiration, but rather an evidence of their appreciation of the literary aptitudes of those whom they addressed. *SEE ACCOMMODATION*.



On the other hand, within the bounds of the orthodox view of inspiration, as above stated, there are two epithets currently employed which seem to border too closely upon the extravagant, and are equally unnecessary and incorrect.

1. “*Plenary Inspiration*” is a phrase nowhere warranted by the Scriptures as predicated of themselves. Christ alone was plenary inspired (~~EBB~~ John 3:34) of all human beings. The term plenary *authority* would be far more scriptural and definite.

2. “*Verbal Inspiration*” is an expression still more objectionable as applied to the Scriptures. For,

(I.) *Words*, as such, are incapable of inspiration. They are either oral, consisting of certain sounds, or written, consisting of certain marks on paper; both material signs of which a spiritual element cannot properly be predicated. Thought, ideas, sentiments only can be inspired; and this is really what the theorists mean. It is better to say so plainly.

(II.) The assumption by these theorists that we think only in words is plentifully contradicted by every man’s consciousness. As children, we have conceptions long before we have words. The dog that lies dreaming of the chase has rapid trains of thought, but not a syllable of a word. We are constantly exercising perceptions of shades of color, and shapes of matter, for which there is no name. He must have a feeble power of consciousness, or a mighty power over words, who is not often possessed of a thought for which he pauses for the word. We hold the conception fast, waiting for its correlative term to come.’ Who does not often think of a friend’s face without being able to recall his name? Words, it is true, enable us to express our ideas, and generally that expression renders the conception itself more distinct. But surely God is shut up to no such necessity in communicating his mind to men. His Spirit even gives us thoughts beyond the compass of language (ἀλάλητα, ~~EBB~~ Romans 8:26; ἄῤῥήτα, ~~7104~~ 2 Corinthians 12:4).

(III.) The suggestion of the *ipsissima verba* to the minds of the sacred writers is incompatible with their free action, as evinced in the varieties and even blemishes of style. These are clearly the *human* element, partaking of the imperfection and diversity inseparable from man’s productions. To say that God makes use of them is only evading the point. He does not directly supply them nor authorize them; he only suffers them. The inconsistency of



statement by Gausson and other verbalists on this head is palpable, and shows the untenableness of their position in the face of infidel objections and rationalistic criticism. Equally inconclusive and self-contradictory is their method of disposing of the objection that if the actual Greek and Hebrew words are inspired, no translations can in any correlative sense be called “the word of God.”

**(IV.)** Nothing is gained by asserting the verbal theory that is not equally secured in point of divine sanction and infallible truth by simply claiming for the Holy Scriptures that their statements and sentiments substantially and in their essential import represent the mind and will of God: that they contain divine thoughts clothed in merely human language. Such is the obvious fact, recognized by every devout and judicious interpreter. Such a view, indeed, gives far more dignity to the sacred volume than the mechanical theory of a mere amanuensis. It is the power of God in earthen vessels (~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 4:7).

**(V.)** The theory of verbal inspiration is comparatively recent in the history of theology.

**[1.]** There is no such theory stated in the Scriptures. Scriptural authority would preclude all citation of names, great or small, among the theologians. The passages adduced in its favor have no pertinence.

**[2.]** The fathers had no definite theory of inspiration at all. Sometimes, in dwelling upon the perfection of Scripture, they used striking figures and strong expressions, from which we might infer a belief in verbal inspiration. But, on the other hand, their ordinary mode of commenting on Scripture, of quoting it, and of defending it, is inconsistent with such a belief.

**(a.)** John, the presbyter, who is believed to have been *one of our Lord's disciples*, speaking of Mark's Gospel, says that Mark “wrote it with great accuracy, as Peter's interpreter... He committed no mistake when he wrote down things as he remembered them. He was very careful to omit nothing of what he had heard, and to say nothing false in what he related” (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:39).

**(b.)** Justin Martyr, after using the figure of the “lyre,” which is so much relied upon by the advocates of verbal inspiration, goes on to limit his remark to “those things in Scripture which are necessary for us to know” (Just. *Ad Graec.* § 8).

(c.) Ireneus, in a fragment on “the style of St. Paul,” alludes to the fact that his sentences were sometimes “unsyntactic,” and accounts for it by the “rapidity of his utterances (*velocitas sermonum*), and the impulsiveness of spirit which distinguished him.”

(d.) Clemens Alexandrinus states that “Peter having preached the Gospel at Rome many present exhorted Mark to write the things which had been spoken, since he had long accompanied Peter, and remembered what he had said; and when he had composed the Gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him” (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 6:14).

(e.) Origen, speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews, remarks that the “thoughts are Paul’s, but the language belongs to some one who committed to writing what the apostle said, and, as it were, reduced to commentaries the things spoken by his master. But the ideas are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle.” Again, speaking of an apparent discrepancy between John and Matthew, Origen says, “I believe it to be impossible for those who upon this subject direct attention merely to the external history, to prove that this apparent contradiction can be reconciled” (Origen, *in Johann.* 1, 183).

(f) Chrysostom remarks on ~~Acts~~ Acts 26:6: “Here Paul speaks humanly, and does not throughout enjoy grace but is permitted to intermix even his own materials.”

(g.) Augustine declares that the evangelists wrote more or less fully, “according as each remembered, and as each had it in his heart (ut quisque meminerat, et ut cuique cordi erat);” and asserts that the “truth is not bound to the words,” and that the “language of the evangelists might be ever so different, provided their *thoughts* were the same” (August. *De Consensu Evangelist.* 2, 12,28).

[3.] The period between the fathers and the schoolmen is of so little value in the history of theology that it is hardly worth while to refer to it. One or two writers of some note in this period adopted verbal inspiration, but there was no received theory of the kind. Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in answer to Fredegis (who is cited by Prof. Harris), asks, “What absurdity follows if the notion be adopted that the Holy Spirit not only inspired the prophets and apostles with the *sense* of their teachings, but also fashioned on their lips the very words themselves, bodily and outwardly (*corporea verba extrinsecus in ora illorum*)” (Agobard, *Contra Fredegisum*, c. 12).

[4.] By the schoolmen, and subsequently by the doctors of the Church in general, a distinction was made in inspiration between, *revelatio* and *assistentia*.

[5.] Of the great reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and Zwinglius, not one maintained any such doctrine as that of verbal inspiration, while they all speak in the strongest possible language of the divinity, credibility, and infallibility of the sacred writings.

[6.] It was in the 17th century that the notion of verbal inspiration, which had before only floated about from one individual mind to another, took the shape of a definite theory, and received a proper ecclesiastical sanction. The subject was treated at length by Calovius (the bitter opponent of Grotius and Calixtus). who set forth the verbal theory very fully; and later writers, both Lutheran and Reformed, carried it so far as to extend inspiration to the vowel-points and the punctuation. The *Formula Consensus Helvetici* declares that the Old Testament “is **θεόπνευστος**, equally as regards the consonants, the vowels, and the vowel-points, or at least their force.”

**V. Literature.** — Early treatises on the subject, of a general character, are those of Quenstedt, Carpzov, Weger, Lange, Le Clerc, Lowth, Lamothe, Clarke, Doddridge, etc., which rather belong to the province of “Introduction” (q.v.); more explicit are the works of Bayly, *Essay on Inspiration* (London, 1707, 1708); Jaquelot, *La Ve ite et l’Inspiration des livres du V. et N.T.* (Rotterd. 1715); Calamy, *Inspiration of Old and N.Test.* (London, 1710); Martense, *Christiana doctrinae de divina Sacrarum Litterarum inspir. vindicic* (Jena, 1724); Klemm, *Theopneust. Sacrorum Litt. asserta* (Tub. 1743); Stosch, *De duplici Apostoll. theopneustia, turn generali turn speciali* (Guelpherb. 1754); Bullstedt, *De vera S. S. inspirationis indole* (Coburg, 1757 sq.); Teller, *De inspir. divina Vatum Sacrorum* (Helmst. 1762); also *Diss. de Inspir. Script. Sac. judicioformando* (Helmst. 1764); Tollner, *Die Gottliche Eingebung der heiligen SchriIt untersucht* (Mittau and Leipzig, 1772); Jablonsky, *De Eo7r’, evarai Scriptorum Sacrorum N.T.* [in his *Opusc.* ed. te Water, 4:425-54]; Wakefield, *Essay on Inspiration* (Lond. 1781); Meyer, *De Inspiratione S. S.* (Tr. ad Rh. 1784); Hegelmaier, *De Theopneustia ejusqute statu in viris sanctis Libb. Sacc. auctoribus* (Tub. 1784); Miller, *Cum theopneustia Apostolorum nec osmniscientiams quasi aliquam, nec anamartesian fuisse* (Gott. 1789); Henckel, *Inspirationem Evv. et Act.*

*sine ullo religionis damno negari posse dubitatum* (Freft. ad V. 1793): the definite questions of the extent and character of inspiration, however, are specially discussed in the works of Moore, *Plenary Inspiration of the N.T.* (Lond. 1793); Jesse, *Of the Learning and Inspiration of the Apostles* (London, 1798); Findlay, *The Divine Inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures*, etc. (Lond. 1803); Dick, *Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* (Glasgow, 1800; 4th edit. 1840); Sontag, *Doctr. inspirationis ejusque ratio, hist. et usus popularis* (Heidelberg, 1810); Dullo, *Ueber d. gottl. Eingebung des N.T.* (Jena, 1816); H. Planck, *Ueber Offenbarung u. Inspiration* [opposed to Schleiermacher's views] (Gott. 1817); Rennel, *Proofs of Inspiration [N.T. compared with Apocrypha]* (Load. 1822); Parry, *Inquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Writers of the N.T.* (2nd edit. London, 1822); Macleod, *View of Inspiration* [general statement of fact] (Glasg. 1827); Carson, *Theories of Inspiration* [review of Wilson, Pye Smith, and Dick] (Edib. 1830); Haldane, *The Books of the O.T and N.T. proved to be canonical, and their Verbal Inspiration maintained and established*, etc. [a brief partisan treatise] (5th ed. Edinb. 1853); Hinds, Bp., *Proofs, Nature, and Extent of Inspiration* (Oxford, 1831); Fraser, *Essay on the Plenary and Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* [a popular view] (in New Family Library, vol. 2, Edinb. 1834); Henderson, *Divine Inspiration* [a calm and judicious treatise, endeavoring to reconcile the extreme theories, and therefore somewhat inconsistent with itself] (London, 1836; 4th edit. 1852); Carson, *Divine Inspiration* [strictures on Henderson] (London, 1837); Gaussen, *Theopneustie* [a rhetorical rather than logical plea for the extreme view] (2nd ed. 1842; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1850; Boston, 1850); Jahn, *Ad quosdam pertinent promiss. Sp. S. sec. N. Test.* (Basle, 1841); Leblois, *Sur l'Inspiration des premiers Chretiens* (Strasburg, 1850); Carson, *Inspiration* [violent] (Dublin, 1854); Lee, *Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* [an excellent work, making many good distinctions, and giving the history, but defective in arrangement and exactness] (Dublin, 1857, 2nd edit.); Wordsworth, *Inspiration of Canon* [apologetic] (London, 1848, 1851; Philadelphia, 1854); Lord, *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures* [an extremist] (New York, 1858); Macnaught, *Inspir. Infall. and Author of Scrip* sort of somnambulic state, the inspired person receives and manifests the divine inspiration: this manifestation consists sometimes only in convulsive motions, or in broken sentences, which latter are generally invitations to repentance and amendment, or denunciations of some adversary. The congregations are governed by a chief and two elders,

and they hold occasional conferences together. They have no regular ministry, but all members, of both sexes, are required to contribute to the common edification by praying aloud in the assemblies; besides this, if an Inspired teacher is present, and feels inspired, he preaches; if not, he reads some passages of Scripture, or the recorded utterances of some Inspired members. They have also a particular collection of hymns. Their principal festivals are love-feasts, at which preaching is generally part of the order of exercises of the day. These festivals are announced long beforehand, but none take part in them except those who are personally invited to do so by the Inspired leaders. The week before a love-feast is always a season of especial fasting, penitence, and prayer, and the day preceding it is still more strictly observed. Prayer, singing, prophesying, and feet-washing always precede the love-feast, at which the persons invited partake of cake and wine. See M. Gobel, *Gesch. c. wahren Inspirationsyem veinden von 1688-1854* (in the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, 1854); Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reformation*, 8:401 sq.; Schlegel, *Kirchengeschichte d. 18tel Jahrhunderts*, 2, div. 2, 1047 sq.; Baumgarten, *Geschichte d. Relig. Partheien*, p. 1048 sq.

## Installare

*SEE INSTALLATION.*

## Installation

(Low Latin and *stallum*, a seat) is a name in some churches for the ceremonial act or process by which an ordained minister is formally put into possession of his office, and by which he is fully empowered not alone to exercise its functions, but to enjoy its honors and emoluments. The ceremonial form, as well as the name, differs according to the office which is conferred, as *enthronization* for a bishop, *induction* for a minister, etc. *Installation* in the English Church, however, properly regards only the office of a canon or prebendary. The word is also used generally for a formal introduction to any office. "Though technically distinguished in modern times from the act of *ordination*, it is virtually included in the 'ordination' services whenever the minister is inducted into the pastoral office for the first time. But when, having been previously ordained, he forms another pastoral connection, the public and official induction is termed simply an 'installation.' See Chambers, *Cyclop. s.v.*; Walcott,

*Sacred Archceöl.* p. 329 (for the use of the term as used in the English Church); *Congregat. Quarterly*, 1868, p. 340.

## Instinct

that power which acts on and impels any creature to a particular manner of conduct, not by a view of the beneficial consequences, but merely from a strong impulse, supposed to be necessary in its effects, and to be given in order to supply the place of reason.

## Institutio

is one of the names by which the addresses on the Catechism or the catechetical instruction was designated in the Christian Church after the time of Charlemagne. *SEE CATECHISM.*

## Institution

an established custom or law; a precept, maxim, or principle. Institutions may be considered as positive, moral, and human.

1. Those are called *positive* institutions or precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given, or discoverable by them, but which are observed merely because some superior has commanded them.
2. *Moral* are those, the reasons of which we see, and the duties of which arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command.
3. *Human* are generally applied to those inventions of men, or means of honoring God, which are not appointed by him, and which are numerous in the Church of Rome, and too many of them in Protestant churches. See Butler's *Analogy*, p. 214; Doddridge's *Lect.* lect. 158; Robinson's *Claude*, 1. 217; 2, 258; Burroughs, *Disc. on Positive Institutions*; Bp. Hoadley's *Plain Account*, p. 3. INSTITUTION in Church law means the final and authoritative appointment to a church benefice—more especially a bishopric—by the person with whom such right of appointment ultimately rests. Thus, in the Roman Catholic Church—even after the *election* of a bishop by the chapter, or his *nomination* by the crown, when that right belongs to the crown—it is only the pope who confers *institution*. In English usage, institution is a conveyance of the cure of souls by the bishop, who, or whose deputy, reads the words of the institution, while the clerk kneels.

The institution vests the benefice in the clerk, for the purpose of spiritual duty, who thereupon becomes entitled to the profits thereof. But the title is not complete till induction (q.v.).

### Institution of a Christian Man

also called *The Bishop's Book*, is the name of a book containing an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave. Maria, Justification, and Purgatory, which was drawn up by a committee of prelates and divines of the English Church in 1537. "for a direction for the bishops and clergy," and to be "an authoritative explanation of the doctrine of faith and manners," and a sort of standard for the desk and the pulpit, or, as it itself expresses it, for the clergy "to govern themselves in the instruction of their flocks by this rule." Some say that Stephen Poynt, bishop of Winchester, wrote the book himself, and that a committee of prelates and divines gave it their sanction. It was called forth at the time of the early reformatory ecclesiastical movements in England during the reign of Henry VIII. At the time of the publication of the "Institution of 'a Christian Man" (printed in *Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxf. 1825), the English Church had become alienated from the Church of Rome; at least king Henry had laid claim to his sovereignty over the Church in his dominions, which an act of Parliament in 1533 had secured him, and, with few dissentient voices, the clergy of the land had seconded the opinion of Parliament. In 1536 a convocation, called "the Southern Convocation," published a manifesto, entitled "Articles to stablyshe Christen quietness, and unite amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions," which are generally regarded as the starting-point of the English Reformation. "But, upon the whole, these articles breathed rather the animus of the Middle Ages. Thus they took, on the doctrine of justification, a course midway between the Romanists and the Lutherans. They had also paid reverence to some of the Romish superstitions, as the use of images, invocation of saints, and still held to the doctrine of purgatory, which was at this time beginning to encounter a determined opposition from the more radical reformers. To represent more truly the real desires and opinions of the English Church, the Bishops' Book was launched. It discussed at length the Romish superstitions which the Southern Convocation had sanctioned, and declared against a further adherence to them by the English people. They also held that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable

partly to the favor and indulgence of the Roman emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as' men originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus reoccupy the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages." See Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 202; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, anno 1537.

## Instruction

*SEE EDUCATION.*

## Instrument

(*ἡ κελὶ* *keli'*, ὄπλον, general names for any *implement*, *vessel*, etc.). *SEE MUSIC; SEE ARMOR.*

## Instrumental Music

*SEE MUSIC.*

## Instrumentum pacis

At the *pax tecum* (q.v.) in sacred mass, the celebrant of the mass gives to the deacon the kiss of peace, which the latter gives to the subdeacon, and then it is transmitted successively to the other inferior clergy present. Since Innocent III's time it is customary to use for this purpose an image of the crucified Christ, which is handed to the different clergy for the purpose of bestowing upon it the kiss in token of brotherly love (such are also used at the coronation of Roman Catholic princes), and the image is therefore called *instrumentum pacis*, 'the instrument of peace.' See *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 2, 410.

## Insufflation

*SEE EXORCIST.*

## Insulani

(*islanders*) is an old name by which the monks who belonged to the famous monastery in the island of Lewis were known.



## Insult

or such a treatment of another, in word or deed, as to express contempt, is not definitely taken cognizance of in the Mosaic law; only the reviling of superiors is forbidden (<sup><40228></sup>Exodus 22:28), yet without any special penalty attached. The severity, however, with ‘which disrespect towards sacred persons was punished appears from <sup><41022></sup>2 Kings 2:22 sq. There also occurs mention (<sup><49218></sup>Psalms 22:8; 38:21; <sup><25125></sup>Lamentations 2:15; <sup><41739></sup>Matthew 27:39) of gestures of malicious mockery (wagging the head, **υαο [ϋναε]**). Insult by abusive words (<sup><41652></sup>Matthew 5:22, **ῥακά**; *SEE RACA*) or stroke (smiting on the cheek, <sup><48160></sup>Job 16:10; <sup><41659></sup>Matthew 5:39; <sup><46822></sup>John 18:22; 19:3; pulling the ears, spitting upon, Matt. 27:30, etc.) was, in later law, punished by fine (Mishna, *Baba Kammer*, 8, 6; comp. <sup><41652></sup>Matthew 5:22), as also in Roman law. For a marked public affront which Herod Agrippa I received at Alexandria, see Philo, 2, 522. *SEE COURTESY*.

## Intention

“a deliberate notion of the will by which it is supposed to accomplish a certain act: first, taking in merely the act; secondly, taking in also the consequences of the act. An action may be done with a good intention, and may produce bad results; or it may be done with a good intention, and produce good results. It may also be done with an evil intention and yet good results may follow; or with an evil intention, producing evil results. As a question of morals, therefore, the intention with which anything is done really determines the quality of the action as regards the person who does it. It is not possible that it should always determine the course of social policy in the matter of rewards or punishments; but it may mostly determine the verdict of conscience respecting the good or evil of an act, and has doubtless a large place in the divine judgment of them. No intention can be good, however, which purposes the doing of an evil action, although with the object of securing good results; nor any which does a good action with the object of producing evil results.” *SEE ETHICS; SEE MORAL SENSE*.

In the Roman Catholic Church the *intention of the priest* is held to be essential to the valid celebration of the sacraments. This the Council of Trent decreed in its 11th canon (Sess. 7): “If any one shall say that in ministers, while they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the *intention* at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.”

The same principle, in the main, was advocated and set forth by popes Martin V and Eugenius IV in the early part of the last century. So abused has this principle generally become in the Roman Catholic Church, that by its consequences it must be declared to be greatly detrimental to the cause of the Christian religion. For inasmuch as the insincerity of the actor reduces the act to a mockery and a sinful trifling with sacred things, the Church of Rome, by this decision, “exposes the laity to doubt, hesitation, and insecurity whenever they receive a sacrament at the hand of a priest in whose piety and sincerity they have not full confidence. If a wicked priest, for instance, should baptize a child without an inward *intention* to baptize him, it would follow that the baptism was null and void for want of the intention.” The Church of England, to repudiate this perverse doctrine, in its 26th Article of Religion, declares, therefore, that the unworthiness of ministers does not hinder the effect of sacraments, “forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ’s, and do minister by his commission, [and therefore] we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ’s ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God’s gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.” See Staunton, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 398; Blunt, *Theol. Dict.* 1, 351; and, for a moderate Roman account of *Intention*, Liebermann, *Instit. Theol.* (ed. 1861), 2, 386 sq.

### Intercalary Fruits

is a term in the Roman Catholic Church for the revenues of an ecclesiastical benefice accruing during a vacancy. In the 24th Sess. of the Council of Trent (c. 18, *De Reform.*; c. 1 and 3, X. *De praebend. et dignitt.*) it was decreed that whatever the deceased ecclesiastic had really earned was a part of the property of the deceased, but that the remainder should go either to his successor in office or to *thflabrica ecclesice*, or to him who is to appoint the successor, and to provide in the interim. It is frequently the case that these funds are transferred to societies of widows and orphans, or are used for some benevolent objects in the Church. See Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 673; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:498; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 2, 410.

## Intercalary Month

SEE CALENDAR.

## Intercession

([*ἰνπ*; ἔντευξις]) is the act of interposition in behalf of another, to plead for him (<sup><S312></sup>Isaiah 53:12; 59:16; <sup><S401></sup>1 Timothy 2:1). SEE ADVOCATE.

## Intercession Of Christ.

This refers, in a general sense, to *any aid* which he, as perpetual High priest, extends to those who approach God confiding in him (<sup><S046></sup>Hebrews 4:16; 7:25-27). He is also represented as offering up the prayers and praises of his people, which become acceptable to God through him (<sup><S315></sup>Hebrews 13:15; <sup><A115></sup>1 Peter 2:5; <sup><A88></sup>Revelation 8:3). Of the intercession of Christ we may observe, that it is righteous, for it is founded upon justice and truth (<sup><S075></sup>Hebrews 7:26; <sup><A115></sup>1 John 3:5), compassionate (<sup><S017></sup>Hebrews 2:17; 5:8), perpetual (<sup><S075></sup>Hebrews 7:25), and efficacious (<sup><A111></sup>1 John 2:1). SEE MEDIATOR.

## Intercession

in the sense of supplication, was not appropriate to the office of the Hebrew high-priest; he was the presenter of sacrifices on account of sins, and made intercession or atonement by sprinkling the blood of victims before Jehovah: this gave, as it were, a voice to the blood. Hence-if we attach a special idea to the term “intercession,” as applied to the work of our glorious High priest, may we not say that it is equivalent to propitiation or atonement? In the holiest of all, “the blood of Jesus speaketh” (<sup><S124></sup>Hebrews 12:24). The dignity and merit, power and authority of the Messiah, in his exalted state, imply a continued *presentation* of his obedience and sacrifice as ever valid and efficacious for the pardon and acceptance, the perfect holiness and eternal happiness, of all who are truly penitent, believing, and obedient. Hence his intercession, or his acting as high-priest in the heavenly world, was represented by the Hebrew high-priest’s entering into the most holy place, on the annual day of atonement, with the fragrant incense burning, and with the sacrificial blood which he was to sprinkle upon the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, and before the awful symbols of Jehovah’s presence. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

“The need of an intercessor arose from the loss of the right of communion with God, of which Adam was deprived when he sinned. Before the fall, Adam was the high priest of all creation, and, as such, privileged to hold free intercourse with God; and this privilege, lost by Adam, was restored in Christ. Until the fullness of time came’ a temporary-provision was made for man’s acceptance with God in the sacrifices of the patriarchal age, and the ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual; but all these were shadows of the priestly function of the Son of God, which commenced from the time when he offered up himself as a sacrifice on the cross. The intercession of Christ is the exercise of his priestly office, which is carried on continually in heaven (<sup><8184></sup>Romans 8:34). He was fitted to become our high priest by the union of his divine and human natures (<sup><8175></sup>Hebrews 7:25; <sup><25812></sup>Isaiah 53:12). His manhood enables him to plead on our behalf as the representative of human nature, and so to sympathize with those needs and those sorrows which require his intercessions, that he offers them up as one most deeply interested in our welfare (<sup><8145></sup>Hebrews 4:15). His priesthood, moreover, requires an offering, and it is still his human nature which furnishes both the victim and the priest. His Godhead renders that sacrifice an invaluable offering, and his intercession all-effectual (<sup><8194></sup>Hebrews 9:14).”

### Intercession Of The Holy Ghost.

Man intercedes with man, sometimes to procure an advantage to himself, sometimes as a mediator to benefit another; he may be said to intercede for another when he puts words into the suppliant’s mouth, and directs and prompts him to say what otherwise he would be unable to say, or to say in a more persuasive manner what he might intend to say. The intercession of the Holy Spirit (<sup><8126></sup>Romans 8:26) is easily illustrated by this adaptation of the term. *SEE PARACIETE; SEE INVOCATION.*

### Intercession Of Saints.

In addition to the intercessions of Christ, and, indeed, that of angels likewise, Roman Catholics believe in the efficacy of the intercession of the Virgin and the saints, who, however, as they state, do not directly intercede for men with God, but with the Savior, the sinless One, who alone has the ear of the King of the universe. *SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.*

## Intercessores or Interventores

was the name of officers peculiar to the African Church, who acted as temporary incumbents of a vacant bishopric, and for the time being performed the episcopal functions. It was their duty to take measures for the immediate appointment of a bishop. To prevent abuses, which had become prevalent by either choosing incompetent successors or by protracting the election of a new prelate, a Council of Carthage in 401 forbade the tenure to continue longer than one year, and also any succession to the temporary occupant. See Farrar, *Theol. Dict. s.v.*; Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, s.v.; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 223.

## Interdict

(*interdictum*, sc. *celebrationis divini officii*, a prohibition of religious offices) is an ecclesiastical censure or penalty in the Roman Catholic Church, consisting in the withdrawal of the administration of certain sacraments, of the celebration of public worship, and of the solemn burial service. There are three kinds of interdicts: *local*, which affect a particular place, and thus comprehend all, without distinction, who reside therein; *personal*, which only affect a person or persons, and which reach this person or persons, and these alone, no matter where found; and *mixed*, which affect both a place and its inhabitants, so that' the latter would be bound by the interdict even outside of its purely local limits. But, as the interdict is oftentimes inflicted on the clergy alone, it is always strictly interpreted, so that one imposed on a parish, etc., does not take effect also on the clergy, and vice versa (compare Ferraris, art. 2, 5). The interdict, like the ban (q.v.), may be inflicted by legal order (*interdictum a jure*), or procured by ecclesiastical judges (*ab homine*). The reasons for inflicting this ecclesiastical penalty are various; most generally they are the abolition of Church immunities, disrespect towards ecclesiastical authority or commands, and the effects are generally the prohibition of administering the sacraments, of holding public worship, and the denial of Christian burial; yet various modifications: have been frequent. Thus Alexander III permitted in 1173 the administration of the sacrament of baptism to children, and that of penitence to the dying (c. 11, X. *De sponsalibus*, 4, 1; comp. c. 11, X. *De penit. et remiss.* 5, 38; c. 24, *De sententia excomm.* 6; 5, 11). Innocent III allowed' confirmation and preaching (c. 43, X. *De sent. excomm.* 5, 39, a. 1208), as also penitence, with some restrictions (c. 11, X. *De penit.* 5, 38, a. 1214; comp. c.24, *De sent. excomm.* in 6), the

silent burial of the clergy (c. 11, X. cit. 5, 38), and to convents the observance of the canonical hours, without singing, and the reading of a low mass, which was in the following year extended also to the bishops (c. 25, X. *De privilegiis*, 5, 33, a. 1215). But to this was appended the condition that the parties under excommunication or interdict should not be present, that the doors of the churches should remain locked, and no bells be allowed to ring. Boniface VIII went further, and allowed the celebration of public worship with open doors, ringing of bells, and in the presence of the excommunicated parties on the occasions of the Nativity, Easter, Pentecost, and the Ascension of the Virgin. Yet such of the interdicted and excommunicated as did not come to the altar were to be excluded (c. 24, *De sent. excomm.* in 6 [5, 11]). Martin V and Eugene IV extended this to the whole octave of the Corpus Christi (*Const. Ineffabile*, an. 1429, and *Const. Excellentissimum*, an. 1433, in *Bullar. Magnum*, 1, 308, 323); and Leo X to the octave of the festival of the Holy Conception. There were, moreover, other special regulations made for the benefit of the Franciscans and other orders of monks (Ferraris, art. 6, no. 15). In the 25th Session of the Council of Trent (cap. 12, *De regularibus*) it was decided that the regulars generally were to observe the interdict, as had already been commanded by Clement V (c. 1, Clem. *De sent. excomm.* 5, 10, Concil. Vienn. 1311).

The right of pronouncing the interdict is vested in the pope, the provincial synod, the bishop, with the assent of the chapter, and even without it (c. 2, X. *De his que fiunt a majori parte capituli*, 3, 11, Celestin III, an. 1190; Clem. 1, *De sent. exc.* cit. Cone. Trid. cit. See Gonzalez Tellez, c. 5, X. *De consuet.* no. 4). The interdict can be withdrawn by any confessor when it is particular and personal, not reserved, but applying to minor points (c. 29, X. *De sent. exc.* 5, 39, Innocent III, anno 1199); other interdicts are to be withdrawn by those who pronounced them, their successors, delegates, or superiors (see Ferraris, article 8). The fundamental principles of the interdict are yet in vigor in the Roman Church (see Benedict XIV, *De synod. diac.* lib. 10:cap. 1, § 3 sq.), but it has not been exercised to its full extent since the 17th century. As late as 1606 Paul V pronounced it against the Republic of Venice (see Riegger, *Diss. de penitentiis et penis eccl.* Vienn. 1772, § 76; and Schmidt, *Thesaurus juris eccl.* 7, 172), and particular interdicts are still in frequent use, as, for instance, the *interdictio ingressus in ecclesiam*, the defense for laymen to enter the Church (c. 48, X. *De sent. excomm.* 5, 39, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 20, *eod.* in 6; 5, 11,

Boniface VIII, etc.). The Council of Trent (Sess. 6:cap. 1, *in fin. de ref.*) pronounced this punishment against the bishops and archbishops who neglected the command to reside in their diocese. To it belongs also the *cessatio a divinis*, touching the use of the bells and organ (c. 55, X. *De appellat.* 2, 28, Innocent III, an. 1213; c. 13, § 1, X. *De officio judicis ord.* 1, 31, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 2, *eod.* in 6:and 1, 16, Gregor. X, an. 1274; c. 8, *eod.* Bonifac. VIII), as a public mourning of the Church (c. 18, *De sent. excomm.* in 6:1, *ib.* Bonifac. VIII).

*History.* — The time when the interdict was first introduced into the Church is not generally known; but it is usually traced to the early discipline of public penance, “by which penitents were for a time debarred from the privilege of presence at the celebration of the Eucharist.” Instances of it are met with in very early times (see c. 8, Can. 5, qu. 6 [*Conc. Agath.* anno 506] and 10, 11, Can 17, qu. 4 [*Paenit. Rom.*], etc. Comp. also Gonzales Tellez, cap. 5, X. *De consuet.* 1, 4, no. 19). But it was not until the Middle Ages, the days of superstition, when the mind was in a condition difficult for us of modern ideas fully to realize or to understand, that this ecclesiastical punishment came into general use as a weapon of the Church against all ecclesiastical and civil inroads. In 1125 Ivo of Chartre calls it yet (*Epist.* 94) “remedium insolitum, ob suam nimirum novitatem;” and at the Synod of Limoges in 1301, the following resolution was passed at the second session: “Nisi de pace acquieverint, ligate omnem terram Lemovicensem publica excommunicatione: eo videlicet modo, ut nemo, nisi clericus, aut pauper mendicans, aut peregrinus adveniens, aut infans a bimatu et infra in toto Lemovicino sepeliatur, nec in alium episcopatum ad sepeliendum portetur. Divinum officium per omnes ecclesias omnibus, et omnes proni in faciem preces pro tribulatione et pace fundant. Paenitentia et viaticum in exitu mortis tribuarur. Altaria per omnes ecclesias, sicut in Parasceve, nudentur; et cruces et ornamenta abscondantur, quia signum luctus et tristitiae omnibus est. Ad missas tantum, quas unusquisque sacerdotum januis ecclesiarum obseratis fecerit, altaria induantur, et iterum post missas nudentur. Nemo in ipsa excommunicatione uxorem ducat. Nemo alteri osculum det, nemo clericorum aut laicorum, vel habitantium vel transeuntium, in toto Lemovicino carnem comedat, neque alios cibos, quam illos, quibus in Quadragesima vesci licitum est. Nemo clericorum aut laicorum tondeatur, neque radatur, quousque districti principes, capita populorum, per omnia

sancto obdeiant concilio” (Mansi, *Coll. Conciliorum*, 19, 541; Du Fresne, s.v. Interdictum).

The most remarkable of the interdicts since the 11<sup>th</sup> century were those laid upon Scotland in 1180 by Alexander III; on Poland by Gregory VII, on occasion of the murder of Stanislaus at the altar in 1073; by Innocent III on France, under Philippe Augustus, in 1200; and on England under John in 1209. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 454; Milman, *Latin Christianity* (see Index); Riddle, *History of the Papacy* 2, 83 sq., et al.; Junus, *Pope and Council*, p. 289; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 705 sq.

## Interest

SEE *URSURY*.

## Interim

the name of certain formularies of confessions of faith obtruded upon the Reformers by the emperor Charles V. They were so called because they were only to take place *in the interim*, till a general council should decide all the points in question between the Protestants and Catholics. There were three of such formularies.

**1. THE INTERIM OF RATISBON** (*Regensburg*). Numerous conferences had been held by both parties, i.e. the Romanists and the Protestants, after the formation of the “League of Smalkald” (1531), to bring about a reconciliation. As a literal Roman Catholic writer of our own days (Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 369) says, “It was long before men (in Germany and generally on this side of the Alps) grasped the idea of the breach of Church communion becoming permanent. The general feeling was still so far Church-like that a really free council, *independent* of papal control, was confidently looked to for at once purifying and uniting the Church, though, of course, views differed as to the conditions of reunion, according to personal position and national sentiment.” A conference was finally appointed and held at Worms, under the leadership of Melancthon and Eckius, according to appointment, by Charles V, and afterwards removed to Ratisbon, where the diet met (1541). Here Pflug and Gropper figured prominently by the side of Eckius on the Roman Catholic side, and Bucer and Pistorius by the side of Melancthon. The Roman Catholics now conceded that the communion of both kinds could be administered to all; that the question of sacerdotal celibacy was of no vital importance, etc.;



but the Protestants were nevertheless afraid of some hidden plan, and only an *apparent* reconciliation was effected: it really settled no question at all, satisfied neither party, and finally, as Luther had predicted before the convocation, led only afterwards to much misunderstanding and mutual recrimination. "Let them go on," said Luther, referring to the schemes of those who thought that the differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants might be made up by such conferences, 'we shall not envy the success of their labors; they will be the first who could ever convert the devil and reconcile him to Christ... The scepter of the Lord admits of no bending and joining, but must remain straight and unchanged, the rule of faith and practice.'" Charles V, determined to secure the ratification of the points of agreement entered into at Ratisbon by a national council, forbade the Protestants to argue, in the mean time, on the controverted points, or to dispose in any way of the property of the churches. They protested, however, and went on, regardless of the interim.

**2. THE AUGSBURG INTERIM.** After the duke of Alva, through the treachery of Maurice of Saxony, had broken the power of the Protestants at the battle of Muhlberg, and by the overthrow of the Smalkald league, the emperor had brought them helpless at his feet, Charles V, seeing that the pope had not acted in accordance with his wishes at the Council of Trent, decided to attempt by still other conferences to reunite the two contending parties, or at least "to keep matters quiet until the final verdict of that ecumenical council which constantly vanished in the distance." For that purpose he called the three divines, viz. Julius Pflug, bishop of Naumburg; Michael Helding, titular bishop of Sidon; and the Protestant John Agricola, preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, to agree upon a series of articles concerning the points of religion in dispute between the Catholics and Protestants. The controverted points were, the state of Adam before and after his fall; the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; the justification of sinners; charity and good works, the confidence we ought to have in God; that our sins are remitted; the Church and its true marks, its power, its authority, and ministers; the pope and bishops, the sacraments; the mass; the commemoration of saints; their intercession, and prayers for the dead. The result of their discussions was the agreement drawn up in twenty-six articles. These the emperor submitted to the pope for his approbation, and sent copies of them also to the electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg, and to the other evangelical princes. But both the pope and the German theologians refused to adhere to them. The emperor next had them revised

by two Dominican monks, who made several alterations, and they were then promulgated as an imperial constitution, called the "Interim," wherein he declared that "it was his will that all his Catholic dominions should, for the future, inviolably observe the customs, statutes, and ordinances of the universal Church; and that those who had separated themselves from it should either reunite themselves to it, or at least conform to this constitution; and that all should quietly expect the decisions of the general council;" and it was published in the diet of Augustburg, May 15, 1548. To the Protestant clergy it granted, for the time being, the right of the matrimonial state, and to the Reformed laity communion of both kinds. It was truly a standard of faith put forth by the emperor independent of Rome, as the pope refused to sanction it, and in the face of the bitter complaints that came to him that the power and property of the Church should be left in the hands of its present possessors, he showed the pope that he too, like Henry VIII, could regulate the consciences of his subjects, and prescribe their religious faith. The elector of Mentz, quite contrary to the wishes of the other members of the Diet, and of the people there represented, announced the acceptance of the interim by the states, and it was consequently declared law, and printed in Latin and in German. Both Protestants and Catholics began, however, violently to attack it; the Romanists complained of the concessions made to the Protestants, while the Protestant princes (John Frederick of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave John v. Küstrin, the elector Wolfgang v. Zweibrücken) declined introducing it in their states; the only princes who submitted to it were the elector of Brandenburg, the elector of the Palatinate, the count of Württemberg, and the cities of Augsburg, Halle, etc. (the latter by compulsion).

**III. THE LEIPZIG INTERIM.** — The Lutheran theologians openly declared they would not receive the Augsburg interim, alleging that it re-established popery: some chose rather to quit their chairs and livings than to subscribe it. Calvin and several others wrote against it. On the other side, the emperor was so severe against those who refused to accept it, that he disfranchised the cities of Magdeburg and Constance for their opposition. Most important, however, for the Protestant cause, and impossible for Charles to pass unheeded, was the opposition against the Augsburg interim by Maurice of Saxony, who denied the right of the elector of Mentz to give himself the approval to an act that demanded the concurrence of the states directly and not indirectly. To fortify himself

more strongly in his position, Maurice entered into correspondence with Melancthon, and called a council of state and of prominent theologians at Leipzig and other cities. In the conference at Leipzig it was decided, Sept. 22, 1548, that the Augsburg interim could not be accepted. Yet, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the emperor, a compromise was effected. In a series of resolutions which were adopted, they admitted a great part of the Roman Catholic ceremonials, and tacitly acknowledged also the power of the popes and bishops, but yet well guarded (!) the creed of the Reformers. These resolves of the conference were published as the *Leipzig Interim*, Dec. 22, 1548. Subsequently it was divided into a lesser and greater interim. The first was based on resolutions passed at the conference of Celle, and was published by an edict of the elector, and this ultimately became the basis of the *greater Leipzig Interim*. It was prepared by Melancthon, Eber, Bugenhagen, Major, and prince. George of Anhalt. It restored some Roman Catholic practices; directed that mass should be celebrated with ringing of bells, lighted tapers, and a decorated altar, accompanied by singing, and be performed in Latin by priests in canonicals; that the *Hore canoniae* and psalms should be sung according to the custom of each place; the old festivals of Mary, etc., were re-established, and meat forbidden on Fridays and fast-days, etc. These decisions, which were promulgated in March, 1549, met with much opposition in Saxony, yet they were strictly enforced, and such ministers as refused to submit to the interim were deposed, as, for instance, Flacius of Wittenberg. The latter then put himself at the head of the opposing party, called by the partisans of the interim Adiaphorists. **SEE ADAPHORIC CONTROVERSY**. Another treacherous action of Maurice, which secured his services anew to the Reformers, undid all the work already accomplished by Charles V; “and while Henry II was winning, at the expense of the empire, the delusive title of conqueror, Charles found himself reduced to the hard necessity of restoring all that his crooked policy had for so many years been devoted to extorting.” In 1552 the *interim* was necessarily revoked, and, by the transaction of Passau, August 2, 1552, full liberty of conscience secured to all the Lutheran states; and Sept. 21, 1555, at the Diet of Augsburg, was finally confirmed the right of the states and cities of the Augsburg Confession (q.v.) “to enjoy the practices of their religion in peace.” Compare Menzel, *Neue Geschichte*, vol. 3; Robertson, *Charles V* (Harper’s edit.), bk. 9: especially p. 377 sq.; and see Bieck, *Ueber d. Interim* (Leipz. 1727, 8vo); Hirsch, *Ueb. d. Interim* (Lpz. 1753); Baumgarten, *Gesch. d. Rel. Partheien*, p. 1163 sq.; Schrbckh,

*Kirchengesch. s. d. Rpf.* 1, 592, 674 sq., 683, 686 sq.; *Zeitschrift. hist. theol.* 1868, p. 3 sq.; *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, 1868, p. 631; *Lea Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 432 sq.; *Hardwick, Reformation* (see Ind.); *Pierer, Univ. Lex.* s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Intermediate State

a phrase employed to denote the state or situation of disembodied souls during the interval between death and the resurrection. There have been several theories upon the subject. *SEE HADES.*

The condition of the soul after death cannot but be a subject of intense concern to every thoughtful mind. Pagan philosophers have groped in the dark for some clew to guide their aspirations after immortality, but have at best attained only surmises and conjectures. Of all the millions that have crossed the dread gulf which separates time from eternity, none have ever returned to bring tidings of what befell them the moment after they launched from the shores of mortality.. Revelation alone has cast a ray across the mighty void, and its light has gradually grown clearer and more penetrating, until in the New Testament we are no longer left in any measure to doubt whether, "if a man die, he shall live again." We rest assured that not only shall the soul survive the shock of dissolution, but the body also shall eventually join it in an endless reunion.

Still the question recurs, what will be the internal state and what the external circumstances of the spirit during the period between death and the resurrection? Respecting this little is definitely said in the Scriptures, and it is therefore left for speculation to fill up the lack of information on this interesting theme, guided by such hints as are casually thrown out by the sacred writers, and such considerations as the ascertained nature and destiny of man afford.

**I.** The popular sentiment or belief of Christians--expressed rather in the form of hope than as a theory--appears to be that the righteous enter heaven *immediately* after they pass away from this world. Such passages as the Savior's declaration to the dying thief, "*This day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise," and the parable of Dives and Lazarus, are thought especially to support this view; and hence believers have fearlessly cast themselves into the arms of death, expecting to awake the next moment in the full realities of everlasting glory.

Now we would not for all the world deprive dying saints of a particle of the consolation which the Gospel is designed to yield, \nor is it: any part of our present purpose to weaken anticipations of the future rest in the bosom of any, however sanguine and impatient. But the known truth that a long-probably immense-interval of time will elapse between the decease of Christians of the present age-and certainly of past centuries and the revival of their bodies at the general judgment, is sufficient to prove that they do not instantly pass from the Church militant to the New Jerusalem above. Let us calmly and logically consider what may be ascertained as to the experience and surroundings of the soul during this intermediate period.

*SEE IMMORTALITY.*

The topic calls for a volume rather than an essay, and, as we must be brief, we make but two other preliminary remarks. The first is that we have not space here to discuss the above and kindred passages of the New Testament; but we direct the reader to professed commentaries for their exposition, and the solution of their bearing upon the point in question, contenting ourselves here with simply observing that they are figurative in their phraseology, and that, whatever they may mean, they cannot be intended to contradict the *fact* of a real space between death and the resurrection. Our other prefatory remark is, that as this is legitimately debatable ground, no essential item of creed or orthodoxy being involved in it, we ought not to incur any *odium theologicum* of unsoundness in the faith should our discussion lead to new and surprising conclusions. This last remark is especially pertinent in view of the fact that even orthodox Christians ill all ages have entertained very different views on this subject, as will appear from the following enumeration of opinions.

**II.** The theory of a state of *sleep*, insensibility, or unconsciousness. It was taught as early as A.D. 248 by the Arabian Thetopsychites, whom Origen combated. It was thought to be held by pope John XXII, and was disapproved by the University of Paris and pope Benedict XII. It was revived by the Swiss Anabaptists under the name of *Psychopannychia*, and was opposed by Calvin. And in later times it has been started anew, in a form more or less distinct, by John Heyn, Wetstein, Sulzer, Reinhard, and Whately, and by a new sect in Iowa. The defenders of a state of unconsciousness produce such texts as <sup><01715></sup>Psalm 17:15; <sup><0114></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:14. In opposition are cited <sup><0118></sup>2 Corinthians 5:8; <sup><0123></sup>Philippians 1:23; <sup><0173></sup>Matthew 17:3; <sup><0123></sup>Luke 16:23; 23:43; <sup><0119></sup>Revelation 6:9.

**3.** The theory of *Purgatory*. That Christ preached to the souls detained in Hades, as the patriarchs or others, was held in the 2nd and 3rd centuries by Justin, Ireneus, Tertullian, and Clem. Alexandrinus. It was supposed to be warranted by <sup><1819></sup>1 Peter 3:19; <sup><4127></sup>Acts 2:27; <sup><5107></sup>Romans 10:7; <sup><4049></sup>Ephesians 4:9; <sup><4123></sup>Matthew 12:31. The idea of a purgatorial fire is more or less obscurely hinted in the writings of Clem. Alexandrinus, Origen, and Augustine. But the complete scheme owes its paternity to Gregory the Great, who propounded it as an article of faith, along with intercessory masses for the dead; finding a supposed warrant in 2 Macc. 12:46. In opposition to the notion of a Purgatory, it may be said that it is a fiction borrowed from paganism; that it is repugnant to reason and common sense; that it is contradictory to express assertions of Scripture (<sup><5123></sup>Hebrews 12:23; <sup><6143></sup>Revelation 14:13; 22:11); that it is subversive of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, the atonement and justification by faith in Christ; that it robs the Christian of evangelical peace and consolation; and that it was unknown to the primitive Church. Even Augustine, when he prayed for the increase of his deceased mother's happiness, denied the existence of any middle place. (So also Clem. Rom. *Ephesians 2 and Corinthians*) The article, "he descended into hell," was not admitted into the Apostles' Creed, nor those of the East, until the 5th century. It appeared first in the Creed of Ariminum, A.D. 358, and in that of Aquileia, A.D. 381 (Rufinus, *De Symbol.*). See Wilson, *Illustrations from Apost. Fathers*, p. 108. **SEE PURGATORY.**

**4.** The scheme of a middle or intermediate place, or place of rest. This is a different idea from that of an intermediate state, meaning by the latter only an inferior degree of happiness apart from the yet unraised body. It is affirmed that judgment is not pronounced till the last day; but this is denied, a particular judgment passing on each individual, and his place being assigned him, upon his death (<sup><4125></sup>Acts 1:25; <sup><2163></sup>Luke 16:23; 23:43; <sup><4712></sup>2 Corinthians 12:2, 4). It is said that no one is perfectly holy when he dies, but only such can enter heaven. In reply, it is contended, as in the Westminster Catechism, that there is a distinction made between being perfectly holy and perfectly blessed, the first taking place at death, the latter only at the resurrection (<sup><5123></sup>Hebrews 12:23). It is alleged that the Scriptures favor the notion (<sup><41813></sup>John 3:13; 20:17; <sup><41234></sup>Acts 2:34; <sup><51139></sup>Hebrews 11:39); to which it is replied that these texts are dubious, and neutralized by others positive and unequivocal (<sup><1842></sup>Job 14:12; <sup><1111></sup>2 Kings

2:11; ~~408~~ Acts 7:59; ~~640~~ Revelation 14:2-5; 7:14). We proceed to render this theory more definite by proposing our own view of the subject.

**1.** In the first place, we lay it down as an axiom that a disembodied *or pure spirit is necessarily freed from all the relations of space* of which we are terrestrially cognizant. The external senses are locked up, because their physical organs are absent. Such a spirit may, for aught we know-and perhaps this position is the more probable-be open to intercourse with other pure spirits; doubtless it is at least accessible to the divine Spirit, from whose influence nothing material or immaterial can be veiled; but we are unable to conceive of any intercourse or connection between it and the present relations of things. There is absolutely no medium of communication, as far as we are aware. Death severs the link between the soul and the body, and therefore between the soul and all bodies. What new capacities may by that act be developed *within* the soul, what new relations created with other immaterial beings, or what realization of new conceptions, we of course know not; and, indeed, we have no reason to suppose any such; but if we would not utterly confound mind and matter, or unconsciously clothe the departed spirits with some ethereal form of body, we are bound to conclude, from the total diversity and even contrariety of their properties and attributes, that a dead man is really dead to everything pertaining to time and sense.

This cuts up, root and branch, all those impressions some have even gone so far as to claim them as scientific experience of intercommunication between living persons and the spirits of their deceased friends. The common sense of enlightened Christianity has long since stamped all such stories with the just suspicion of superstitious imagination. Severe reasoning compels us to set them down as hallucination or imposture. Those who have indulged themselves in these fancies have always diverged towards insanity or materialism.

A disembodied spirit, therefore, prior to the restoration of its physical organism, is incapable of any of the material joys which imagination is wont to associate with the fill idea of the heavenly state. We must carefully exclude from its experience during that interval everything that grows out of our mundane notions and present externalities. That these, and more than these, will be restored on the consummation of its bliss in the new heavens and the new earth of its final abode, we are abundantly assured by the symbols and teachings of the New Testament; but the soul must wait



for these enjoyments until its bodily counterpart shall have been raised, spiritualized, perfected, and immortalized.

We may go further than this, and declare that none of the now known and verbally defined relations in point of location are predicable of the departed soul; in other words, it is not in any particular assignable *place* while in that state. The instant it quits the body it possesses no local habitation. Its position cannot be determined as to space, for it has no metes or boundaries, no point of contact with visible objects. It can neither be said to be somewhere nor nowhere, nor yet everywhere. It simply exists-like God, but not infinite. In short, if heaven be a locality (and the existence in some part of the universe of the Redeemer's actual body, as well as those of Enoch and Elijah, besides the concurrent figures of the whole Bible, lead us to conclude that it is such as well as a state), then certainly the disembodied spirit cannot with propriety be spoken of as being *there* any more than elsewhere. This, we admit, is an abstraction; but we are speaking of a mere abstraction; for what can be more abstract more really inconceivable according to our earthly notions than a soul without a body.

But let it not be imagined that the soul has thus lost any of its essence or inherent powers. It remains in all these absolute and intact, a veritable entity, as truly such as any spiritual being, or as when united to the body, or indeed as the body itself; but it is shut within itself, and circumscribed by the limits of its own nature. All that we are now demanding is that it shall no longer be viewed, and treated, and spoken of under the conditions, and associations, and terms of an absent corporeity. These have no meaning when applied to it, except as belonging to the past.

**2.** In the second place, it follows that *the soul can have no cognizance of the passage of time* while thus disembodied. Time consists of the sequence of events, and all means of knowing the transpiration of these are excluded by the very supposition of the present case. Time, moreover, is measured by the alternations of natural objects, and these are also abnegated here. It is evidently impossible for the isolated spirit to be at all aware of the flight of hours, seasons, or ages. To it "a thousand years are as one day" — both alike unappreciable. The only change it could experience would be the succession of its own ideas, and these if comparable for such a purpose with our present associations of thought, which are like chords played upon by every passing breeze of circumstance and touch of physical condition-furnish no fixed standard or definite mark to our own



consciousness. How seldom do we think of the lapse of time during our dreams, which afford the nearest parallel to the state we are considering; and how wide of a true estimate are we when we chance to compute the moments or imaginary hours in our somnolency. Some notable instances are on record of the egregious miscalculation of time by dreaming persons, showing that in sleep they have no accurate means of determining it, but that they protract or abbreviate it to suit the humor of the dream. Much more would this be true with the disembodied soul, which has even less opportunity or occasion to review its course of thoughts for such a purpose, or, indeed, to take any note of their rapidity or tediousness of succession. We conclude, therefore, that *the intermediate state will pass to all its subjects as an instant*, and that none will be aware of the length of the interval.

This is in accordance with a remarkable passage of Scripture—about the only one where the subject is directly and literally touched upon—and this but incidentally, in answer apparently to a query that had been addressed to an apostle on account of certain curious or captious persons; for the Scriptures are very chary of information on such abstruse points. Paul tells us expressly (~~1~~<sup>2</sup> Thessalonians 4:15, 17), “We [or those] which are alive and remain unto the [final] coming of the Lord *shall not precede* [“prevent”] them which are asleep... We [or those] which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds.” He is speaking, it is true, of the resurrection of the body, and it is with reference to this that he says one class of saints shall not anticipate another in that reward; but his language implies that none shall have any advantage in point of time over the rest, and this would not be true if some must pass long centuries of waiting, while others are translated suddenly from earth to heaven. No; it will all be equalized: Noah, who died thousands of years ago, shall not seem to himself to pass any longer period of expectation in the grave, or, rather, in the spirit world, than the last saint that is interred just as Gabriel’s trump shall reawaken his undecayed corpse, or than those who then shall be living on the globe. This theory meets and harmonizes all their cases, and vindicates the divine impartiality.

Some confirmation of this view may likewise be derived from the simultaneousness of the general judgment. We surely are not to suppose that any will remain cycles of ages in the other world, whether happy or miserable, without having their destiny as yet fixed, and their final doom awarded. To each individual’s consciousness, doubtless, will be definitely

assigned, at the instant he is ushered into the presence of his Maker, the awards of his irrevocable fate, and this knowledge will form the basis of his joy or despair. The only object after this of a general gathering would be to make known to the universe a sentence that has already been anticipated to the parties chiefly interested. The Scriptural representations of the “last grand assize” are evidently *scenic* in their character, that is, pictures of what to those concerned shall seem to transpire substantially, but not necessarily literally thus. *SEE JUDGMENT, GENERAL*. Be that as’ it may, on our theory alone a universal assemblage would be more possible and significant: to each human being the hour of death is practically, although not actually, the day of judgment, for the two events are separated only by an inappreciable interval; and as the same is true of all his fellows, and as their several days of doom are also separated by an inappreciable interval, they are all reduced to *every man’s own apprehension* to the same plane of time, and consequently may justly even with reference to individuals be depicted as judged together. The hour of Christ’s three predicted comings—in vengeance on the Jews—in the article of death in the final scene thus, although really distinct events, become identical by more than a figure of speech, and he is justified in alluding to them all in the same breath.

**3.** In the third and last place, however, as above intimated, *the intermediate state will not be a period of unconsciousness*. This might be hastily inferred from the insulation of the spirit from all sources of external knowledge and impression. But it has still left to it the whole inner world of thought and feeling: memory is busy with the past, and hope is active with anticipations of the future; the direct comforts of the Holy Spirit also are by no means denied during this expectant period, and none can tell how greatly these and all the foregoing emotions may be intensified by the rapt state of the disembodied soul. Examples like those of Paul “caught up into the third heavens,” of Tennent in a prolonged fit of catalepsy, and of others in similar extraordinary states of spiritual elevation, might be cited to show how far such an abreption of bodily functions is calculated to enhance the perceptions of celestial verities; but these, it must be borne in mind, were really experiences in the flesh—although Pal seems doubtful whether he was not actually “out of the body,” and at least intimates that such mental exaltation would be possible if he were released from earth; they are, therefore, not strictly in point as proof. On the other hand, general observation and experiment show that all temporary collapse or extinction of the bodily functions — as by accident or disease affecting the brain or

nervous centers — is attended by suppression in the same degree of the mental faculties; but these, again, are symptoms occurring under the joint relations of soul and body, and therefore no sure indications of what might take place in a disembodied state. Accordingly, we fall back upon the position most agreeable to our native aspirations, and most conformable, as we think, to the teachings of revelation, that the soul, immediately after passing out of the body, enters upon a condition of conscious happiness or misery, according to its previous fitness and habits. In a word, we see no reason why, when set free from connection with the body, the spirit should do otherwise than continue to exercise the emotions and intellections which had already become customary with it. Until its reunion with the body, however—a space, as we have seen, of practically no account to itself, at least in point of duration—it can receive no new experience, and be subject to no external influences, unless they be purely spiritual. *SEE HEAVEN.*

See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*; Bp. Law, *Theory of Religion*; Bees, *Cyclopaedia*, art. Sleep of Soul; Taylor, *Physical Theory of another Life*; Tucker, *Light of Nature*, Brougham, *Natural Theology*; Stuart, *Essays*; Abp. Whately, *On Future State*; *Les Horizons Celestes*; Barrow, Pearson, Bull, *On Apostles' Creed*; Bp. White, *Lectures on the Catechism*; Archibald Campbell, *View of the Middle State*; Watts, *World to Come*; Watson, *Theolog. Institutes*; Hall, *Purgatory Examined*; M'Cullough, *On the Intermediate State*; *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1852, p. 240; Baylie, *The Intermediate State of the Blessed* (Lond. 1864); Shimeall, *The Unseen World* (N. York, 1868); *Freewill Baptist Quarterly*, April, 1861; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* October, 1861; *Christian Rev.* April, 1862; *Boston Rev.* Jan. 1864.

## Interment

*SEE BURIAL.*

## Internal Dignitaries

was the name by which, in the English Church, under the “old foundation,” the dean, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer of cathedrals were known. See Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 331.

## Internuntius or Internuncio

an envoy of the pope, sent only to small states and republics, while the real nuncio is the representative of the papal see at the courts of emperors and kings.

## Interpretation, Biblical

or the science of sacred *Hermeneutics*, as it is more technically called. In a narrower sense it is frequently termed *exegesis*, especially in relation to particular passages. For practical rules of interpretation, *SEE HERMENEUTICS*.

### I. *Definition and Distinctions.* —

**1.** There is a very ancient and wide-spread belief that the knowledge of divine things in general, and of the divine will in particular, is by no means a common property of the whole human race, but only a prerogative of a few specially gifted and privileged individuals. It has been considered that this higher degree of knowledge has its source in light and instruction proceeding directly from God and that it can be imparted to others by communication to them a key to the signs of the divine will. Since, however, persons who in this manner have been indirectly taught, are initiated into divine secrets, and consequently appear as the confidants of Deity, they also enjoy, although instructed only through the medium of others, a more intimate communion with God, a more distinct perception of his thoughts, and consequently a mediate consciousness of Deity itself. It therefore follows that persons thus either immediately or mediately instructed are supposed to be capable, by means of their divine illumination and their knowledge of the signs of the divine will, to impart to mankind the ardently desired knowledge of divine things and of the will of Deity. They are considered to be interpreters or explainers of the signs of the divine will, and, consequently, to be mediators between God and man. Divine illumination, and a communicable knowledge of the signs and expressions of the divine will, are thus supposed to be combined in one and the same person. *SEE REVELATION*.

**2.** The above general idea is the basis of the Hebrew *aybæ* prophet. The prophet is a divinely-inspired seer, and, as such, he is an interpreter and preacher of the divine will. He may either be directly called by God, or have been prepared for his office in the schools of the prophets (comp.

Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebraer volstaddig dargestellt*. Bresl. 1837, 1, 102 sq.; 2, 45 sq.). **SEE SEER**. However, the being filled with the Holy Ghost was the most prominent feature in the Hebrew idea of a prophet. This is even implied in the usual appellation **aybn**, which means a person in the state of divine inspiration (not a predictor of future events). Prophetism ceased altogether as soon as Jehovah, according to the popular opinion, ceased to communicate his Spirit. **SEE PROPHET**.

**3.** The Hebrew notion of a **aybæ** appears among the Greeks to have been split into its two constituent parts of **μάντις**, from **μαίνεσθαι**, to rave (Plato, *Phadrus*, § 48, ed. Steph. p. 244, a. b.), and of **ἐξηγητής**, from **ἐξηγείσθαι**, to expound. However, the ideas of **μάντις** and of **ἐξηγητής** could be combined in the same person. Compare Boissonnade, *Anecdota Græca*, 1, 96, **Λάμπων ἐξηγητής, μάντις γὰρ ἦν καὶ χρησμούς ἐξηγείτο** (compare Scholia in Aristophanes, *Nubes*, 336), and Arrian, *Epictetus*, 2, 7. **Τὸν μάντιν τὸν ἐξηγούμενον τὰ σημεῖα**; Plato, *De Leibus*, 9:p. 871, c., **Μετ' ἐξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων**; Euripides, *Phsenisse*, 5. 1018, **Ὁ μάντις ἐξηγήσατο**, and *Iphigenia in Aulide*, 1. 529. Plutarch (*Vita Numce*, cap. 11) places **ἐξηγητής** and **προφήτης** together; so also does Dionysius Halicarnassensis, 2, 73. The first two of these examples prove that **ἐξηγηταί** were, according to the Greeks, persons who possessed the gift of discovering the will of the Deity from certain appearances and of interpreting signs. Jul. Pollux (8, 124) says, **Ἐξηγηταὶ δὲ ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ τὰ περὶ τῶν διοσεμείων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν διδάσκοντες**. Harpocration says, and Suidas repeats after him, **Ἐξηγητής, ὁ ἐξηγούμενος τὰ ἱερά**. Comp. Becker, *Anecdota Græca*, 1, 185, **Ἐξηγοῦνται οἱ ἔμπειροι**. Creuzer defines the **ἐξηγηταί**, in his *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Volker*, 1, 15, as “persons whose high vocation it was to bring laymen into harmony with divine things. These **ἐξηγηταί** moved in a religious sphere (compare Herod. 1, 78, and Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 8, 3, 11). Even the Delphic Apollo, replying to those who sought his oracles, is called by Plato **ἐξηγητής** (*Polit.* 4, 448, b.). Plutarch mentions, in *Vita Thesei*, **ὀσίων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐξηγηταί**; compare also the above-quoted passage of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, and especially Ruhnken (*ad e Timceum Lexicon*, ed. Lugd. Bat. 1789, p. 189 sq.). The Scholiast on Sophocles (*Ajax*, 320) has **ἐξήγησις ἐπὶ τῶν θείων**, and the Scholiast on *Electra* (426) has the e definition **ἐξήγησις διασάφησις θείων**. It is in connection with this original signification of the word **ἐξηγητής** that the expounders of the law are styled **ἐξηγηταί**;

because the ancient law was derived from the gods, and the law-language had become unintelligible to the multitude. (Compare Lysias, 6, 10; Diodorus Siculus, 13:35; Ruhnken, as quoted above; the annotators on Pollux and Harpocration; and K. Fr. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staats-Alterthuiner*, Marburg, 1836, § 104, note 4). In Athenueus and Plutarch there are mentioned books under the title **ἐξηγητικά**, which contained introductions to the right understanding of sacred signs. (Compare Valesius, *ad Harpocrationem Lexicon*, Lipsiae, 1824, 2, 462.)

**4.** Like the Greeks, the Romans also distinguished between *vates* and *izterpres* (Cicero, *Fragm.*; Hortens.): “Sive vates sive in sacris initiisque tradendis divinae mentis interpretes.” Servius (*ad Virgilio AEn.* 2, 359) quotes a passage from Cicero to this effect: “The science of divination is twofold; it is either a sacred raving, as in prophets, or an art, as in soothsayers, who regard the intestines of sacrifices, or lightnings, or the flight of birds.” The *aruspices*, *fulguriti*, *fulguratores*, and *augures* belong to the idea of the *interpretres deorum*. Comp. Cicero, *Pro domo sua*, c. 41 “I have been taught thus, that in undertaking new religious performances the chief thing seems to be the interpretation of the will of the immortal gods.” Cicero (*De Divinatione.* 1, 41) says: “The Hetrusci explain the meaning of all remarkable foreboding signs and portents.” Hence, in Cicero (*De Legibus*, 2, 27), the expression “interpretres religionum.”

An example of this distinction, usual likewise among the Greeks, is found in ~~1~~1 Corinthians 12:4,30. The Corinthians filled with the Holy Ghost were **γλώσσαῖς λαλοῦντες**, *speaking in tongues*, consequently they were in the state of a **μάντις**; but frequently they did not comprehend the full import of their own inspiration, and did not understand how to interpret it because they had not the **ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν**, *interpretation of tongues*: consequently they were not **ἐξηγηταί**.

The Romans obtained the *interpretatio* from the Etruscans (Cicero, *De Divinatione*, 1, 2, and Ottfried Muller, *Die Etrusker*, 2, 8 sq.); but the above distinction was the cause that the *interpretatio* degenerated into a common art, which was exercised without inspiration, like a contemptible soothsaying, the rules of which were contained in writings. Cicero (*De Divinatione*, 1, 2) says: “Supposing that divination by raving was especially contained in the Sibylline verses, they appointed ten public interpreters of the same.”

The ideas of *interperes* and of *interpretatio* were not confined among the Romans to sacred subjects, which, as we have seen, was the case among the Greeks with the corresponding Greek terms. The words *interpretes* and *interpretatio* were not only, as among the Greeks, applied to the explanation of the laws, but also, in general, to the explanation of whatever was obscure, and even to a mere intervention in the settlement of affairs; for instance, we find in Livy (21, 12) *pacis interpretes*, denoting Alorcas, by whose instrumentality peace was offered. At an earlier period *inteopretes* meant only those persons by means of whom affairs between God and man were settled (comp. Virgil, *Eneid*, 10, 175, and Servius on this passage). The words *interpretes* and *conjectores* became convertible terms: “for which reason the interpreters of dreams and omens are called also *conjecturers*” (Quintil. *Instit.* 3, 6).

From what we have stated, it follows that ἐξήγησις and *interpretatio* were originally terms confined to the unfolding of supernatural subjects, although in Latin, at an early period, these terms were also applied to profane matters.

5. The Christians also early felt the want of an interpretation of their sacred writings, which they deemed to be of divine origin; consequently they wanted interpreters and instruction by the aid of which the true sense of the sacred Scriptures might be discovered. The right understanding of the nature and will of God seemed, among the Christians, as well as at an early period among the heathen, to depend upon a right understanding of certain external signs; however, there was a progress from the unintelligible signs of nature to more intelligible written signs, which was certainly an important progress.

The Christians retained about the interpretation of their sacred writings the same expressions which had been current in reference to the interpretation of sacred subjects among the heathen. Hence arose the fact that the Greek Christians employed with predilection the words ἐξήγησις and ἐξηγητής in reference to the interpretation of the holy Scriptures. But the circumstance that St. Paul employs the term ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν for the interpretation of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (1 Corinthians 12:10; 14:26), greatly contributed to the use likewise of words belonging to the root ἑρμηνεύειν. According to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, 3:9), Paulus, bishop of Hierapolis wrote, as early as about A.D. 100, a work under the title of λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, which means an interpretation of



the discourses of Jesus. Papias explained the religious contents of these discourses, which he had collected from oral and written traditions. He distinguished between the meaning of ἐξηγεῖσθαι and ἐρμηνεύειν, as appears from his observation (preserved by Eusebius in the place quoted above), in which he says concerning the λόγια of Matthew, written in Hebrew, Ἐρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἐδύνατο ἕκαστος, “But every one interpreted them according to his ability.” In the Greek Church, ὁ ἐξηγητής and ἐξηγηταὶ τοῦ λόγου were the usual terms for teachers of Christianity. (See Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 7:30, and Heinichen on this passage, note 21; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* p. 105; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* 1, 146). Origen called his commentary on the holy Scriptures ἐξηγητικά; and Procopius of Gaza wrote a work on several books of the Bible, entitled σχολαὶ ἐξηγητικάί. However, we find the word ἐρμηνεία employed as a synonyme of ἐξήγησις, especially among the inhabitants of Antioch. For instance, Gregorius Nyssenus says concerning Ephraem Syrus, Γραφὴν ὅλην ἀκριβῶς πρὸς λέξιν ἠρμήνευσεν (see Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Ephraini Syri*, in *Opera*, Paris, 2, 1033). Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and others, wrote commentaries on the sacred Scriptures under the title of ἐρμηνεία (comp. A. H. Niemeyer, *De Isidori Pelusiotce Vita, Scriptis, et Doctrina*, Halwe, 1825, p. 207).

Among the Latin Christians the word *interpres* had a wider range than the corresponding Greek term, and the Latins had no precise term for the exposition of the Bible which exactly corresponded with the Greek. The *interpretatio* was applied only in the sense of OCCUPATION or ACT of an expositor of the Bible, but not in the sense of CONTENTS elicited from Biblical passages. The words *tractare*, *tractator*, and *tractatus* were in preference employed with respect to Biblical exposition, and the sense which it elicited. Together with these words there occur *commentarius* and *expositio*. In reference to the exegetical work of St. Hilary on Matthew, the codices fluctuate between *commentarius* and *tractatus*. St. Augustine’s *tractatus* are well known; and this father frequently mentions the *divinarum scripturarum tractatores*. For instance, *Retractationes*, 1. 23. “Divinorum tractatores eloquiorm;” Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 1, 6,” Origenes qui tractator sacrorum peritissimili habebatur.” Vincentius Lirinensis observes in his *Comonitorium* on <sup>4128</sup>1 Corinthians 12:28: “In the third place, teachers who are now called *tractatores*; whom the same apostle sometimes styles prophets, because by them the mysteries of the prophets are opened to the people” (comp. Dufresne, *Glossarium’ medice*



*et infimce Latihitatis*, s. vv. Tractator, Tractatus; and Baluze, *ad Servat. Lupum.*, p. 479).

However, the occupation of *interpres*, in the nobler sense of this word, was not unknown to St. Jerome, as may be seen from his *Præfatio in libros Sanmuelis (Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, 9:459): “For whatever, by frequently translating and carefully correcting, we have learned and retain, is our own. And if you have understood what you formerly did not know, consider me to be an expositor if you are grateful, or a paraphrast if you are ungrateful.”

**6.** In modern classification, Hermeneutics “forms a branch of the same general study with Exegesis (q.v.), and, indeed, 1§ often confounded with that science; but the distinction between the two branches is very marked, and is, perhaps, sufficiently indicated by the etymology of the names themselves. To hermeneutics properly belongs the ‘interpretation’ of the text—that is, the *discovery* of its true meaning; the province of exegesis is the ‘exposition’ of the meaning so discovered, and the practical office of making it intelligible to others in its various bearings, scientific, literal, doctrinal, and moral. Hence, although the laws of interpretation have many things in common with those of exposition, it may be laid down that to the especial province of hermeneutics belongs all that regards the text and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; the signification of words, the force and significance of idioms, the modification of the sense by the context, and the other details of philological and grammatical inquiry; the consideration of the character of the writer or the persons whom he addressed; of the circumstances in which he wrote, and the object to which his work was directed; the comparison of parallel passages; and other similar considerations. All these inquiries, although seemingly purely literary, are modified by the views entertained as to the text of Holy Scripture, and especially on the question of its inspiration, and the nature and degree of such inspiration” (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*).

## II. *History, Methods, and Literature.* —

**1.** From ancient times the Church, or rather ecclesiastical bodies and religious denominations, have taken the same supernatural view with reference to the Bible, as, before the Church, the Jews did with respect to the Old Testament. The Church and denominations have supposed that in the authors of Biblical books there did not exist a literary activity of the

same kind as induces men to write down what they have thought, but have always required from their followers the belief that the Biblical authors wrote in a state of inspiration, that is to say, under a peculiar and direct influence of the divine Spirit. Sometimes the Biblical authors were described to be merely external and mechanical instruments of God's revelation. But, however wide or however narrow the boundaries were within which the operation of God upon the writers was confined by ecclesiastical supposition, the origin of the Biblical books was always supposed to be essentially different from the origin of human compositions; and this difference demanded the application of peculiar rules in order to understand the Bible. There were required peculiar arts and kinds of information in order to discover the sense and contents of books which, on account of their extraordinary origin, were inaccessible by the ordinary way of logical rules, and whose written words were only outward signs, behind which a higher and divine meaning- was concealed. Consequently, the Church and denominations required *ἐξηγηταί*, or interpreters, of the signs by means of which God had revealed his will. Thus necessarily arose again in the Christian Church the art of opening or interpreting the supernatural, which art had an existence in earlier religions, but with this essential difference, that the signs, by the opening of which supernatural truth was obtained, were now more simple, and of a more intelligible kind than in earlier religions. They were now written signs, which belonged to the sphere of speech and language, through which alone all modes of thinking obtain clearness, and can be readily communicated to others. But the holy Scriptures, in which divine revelation was preserved, differ, by conveying divine thoughts, from common language and writing, which convey only human thoughts. Hence it followed that its sense was much deeper, and far exceeded the usual sphere of human thoughts, so that the usual requisites for the right understanding of written documents appeared to be insufficient. According to this opinion, a *lower* and a *higher* sense of the Bible were distinguished. The lower sense was that which could be elicited according to the rules of grammar; the higher sense was considered to consist of deeper thoughts concealed under the grammatical meaning of the words. These deeper thoughts they endeavored to obtain in various ways, but not by grammatical research.

The Jews, in the days of Jesus, employed for this purpose especially the typico-allegorical interpretation. The Jews of Palestine endeavored by means of this mode of interpretation especially to elicit the secrets of

futurity, which were said to be fully contained in the Old Testament. (See Wahner, *Antiquitates Hebraeorum*, Gottinge, 1743, 1, 341 sq.; Dopke, *Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller*, Leipzig, 1829, p. 88 sq., 164 sq.; Hirschfeld, *Der Geist der Talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel*. Berlin, 1840; compare Juvenal, *Sat. 14*, 103; Justin Martyr, *Apol. 1*, p. 52, 61; Bretschneider, *Historisch-dogmatische Auslegung d. Neuen Testamentes*, Leipzig, 1806, p. 35 sq.)

The Alexandrine Jews, on the contrary, endeavored to raise themselves from the simple sense of the words τὸ ψυχικόν, to a higher, more general, and spiritual sense, τὸ πνευματικόν (see Dithne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der Jidisch-Alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, Halle, 1834, 1, p. 52 sq.; 2, 17, 195 sq., 209, 228, 241). Similar principles were adopted by the authors of the New Testament (see De Wette, *Ueber die Symbolisch Typische Lehrart in Briefe an die Hebrer*, in the *Theologische Zeitschrift*, by Schleiermacher and De Wette. pt. 3; Tholuck, *Beilage zum Commentar über den Brief an die Hebrer*, 1840).

These two modes of interpretation, the *allegorico-typical* and the *allegorico-mystical*, are found in the Christian writers as early as the first and second centuries; the latter as γνώσις, the former as a demonstration that all and everything, both what ‘had happened and what would come to pass, was somehow contained in the sacred Scriptures (see Justin Martyr, *Apol. 1*, p. 52, 61, and Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4, 2, “The preaching of the disciples might appear to be questionable, if it was not supported by other authority”).

To these allegorical modes of interpretation was added a third mode, which necessarily sprung up after the rise of the Catholico-apostolical Church, namely, the *dogmatical* or *theologico-ecclesiastical*. The followers of the Catholico-apostolical Church agreed that all apostles and all apostolical writings had an equal authority, because they were all under an equal guidance of the Holy Ghost. Hence it followed that they could not set forth Wither contradictory or different doctrines. A twofold expedient was adopted in order to effect harmony of interpretation. The one was of the apparent and relative kind, because it referred to subjects which appear incomprehensible only to the confined human understanding, but which are in perfect harmony in the divine thoughts. Justin (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, c. 65) says: “Being quite certain that no Scripture contradicts the other, I will rather confess that I do not understand what is said therein.” St.

Chrysostom restricted this as follows (*Homil. 3, c. 4, in Ep. 2 ad Thessalonicenses*): “In the divine writings everything is intelligible and plain, whatever is necessary is open” (compare *Homil. 3, De Lazaro*, and *Athanasii Oratio contra gentes, in Opera, 1, 12*).

The second expedient adopted by the Church was to consider certain articles of faith to be *leading doctrines*, and to regulate and define accordingly the sense of the Bible wherever it appeared doubtful and uncertain. This led to the *theologico-ecclesiastical* or *dogmatical* mode of interpretation, which, when the Christians were divided into several sects, proved to be indispensable to the Church, but which adopted various forms in the various sects by which it was employed. — Not only the heretics of ancient times, but also the followers of the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, the Syrian, the Anglican, the Protestant Church, etc., have endeavored to interpret the Bible in harmony with their dogmas.

Besides the three modes of interpretation which have been mentioned above, theological writers have spoken of *typical, prophetic, emphatical, philosophical, traditional, moral, or practical* interpretation. But all these are only one-sided developments of some single feature contained in the above three, arbitrarily chosen; and, therefore, they cannot be considered to be separate modes, but are only modifications of one or other of those three. The interpretation in which all these modes are brought into harmony has lately been called the *panharmonical*, which word is not very happily chosen (F. H. Germar, *Die Panharmonische Inteopretation der Heiligen Schrift*, Lpz. 1821; and by the same author, *Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Hermeneutik*, Altona, 1828).

The interpretation which, in spite of all ecclesiastical opposition, ought to be adopted as being the only true one, strictly adheres to the demands of general hermeneutics, to which it adds those particular hermeneutical rules which meet the requisites of particular cases. This has, in modern times, been styled the *historico-grammatical* mode of interpretation. This appellation has been chosen because the epithet grammatical seems to be too narrow and too much restricted to the mere verbal sense. It might be more correct to style it simply the *historical* interpretation, since the word “historical” comprehends everything that is requisite to be known about the language, the turn of mind, the individuality, etc., of an author in order to rightly understand his book. This method, the origin of which has been traced to Semler (*Vorbereitung z. d. theol. Hermeneut. 1762*), is liable,

however, to degenerate into Rationalism (Farrar, *History of Free Thought*, p. 22), unless guarded by the spirit of evangelical piety.

The different modes of interpreting the Bible which have generally obtained are, according to what we have stated, essentially the following three: the GRAMMATICAL, the ALLEGORICAL, the DOGMATICAL. The grammatical mode of interpretation simply investigates the sense contained in the words of the Bible. The allegorical, according to Quintilian's sentence, "Aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendo," maintains that the words of the Bible have, besides their simple sense, another which is concealed as behind a picture, and endeavors to find out this supposed figurative sense, which, it is said, was not intended by the authors (see Olshausen, *Ein Wort iiber tieferen Schriftsinn*, Kbnigsberg, 1824). The dogmatical mode of interpretation endeavors to explain the Bible in harmony with the dogmas of the Church, following the principle of *analogia fidei*. Compare *Concilii Tridentini*, Session 4:decret. 2: "Let no one venture to interpret the holy Scriptures in a sense contrary to that which the holy mother Church has held, and does hold, and which has the power of deciding what is the true sense and the right interpretation of the holy Scriptures." So also Rambach. *Institutiones Hermeneutice Sacrae* (Jense, 1723): "The authority which this analogy of faith exercises upon interpretation consists in this, that it is the foundation and general principle according to the rule of which all scriptural interpretations are to be tried as by a touchstone." Art. 20 of the Anglican Church: "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it expound one place of Scripture so as to be repugnant to another." Scotch Confession, art. 28: "We dare not admit any interpretation which contradicts any leading article of faith, or any plain text of Scripture, or the rule of charity," etc.

**2.** The allegorical, as well as the dogmatical mode of interpretation, presupposes the grammatical, which consequently forms the basis of the other two, so that neither the one nor the other can exist entirely without it. Hence the grammatical mode of interpretation must have a historical precedence before the others. But history also proves that the Church has constantly endeavored to curtail the province of grammatical interpretation, to renounce it as much as possible, and to rise above it. If we follow, with the examining eye of a historical inquirer, the course in which these three modes of interpretation, in their mutual dependence upon each other, have generally been applied, it becomes evident that in opposition to the grammatical mode, the allegorical was first set up.

Subsequently, the allegorical was almost entirely supplanted by the dogmatical; but it started up with renewed vigor when the dogmatical mode rigorously confined the spiritual movement of the human intellect, as well as all religious sentiment, within the too narrow bounds of dogmatical despotism. The dogmatical mode of interpretation could only spring up after the Church, renouncing the original multiplicity of opinions, had agreed upon certain leading doctrines; after which time it grew, together with the Church, into a mighty tree, towering high above every surrounding object, and casting its shade over everything. The longing desire for light and warmth, of those who were spellbound under its shade, induced them to cultivate again the allegorical and the grammatical interpretation: but they were unable to bring the fruits of these modes to full maturity. Every new intellectual revolution, and every spiritual development of nations, gave a new impulse to grammatical interpretation. This impulse lasted until interpretation was again taken captive by the overwhelming ecclesiastical power, whose old formalities had regained strength, or which had been renovated under new forms. Grammatical interpretation, consequently, goes hand in hand with the principle of spiritual progress, and the dogmatical with the conservative principle. Finally, the allegorical interpretation is as an artificial aid subservient to the conservative principle, when, by its vigorous stability, the latter exercises a too unnatural pressure. This is confirmed by the history of all times and countries, so that we may confine ourselves to the following few illustrative observations.

The various tendencies of the first Christian period were combined in the second century, so that the principle of one general (Catholic) Church was gradually adopted by most parties. But now it became rather difficult to select, from the variety of doctrines prevalent in various sects, those by the application of which to Biblical interpretation a perfect harmony and systematical unity could be effected. 'Nevertheless, the wants of science powerfully demanded a systematic arrangement of Biblical doctrines, even before- a general agreement upon dogmatical principles had been effected. The wants of science were especially felt among the Alexandrine Christians; and in Alexandria, where the allegorical interpretation had from ancient times been practiced. it offered the desired expedient which met the exigency of the Church. Hence it may naturally be explained why the Alexandrine theologians of the second and third century, particularly Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, interpreted allegorically, and why the

allegorical interpretation was perfected, and in vogue, even before the dogmatical came into existence. Origen, especially in his fourth book, *De Principiis*, treats on scriptural interpretation, using the following arguments: The holy Scriptures, inspired by God, form a harmonious whole, perfect in itself, without any defects and contradictions, and containing nothing that is insignificant and superfluous. The grammatical interpretation leads to obstacles and objections which, according to the quality just stated of the holy Scriptures, are inadmissible and impossible. Now, since the merely grammatical interpretation can neither remove nor overcome these objections, we must seek for an expedient beyond the boundaries of grammatical interpretation. The allegorical interpretation offers this expedient, and consequently is above the grammatical. Origen observes that man consists of body, soul, and spirit; and he distinguishes a triple sense of the holy Scriptures analogous to this division (*De Princip. 4*, 108; comp. Klausen, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, Leipzig, 1841, p. 104 sq.).

Since, however, allegorical interpretation cannot be reduced to settled rules, but always depends upon the greater or less influence of imagination; and since the system of Christian doctrines, which the Alexandrine theologians produced by means of allegorical interpretation, was in many respects objected to; and since, in opposition to these Alexandrine theologians, there was gradually established, and more and more firmly defined, a system of Christian doctrines which formed a firm basis for uniformity of interpretation, in accordance with the mind of the majority, there gradually sprung up a dogmatical mode of interpretation founded upon the interpretation of ecclesiastical teachers, which had been recognized as orthodox in the Catholic Church. This dogmatical interpretation has been in perfect existence since the beginning of the fourth century, and then more and more supplanted the allegorical, which henceforward was left to the wit and ingenuity of a few individuals. Thus St. Jerome, about A.D. 400, could say (*Comment. in Malachai 1:16*): “The rule of Scripture is, where there is a manifest prediction of future events, not to enfeeble that which is written by the uncertainty of allegory.” During the whole of the fourth century, the ecclesiastico dogmatical mode of interpretation was developed with constant reference to the grammatical. — Even Hilary, in his book *De Trinitate*, 1, properly asserts: “He is the best reader who rather expects to obtain sense from the words than imposes it upon them, and who carries more away than he has brought, nor

forces that upon the words which he had resolved to understand before he began to read.”

After the commencement of the fifth century, grammatical interpretation fell entirely into decay; which ruin was effected partly by the full development of the ecclesiastical system of doctrines defined in all their parts, and by a fear of deviating from this system, partly also by the continually increasing ignorance of the languages in which the Bible was written. The primary condition of ecclesiastical or dogmatical interpretation was then most clearly expressed by Vincentius Lirinensis (*Commonit.* 1): ““Since the holy Scriptures, on account of their depth, are not understood by all in the same manner, but their sentences are understood differently by different persons, so that they might seem to admit as many meanings as there are men, we must well take care that within the pale of the Catholic Church we hold fast what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all” (Compare *Commonit.* 2, ed. Bremensis, 1688, p. 321 sq.). Henceforward interpretation was confined to the mere collection of explanations, which had first been given by men whose ecclesiastical orthodoxy was unquestionable. “It is better not to be imbued with the pretended novelty, but to be filled from the fountain of the ancients” (Cassidori *Institutiones Divine*, Praef. Compare Alcuini *Epistola ad Gislans*, in *Opera*, ed. Frobenius, 1, 464; *Comment. in Joh.*, *Prea.*; ib. p. 460; Claudius Turon. *Prolegomena in Comment. in libros Regum*; Haymo, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 9:3, etc.). Doubtful cases were decided according to the precedents of ecclesiastical definitions. “In passages which may be either doubtful or obscure, we might know that we should follow that which is found to be neither contrary to evangelical precepts, nor opposed to the decrees of holy men” (Benedicti *Capitulara*, 3, 58, in Pertz, *Monumeneta Veteris German. Histor.* 4, 2, p. 107).

During the whole period of the Middle Ages the allegorical interpretation again prevailed. The Middle Ages were more distinguished by sentiment than by clearness, and the allegorical interpretation gave satisfaction to sentiment and occupation to free mental speculation. — The typical system of miracle-plays (q.v.) and the *Biblia Pauperum* exactly illustrate the spirit of allegorical interpretation in the Middle Ages. But men like bishop Agobardus (A.D. 840, in Gallandii *Bibl.* 13, p. 446), Johannes Scotus, Erigena, Druthmar, Nicolaus Lyranus, Roger Bacon, and others, acknowledged the necessity of grammatical interpretation, and were only



wanting in the requisite means, and in knowledge, for putting it successfully into practice.

When, in the fifteenth century, classical studies had revived, they exercised also a favorable influence upon Biblical interpretation, and restored grammatical interpretation to honor. It was especially by grammatical interpretation that the domineering Catholic Church was combated at the Reformation; but as soon as the newly-arisen Protestant Church had been dogmatically established, it began to consider grammatical interpretation a dangerous adversary of its own dogmas, and opposed it as much as did the Roman Catholics themselves. From the middle of the 16th to the middle of the 18th century this important ally of Protestantism was subjected to the artificial law of a new dogmatical interpretation, while the Roman Catholic Church changed the principle of interpretation formerly advanced by Vincentius into an ecclesiastical dogma. In consequence of this new oppression, the religious sentiment, which had frequently been wounded both among Roman Catholics and Protestants. took refuge in allegorical interpretation, which then reappeared under the forms of typical and mystical theology.

After the beginning of the 18th century grammatical interpretation recovered its authority. It was then first reintroduced by the Arminians, and, in spite of constant attacks, towards the conclusion of that century, it decidedly prevailed among the German Protestants. It exercised a very beneficial influence, although it cannot be denied that manifold errors occurred in its application. During the last half century both Protestants and Roman Catholics have again curtailed the rights and invaded the province of grammatical interpretation by promoting (according to the general reaction of our times) the opposing claims of dogmatical and mystical interpretation. Comp. J. Rosenmüller, *Historiae Interpretationis Librorum sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana*, Lipsine, 1795-1814, 5 vols.; Van Mildert, *An Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation, in Eight Sermons*, etc. (Oxford, 1815); Meyer, *Geschichte der Schriffterklärung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Göttingen, 1802-9, 5 vols.); Simon, *Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouv. Test.* (Rotterdam, 1693); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der Biblischen Kritik und Exegese* (Gott. L797,1800, 4 vols.).

**3.** In accordance with the various notions concerning Biblical interpretation which we have stated, there have been produced Biblical hermeneutics of very different kinds; for instance, in the earlier period we might mention that of the Donatist Ticonius, who wrote about the fourth century his *Regule ad investigandam et inveniendam intelligentisam Scripturarum septem*; Augustinus, *De Doctrinat Christiana*, lib. 1, 3; Isidorus Hispalensis, *Senten.* 419 sq.; Santis Pagnini (who died in 1541), *Isagoga ad imysticos Sacrce Scripturce sensus. libri octodecim* (Colon. 1540); Sixti Senensis (who died 1599), *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Venetiis, 1566. Of this work, which has frequently been reprinted, there belongs to our present subject only *Liber tertius, Artem exponendi Sancta Scripta Catholicis Expositoribus aptissimis Reg. ulis et Exemplis ostendens.*) At a later period the Roman Catholics added to these the works of Goldhagen (Mainz, 1765), Bellarmine, Martianay, Calmet, and, more recently, See Muller's *Hermeneutica Sacra* (1799); Mayr's *Institutio Interp. Sacri* (1789); Jahl's *Enchiridion Hermen.* (Vienna, 1812); Arigler's *Hermeneutica Generalis* (Vienna, 1813); Unterkircher's *Hermeneutica Biblica* (1831); Ranolder, *Herm. Bibl. Principia Rationalia* (Fiinf Kirchen, 1838); Schnittler, *Grundlinien der Hermeneutik* (Ratisbon, 1844); Glaire's *Hermeneutica Sacra* (1840).

On the part of the Lutherans were added by Flacius *Clavis Scripturea Sacrce* (Basilee, 1537, and often reprinted in two volumes); by Johann Gerhard, *Tractatus de Legitima Script. Sacrce Interpretatione* (Jenee, 1610), by Solomon Glassius, *Philologice Sacrce libri quinque* (Jenae, 1623, and often reprinted); by Jacob Rambach, *Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae* (Jenae, 1723).

On the part of the Calvinists there were furnished by Turretin, *De Scripturce Sacrei Interpretatione Tractatus Bipartitus* (Dordrecht, 1723, and often reprinted). In the English Church were produced by Herbert Marsh. *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1828).

Since the middle of the last century it has been usual to treat on the Old-Testament hermeneutics and on those of the New Testament in separate works: for instance, Meyer, *Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten Testamentes* (Lübeck, 1799); Pareau, *Institutio Intempretis Veteris Testamenti* (Trajecti, 1822); Ernesti, *Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti* (Lipsise, 1761, ed. 5ta. curante Ammon, 1809; translated into English by

Terrot, Edinburgh, 1833); Morus, *Super Hermeneutica Novi Testamenti ccroases academica* (ed. Eichstadt, Lipsise, 1797-1802, in two volumes, but not completed); Keil, *Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamientes, nach Grundsitzen derl gramimatisch-historischen Interpretation* (Leipzig, 1810; the same work in Latin, Lipsise, 1811);

Conybeare, *The Bampton Lectures for the year 1824, being an attempt to trace the History and to ascertain the limits of the secondary and spiritual Interpretation of Scripture* (Oxford, 1824); Schleie-macher, *Hermeneutik und Kritik mit besonderer Beziehung aufdas Neute Testament* (edited by Liicke, Berlin, 1838). The most complete is Klausen, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes* (from the Danish, Leipzig, 1841); Wilke, *Die Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes systematisch dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1843); S. Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics developed and applied; including a history of Biblical Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1843).

For lists of other works on the subject; see Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 4, 206 sq.; Danz, *Universal Warterbuzch.*, p. 384 sq.; Append. p. 46; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 2, 31 sq.; Malcolm, *Theological Index*, p. 218.

## Interregnum

The interregnum from the time of the execution of Charles I to the accession of Charles II to the throne of England is one of the most important periods in the ecclesiastical history of that country. It was during this period that the Episcopal Church, "which had been reared by the wealth and power of the state, and cemented with the tears and blood of dissentients," was hurled to the ground, and Presbyterianism, and for a time even Congregationalism, gained the ascendancy. But, to the justice of the latter, it must be said that the Congregationalists, or, rather, the Independents, never actually sought to establish their religion-as the religion of the state, while Presbyterianism struggled hard to enforce uniformity to her creed. Stoughton says (in his *Eccles. Hist. of England since the Restoration*, 1, 49), "It was with Presbyterianism thus situated, rather than with Independency, or any other ecclesiastical systems, that Episcopacy came first into competition and conflict after the king's (Charles II) return." Some writers deny the possibility of an inter' regnum in the English government as it then existed, because, say they, "there can be legally no interregnum in a hereditary monarchy like that of England,"

and hold that the reign of Charles II is “always computed in legal language as commencing at the execution of Charles I.” See Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (2nd ed. Lond. 1839, 1, 68 sq. *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE INDESSIDENTS; SEE PRESBYTERIANS.* (J. H.W.)

### Interrogationes Marie

an apocryphal work. *SEE PSEUDOGRAPH.*

### Interstitia Temporum

The Council of Sardica established the principle “Potest per has promotiones (i.e. to consecrate), *quae habebant utiqueprolixum tempus*, probari, qua fide sit, qua modestia, qua gravitate et verecundia, et si dignus fuerit probatus, divino sacerdotio illustretur, quia conveniens non est, nec ratio vel disciplina patitur, ut temere et leviter ordinetur episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus... sed hi, *quorumper lonygums tempus examinata sit vita et merita fuerint comprobata.*” Consequently every member of the clergy was obliged to spend a preparatory *interval* (interstitium) before he could be promoted from a lower to a higher order (*ordo*) (*Dist.* 59, c. 2). This principle was also observed concerning the consecration for the lower orders of the priesthood while special ecclesiastical functions were attached to them, but, as their earlier character changed, the discipline also became more lax as regards the time of probation (see *Dist.* 77, c. 2, 3, 9). After the consecration to these lower offices had come to be considered a mere formality for the transition to higher *ordines*, the observation of these probations was also neglected. The Council of Trent attempted to restore the old customs concerning the lower degrees of the priesthood (c. 17, Sess. 23, *De Reform.*), and stated expressly that “per temporum interstitia, nisi aliud episcopo expedire magis videretur, conferantur, ut... in unoquoque munere juxta praescriptum episcopi se exercent” (c. 11, etc.); yet this had but little or no effect, and it is even usual in some Roman Catholic countries to confer at once the tonsure and all the lower orders. The Council of Trent decided also that between the lower consecration and the higher, and between each of these, there should be an interval of one year, “unisi necessitas aut ecclesie utilitas aliud exposcat” (c. 11, 13, 14, etc.), but that “duo sacri ordines non eodem die, etiam regularibus, conferantur, privilegiis ac indultis quibusvis concessis non obstantibus quibuscunque” (c. 13, etc.; compare also c. 13, 15, X. *De temp. ord.* 1, 11; c. 2, X. *De eo qui furtiv.* 5, 30). These years of interval are computed, not

according to the calendar, but according to the Church year. With regard to the right of dispensation conceded to the bishops by the Council of Trent (c. 11, cit.), the *Congregatio Concil* decided that the simultaneous administration of the *ordines minores* and the subdeaconship is a punishable offence (No. 1, ad c. 11, cit. in the edition of Schulte and Richter). See Thomassen, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* 1, 2, c. 35, 36; Van Espen, *Jus eccl. univers.* 1, 1, c. 2; 2, 9, c. 5; Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, 1, 648 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklopadie*, 6:707.

## Intervals

*SEE INTERSTITIA*

## Interventores

*SEE INTERCESSORES.*

## Inthronization

is the ceremony of installing a bishop on the episcopal seat immediately after his consecration. It is said that in the early times of the Church it was customary for the bishop, after taking possession of his seat, to address the congregation, and this address was called the *Inthronization sermon*. To the provincials under his control he addressed instead letters containing his confession of faith, intended to establish communications with them: these were called *Inthronization letters* (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* 1, 2, c. 11:§10). Inthronization money is the sum of money paid by some prelates for the purpose of securing their ordination. — Bergier, *Dict. de Theol.* 3:438.

## Intinction

is a name for one of the three modes in which the sacrament is administered to the laity of the Eastern Church (comp. Neale, *Introd. East. Church*, p. 525), viz., by breaking the consecrated bread into the consecrated wine, and giving to each communicant the two elements together in a spoon, to prevent the possibility of a loss of either element. Some Greek liturgical writers assert that the practice of intinction was introduced by Chrysostom himself (which Neale approves), but the traditional evidence adduced does not well support this assertion; and the fact, which seems to be pretty well established, that the two elements were of old administered by two persons, and not by one only, as is done at present, makes it doubtful whether their admixture for communion was

ever the *ordinary* practice. Bona (*Rerum Liturg.* II, 18:3), however, says that it was forbidden by Julius I (A.D. 337-352), whose decree, as given by Gratian (*Distinct.* 2, c. 7), speaks of it as a practice not warranted by the Gospel, in which Christ is represented as giving first his body and then his blood' to the apostles; and, if this decree is authentic, it goes to prove that the practice was known during Chrysostom's time. The third Council of Braga (A.D. 675) decreed against it in their first canon in the identical words used by Julius I: "Illud, quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc probatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit; seorsum enim panis et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum non praebuisse legimus excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem proditorem ostenderet." Micrologus (c. 19) asserts that the practice contradicted the primitive canon of the Roman liturgy, but this certainly cannot go to prove the time of its introduction into the Eastern Church. In the 11th century it was forbidden by pope Urban II (A.D. 1088-1099), except in cases of necessity; and his successor, Pascal II, forbade it altogether, and ordered in cases where difficulty of swallowing the solid element occurred, to administer the fluid element alone. Bona, however, quotes from Ivo of Chartres about this time a canon of a Council of Tours, in which priests are ordered to keep the reserved oblation "intincta in sanguine Christi, ut veraciter Presbyter possit dicere infirmo, Corpus, et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi proficiat tibi in remissionem peccatorum et vitam seternam." The Convocation of Canterbury (A.D. 1175) expressed itself opposed to the practice of intinction in the following plain language: "Inhibemus ne quis quasi pro complemento communionis intinctam alicui Eucharistiam tradat." But from the word *coplementum* the practice forbidden seems to have been as much the consumption of the superabundant elements by the laity (directed in one of the modern rubrics of the Church of England) as that of intinction. There can be no doubt, however, that the Western Church always stood committed against the practice, though some think that traces of it can be found, e.g. in 'the ancient Irish Visitation Office, written about the 8th century, and which was published by Sir William Bentham (comp. Hart, *Eccles. Records*, Introd. 14). **SEE CONCOMITANT.**

## Intolerance

is a word chiefly used in reference to those persons, churches, or societies who do not allow men to think for themselves, but impose on them articles, creeds, ceremonies, etc., of their own devising. *SEE TOLERATION.*

Nothing is more abhorrent from the genius of the Christian religion than an intolerant spirit or an intolerant church. "It has inspired its votaries with a savage ferocity; has plunged the fatal dagger into innocent blood; depopulated towns and kingdoms; overthrown states and empires, and brought down the righteous vengeance of heaven upon a guilty world. The pretence of superior knowledge, sanctity, and authority for its support is the disgrace of reason, the grief of wisdom, and the paroxysm of folly. To fetter the conscience is injustice; to ensnare it is an act of sacrilege; but to torture it by an attempt to force its feelings is horrible intolerance: it is the most abandoned violation of all the maxims of religion and morality. Jesus Christ formed a kingdom purely spiritual: the apostles exercised only a spiritual authority under the direction 'of Jesus Christi particular churches were united only by faith and love in all civil affairs they submitted to civil magistracy; and in religious concerns they were governed by the reasoning, advice, and exhortations of their own officers: their censures were only honest reproofs; and their excommunications were only declarations that such offenders, being incorrigible, were no longer accounted members of their communities."

Let it ever be remembered, therefore, that no man or men have any authority whatever from Christ over the consciences of others, or to persecute the persons of any whose religious principles agree not with their own. See Lowell's *Sermons*; Robinson's *Claude*, 2, 227, 229; Saurin's *Sermons*, vol. 3, Preface; Locke, *Government and Toleration*; *Memoir of Roger Williams*. *SEE JUDGMENT, PRIVATE.*

## Intorcetta, Prosper

a Roman Catholic Sicilian who went to China as a Jesuit missionary, was born at Piazza in 1625. He had first studied law, but, believing it to be his duty to serve the Church, he joined the order of the Jesuits, and prepared for the missionary field in China.: Here he encountered many obstacles, but, notwithstanding, succeeded in making many converts. Persecuted by the Chinese, he courageously pushed his work forward, and became one of the greatest of the Jesuitical missionaries to that country. He died Oct. 3,

1696. His works evince a careful and continued study of the language of the country in which he aimed to establish his peculiar religious creed; and it might be well for Protestant missionaries sent to Asiatic and other heathen fields of missionary work to imitate the great zeal which has animated so many of the missionaries of the Romish Church, and which has secured them oftentimes greater prominence than the Protestant laborers. He wrote *Taihio* (or “the great study of Confucius and of his disciple Tseu-sse”), edited, with a Latin translation, by Father Ignace de Costa (1662): — *Tchoung-young* (or “Invariability in the intermediate course”); one of the four books of Confucianism, preceded by a life of Confucius: *Conjicitii Vita* (Goa, 1669, small fol.): — *Lunyu* (“the book of Confucius’s philosophical discussions”) (without place or date, 1 vol. small fol.): — *Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi* (Lyon, 1700, 8vo): — *Compendiosa Narrat. dello Stato della Missione Chinese, coniciando dall’ anno 1581, sino al 1669* (Rome, 1671 or 1672, 8vo). There also remains still in MS. a complete paraphrase of the four books of Confucius. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale* 25, 931.

Intrepidity is a term used to designate a disposition of mind unaffected with fear at the approach of danger. Resolution either banishes fear or surmounts it, and is firm on all occasions. Courage is impatient to attack, undertakes boldly, and is not lessened by difficulty. Valor acts with vigor, gives no way to resistance, but pursues an enterprise in spite of opposition. Bravery knows no fear; it runs nobly into danger, and prefers honor to life itself. Intrepidity encounters the greatest perils with the utmost coolness, and dares even present death. This is especially the case with the martyrs of Christianity. No persecution, however great, did they fear to encounter for the sake of their religious belief, and death was welcomed as the crowning victory over error and superstition.

### Introduction, Biblical

is now the technical designation for works which aim to furnish a general view of such subjects and questions as are preliminary to a proper exposition of the sacred books, the corresponding branch of Biblical science being often styled “ISAGOGICS,” in a strict sense. — The word “introduction” being of rather vague signification, there was also formerly no definite idea attached to the expression “*Biblical Introduction.*” In works on this’ subject (as-in Home’s *Introduction*) might be found contents belonging to geography, antiquities, interpretation, natural



history, and other branches of knowledge. Even the usual contents of Biblical introductions were so unconnected that Schleiermacher, in his *Kurze Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums*, justly calls it *ein Mancherlei*; that is, a farrago or omnium-gatherum. Biblical introduction was usually described as consisting of the various branches of preparatory knowledge requisite for viewing and treating the Bible correctly. It was distinguished from Biblical history and archaeology by being less intimately connected with what is usually called history. It comprised treatises on the origin of the Bible, on the original languages, on the translations, and on the history of the sacred text, and was divided into general and special introduction. An endeavor to remove this vagueness by furnishing a firm definition of Biblical introduction was made by Dr. Credner (in his *Einleitung*, noticed below). He defined Biblical introduction to be the history of the Bible, and divided it into the following parts: 1. The history of the separate Biblical books; 2, the history of the collection of these books, or of the canon; 3, the history of the spread of these books, or of the translations of it; 4, the history of the preservation-of the text; 5, the history of the interpretation of it. The same *historical* idea has been advocated by Havernick (in his *Einleit.*), and more particularly by Hupfeld (*Begrif u. Methode der bibl. Einl.* 1844). This view, however, has not generally been acquiesced in by Biblical scholars, being regarded as too limited and special a treatment, inasmuch as the end in view is to furnish a solution of such questions as arise upon the Bible as a book, yet excluding such preparatory sciences in general as philology, archaeology, and exegesis, the first two of which rather relate to all ancient writings, and the last to passages in detail. By common consent, treatises on Biblical introduction have now usually come to embrace the field covered by the articles on the several books as given in this *Cyclopaedia*, and the topics legitimately included in this department of Biblical science may briefly be summed up under the following heads, which may, however, sometimes require to be differently arranged, or even combined: 1, Authorship; 2, date; 3, place; 4, inspiration; 5, contents; 6, style; 7, peculiar difficulties-of the several books, with the literature and commentaries appended. In this way the old division of *general* and *special* introduction is preserved only so far that some treatises are on all the books of the Old or New Testament in order, while others take up a single book only the latter usually as prolegomena to a separate commentary; and the wider topics formerly discussed are relegated to their appropriate and separate spheres, e.g. in addition to Archaeology (including Geography, Chronology, History, and

Antiquities proper), Lexicology (including radical and comparative philology, and synonyms), and Grammar (including all the peculiarities of Hebraistic and Hellenistic phraseology, poetical modes of expression, rhetorical traits. etc.) — the following more especially: the Canon, Criticism, Inspiration, and Interpretation (q.v. severally). *With* these prefatory distinctions, we proceed to give a sketch of the historical development of this department of Biblical Science, with some criticisms upon the several works in which it has been evolved. In these remarks we especially include formal treatises upon the subject at large, besides those found in commentaries; see also Bleek's *Introd. to the O.T.* (Lond. 1869), 1, 5 sq.

The Greek word **εἰσαγωγή**, in the sense of an *introduction* to a science, occurs only in later Greek, and was first used, to denote an introduction to the right understanding of the Bible, by Adrian, a Greek who probably lived in the 5th century after Christ. **Ἀδριάνου εἰσαγωγή τῆς γραφῆς** is a small book, the object of which is to assist readers who are unacquainted with Biblical phraseology in rightly understanding peculiar words and expressions. It was first edited by David Hoschel, under the title of *Adriani Isagoge in Sacram Scripturam Græce cum Scholiis* (Augustse Vindobonae, 1602, 4to), and was reprinted in the *Critici Sacri* (London ed. vol. 8; Frankfort edit. vol. 6). Before Adrian, the want of similar works had already been felt, and books of a corresponding tendency were in circulation, but they did not bear the title of **εἰσαγωγή**. Melito of Sardis, who lived in the latter half of the 2nd century, wrote a book under the title **ἡ κλεις**, being a *key* both to the Old and to the New Testament. The so-called **Λέξεις**, which were written at a later period, are books of a similar description. Some of these **Λέξεις** have been printed, in Matthew's *Novum Testamentum Græca*, and in Boissonade's *Anecdota Græca* (vol. 3, Paris, 1831). These are merely linguistic introductions; but there was soon felt the want of works which might solve other questions, such as, for instance, what are the principles which should guide us in Biblical interpretation? The Donatist Ticonius wrote, about the year 380, *Regulae ad investigandam et inveniendam Intelligentiam Scripturarum Septem*. St. Augustine, in his work *De Doctrin Christiana* (3, 302), says concerning these seven rules that the author's intention was by means of them to open the secret sense of Holy Writ, "as if by a key." There arose also a question concerning the extent of Holy Writ—that is to say, what belonged, and what did not belong to Holy Writ; and also respecting the contents of the

separate Biblical books, and the order in which they should follow each other, etc. About A.D. 550, Cassiodorus wrote his *Imstitutiones Divinae*. He mentions in this work, under the name of *Introductores Divinae Scripturae*, five authors who had been engaged in Biblical investigations, and in his tenth chapter speaks of them thus: "Let us eagerly return to the guides to Holy Writ; that is to say, to the Donatist Ticonius, to St. Augustine on Christian doctrine, to Adrian, Eucherius, and Junillus, whom I have sedulously collected, in order that works of a similar purport might be combined in one volume." Henceforward the title *Introductio in Scripturam Sacrum* was established, and remained current for all works in which were solved questions introductory to the study of the Bible. In the Western or Latin Church, during a thousand years, scarcely any addition was made to the collection of Cassiodorus, while in the Eastern or Greek Church only two works written during this long period deserve to be mentioned, both bearing the title *Σύνοψις τῆς θεϊαῦ γραφῆς*. One of these works is falsely ascribed to Athanasius, and the other as falsely to Chrysostom.

The Dominican friar Santes Pagninus, with the intention of reviewing the Biblical knowledge of Jerome and St. Augustine, published his *Isagoge ad Sacras Literas, liber unicus* (Coloniae, 1540, fol.), a work which, considering the time of its appearance, was a great step in advance.

The work of the Dominican friar Sixtus of Sienna, *Bibliotheca Sancta ex precipuis Catholice Ecclesie auctoribus collecta, et in octo libros digesta* (Venetiis, 1566; frequently reprinted), is of greater importance, although it is manifestly written under the influence of the Inquisition, which had just been restored, and is perceptibly shackled by the decrees of the Council of Trent; but Sixtus furnished also a list of books to be used by a true Catholic Christian for the right understanding of Holy Writ, as well as the principles which should guide a Roman Catholic in criticism and interpretation. The decrees of the Council of Trent prevented the Roman Catholics from moving freely in the field of Biblical investigation, while the Protestants zealously carried out their researches in various directions. The Illyrian, Matthias Flacius, in his *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae, seu de Sermonum Sacrarum Literarum* (Basle, 1567, in folio), furnished an excellent work on Biblical Hermeneutics; but it was surpassed by the Prolegomena of Brian Walton, which belong to his celebrated *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (Lond. 1657, six vols. fol.). These Prolegomena contain much that will always be accounted valuable and necessary for the true criticism of the

sacred text. They have been published separately, with notes, by archdeacon Wrangham (1528, 2 vols. 8vo). Thus we have seen that excellent works were produced on isolated portions of Biblical introduction, but they were not equaled in merit by the works in which it was attempted to furnish a whole system of Biblical introduction. The following Biblical introductions are among the ‘best of those which were published about that period: Rivetus (1627); Michaelis Waltheri *Oficina Biblica noviter adaperata*, etc. (Lipsiae, first published in 1636); Abraham Calovii *Criticus Sacer Biblicus*, etc. (Vitembergae, 1643); Hottinger, *Thesaur. Philologicus, seu Clavis Script. Sac.* (Tiguri, 1649); Heidegger. *Enchiridion Biblicum iepoyivl7ovtciv* (Tiguri, 1681); Leusden, a Dutchman, published a work entitled *Philologus Hebraeus*, etc. (Utrecht, 1656); and *Phiologus Hebr. — Graecis Generalis* (Utrecht, 1670); Pfeiffer (Ultraj. 1704); Van Til (1720-22); Du Pin (1701); Calmet (1720); Moldenhauer (1744); Bbrner (1753); Goldhagen (1765-8); Wagner (1795). Most of these works have frequently been reprinted.

The dogmatical zeal of the Protestants was greatly excited by the work of Louis Capelle, a reformed divine and learned professor at Saumur, which appeared under the title of Ludovici Cappelli *Critica Sacra; sire de vaiis quce in veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex* (Parisiis, 1650). A learned Roman Catholic and priest of the Oratory, Richard Simon, rightly perceived, from the dogmatical bile stirred up by Capelle, that Biblical criticism was the most effective weapon to be employed against the Protestantism which had grown cold and stiff in dogmatics. He therefore devoted his critical knowledge of the Bible to the service of the Roman Catholic Church, and endeavored to inflict a deathblow upon Protestantism. The result, however, was the production of Simon’s excellent work on Biblical criticism, which became the basis on which the science of Biblical introduction was raised. Simon was the first who correctly, separated the criticism of the Old Testament from that of the New. His works on Biblical introduction appeared under the following titles: *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris, 1678). This work was inaccurately reprinted at Amsterdam by Elzevir in 1679, and subsequently in many other bad piratical editions. Among these the most complete was that printed, together with several polemical treatises occasioned by this work, at Rotterdam, in 1685, 4to:- *Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, 1689): — *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, 1690):- *Histoire Critique des principaux*

*Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterd. 1693). By these excellent critical works Simon established a claim upon the gratitude of all real friends of truth; but he was thanked by none of the prevailing parties in the Christian Church. The Protestants saw in Simon only an enemy of their Church, not the thorough investigator and friend of truth. To the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, Simon's works appeared to be destructive, because they demonstrated their ecclesiastical decrees to be arbitrary and unhistorical. The *Histoire Critique du Nieuux Testament* was suppressed by the Roman Catholics in Paris immediately after its publication, and in Protestant countries, also, it was forbidden to be reprinted. Nevertheless, the linguistic and truly scientific researches of Pocock; the Oriental school in the Netherlands; the unsurpassed work of Humphry Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus Versionibus*, etc. (Oxoniae, 1705, folio); the excellent criticism of Mill, in his *Novum Testamentum Græcum cum Lectionibus Variantibus* (Oxoniae, 1707, folio), which was soon followed by Wetstein's *Novum Testamentum Græcum editionis receptæ, cum Lectionibus Variantibus* (Amstelodami, 1751-52, folio), and by which even Bengel was convinced, in spite of his ecclesiastical orthodoxy (comp. Bengelii *Apparatus Criticus Novi Testamenti*, p. 634 sq.); the Biblical works by H. Michaeli, especially his *Biblia Hebraica ex a manuscriptis et impressis Codicibus* (Halae, 1720), and Kennicott's *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum varietate Lectionibus* (Oxon. 1776), and the revival of classical philology—all this gradually led to results which coincided with Simon's criticism, and showed the enormous difference between historical truth and the arbitrary ecclesiastical opinions which were still prevalent in the works on Biblical introduction by Pritius, Blackwall, Carpov, Van Til, Moldenhauer, and others. J. D. Michaelis mildly endeavored to reconcile the Church with historical truth, but has been rewarded by the anathemas of the ecclesiastical party, who have pronounced him a heretic. By their ecclesiastical persecutors, Richard Simon was falsely described to be a disciple of the pantheistical Spinoza, and Michaelis as a follower of both Simon and Spinoza. However, the mediating endeavors of Michaelis gradually prevailed. His *Einleitung in die Gottlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes* (Gottingen, 1750, 8vo) was greatly improved in later editions, and the fourth (1788, 2 vols. 4to) was translated and essentially augmented by Herbert Marsh, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, under the title *Introduction to the New Testament*, etc. (Cambridge, 1791-1801, 4 vols. 8vo). Michaelis commenced also an introduction to the Old Testament, under the title *Einleitung in die Gottlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes*

(Hamburg, 1787). Ed. Harwood's *New Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament* (London, 1767-71; translated into German by Schulz, Halle, 1770-73, 3 vols.) contains so many heterogeneous materials that it scarcely belongs to the science of introduction.

The study of New-Testament introduction was in Germany especially promoted also by J. S. Semler, who died at Halle in 1791. It was by Semler's influence that the critical works of Richard Simon were translated into German, and the works of Wetstein re-edited and circulated. The original works of Semler on Biblical introduction are his *Apparatus ad liberalerum Novi Testamenti Interpretationem* (Halae, 1767), and his *Abhandlung vonzfreier Untersuchung des Canons* (Halle, 1771-5, 4 vols.). Semler's school produced J. J. Griesbach, who died at Jena in 1812. Griesbach's labors in correcting the text of the New Testament are of great value. K. A. Hahnlein published a work called *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Erlangen, 1794-1802, 2 vols.), in which he followed the university lectures of Griesbach. A second edition of this work appeared in 1801-9, 3 vols. This introduction contains excellent materials, but is wanting in decisive historical criticism.

J. G. Eichhorn, who died at Göttingen in 1827, was formed in the school of Michaelis at Göttingen, and was inspired by Herder's poetical views of the East in general, and of the literature of the ancient Hebrews in particular. Eichhorn commenced his Introduction when the times were inclined to give up the Bible altogether as a production of priest craft inapplicable to the present period. He endeavored to bring the contents of the Bible into harmony with modern modes of thinking, to explain, and to recommend them. He sought, by means of hypotheses, to furnish a clew to their origin, without sufficiently regarding strict historical criticism. Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* was first published at Leipsic in 1780-83, in three volumes. The fifth edition was published at Göttingen, 1820-24, in five volumes. His *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* was first published at Leipzig (1804-27, 5 vols.). The earlier volumes have been republished. The external treatment of the materials, the style, aim, and many separate portions of both works, are masterly 'and excellent; but, with regard to linguistic and historical research, they are feeble, and overwhelmed with hypotheses.

Leonhardt Bertholdt was a very diligent but uncritical compiler. He made a considerable step backwards in the science of introduction. not only by reuniting the Old and Now Testament into one whole, but by even intermixing the separate writings with each other, in his work entitled *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sammtliche kanonische und apocryphische Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Erlang. 1812-19, 6 vols.).

Augusti's *Grundriss einer hist. — krit. Einleit. ins A. T.* (Lpz. 1806, 1827) contains little new or original.

The *Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Faederis Sacros* (Jene, 1830) of H. A. Schott is more distinguished by diligence than by penetration.

The *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel A. und N.T.* Berlin (pt. 1, O.T. 1817, and often since; pt. 2, 1826, and later), by W.M. L. de Wette, is distinguished by brevity, precision, critical penetration, and in some parts by completeness. This book contains an excellent survey of the various opinions prevalent in the sphere of Biblical introduction, interspersed with original discussions. Almost every author on Biblical criticism will find that De Wette has made use of his labors; but in the purely historical portion the book is feeble, and indicates that the author did not go to the first sources, but adopted the opinions of others; consequently the work has no internal harmony. An English translation of this work, with additions by the translator, Theodore Parker, has been published in this country (Boston, 1850). A new (the 8th), thoroughly revised edition of the German, not only embodying all the later results of exegetical researches, but also modifying many of the views of De Wette, has recently been published by Prof. E. Schrader (Berl. vol. 1 [O.T.], 1869).

K. A. Credner embodied the results of his method (see above) of the critical examination of the books of the New Testament in his work *Dass Neue Testament nach seinem Zweck, Ursprung und Inhalt* (Giessen, 1841-3, 2 vols.). His views are the basis of Reus's *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Hallec 1842; 3rd ed. 1860).

The critical investigation which prevailed in Germany after the days of Michaelis has of late been opposed by a mode of treating Biblical introduction not so much in the spirit of a free search after truth as in an apologetical and polemical style. This course, however, has not enriched

Biblical science. To this class of books belong a number of monographs, or treatises on separate subjects; also the *Handb. der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament* of H. A. C. Havernick (Erlangen, 1837-49, 2 pts. in 3 vols.; 2nd ed. 1854-6, by Keil, who also edited pt. 1 of the first ed.), of which the *General Introduction* and the *Introduction to the Pentateuch* have been translated into English (Edinb. 1850, 1852); also H. E. E. Guericke's *Einleitunz in das Neue Testament* (Halle, 1828), in which too frequently an anathema against heretics serves as a substitute for demonstration. The apologetical tendency prevails in the work of G. Hamilton, entitled *A General Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures*, etc. (Dublin, 1814); in Thomas Hartwell Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, etc. (Lond. 1818, 4 vols.; the 10th ed. of this work was an entirely new production, and the best hitherto produced in English, in 4 vols. 8vo, 1856, vol. 2 on the O.T. by Dr. S. Davidson [since displaced by one by Mr. Ayre], and vol. 4 on the N.T. by Dr. S. P. Tregelles); and in J. Cook's *Inquiry into the Books of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1824).

The Roman Catholics also have, in modern times, written on Biblical introduction, although the unchangeable decrees of the Council of Trent hinder all free, critical, and scientific treatment of the subject. The Roman Catholics can treat Biblical introduction only in a polemical and apologetical manner, and are obliged to keep up the attention of their readers by-introducing learned archaeological researches, which conceal the want of free movement. This latter mode was adopted by J. Jahn (who died at Vienna in 1816) in his *Einleitung in die gottlichen Bücher des alten Bundes* (Vienna, 1793, 2 vols., and 1802, 3 vols.), and in his *Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti in epitonewi redacta* (Viennae, 1805). This work has been republished by F. Ackermann, in what are asserted to be the third and fourth editions, under the title of *Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti, usibus academicis accommodata* (Viennae, 1825 and 1839). But these so-called new editions are full of alterations and mutilations, which remove every free expression of Jahn, who belonged to the liberal period of the emperor Joseph. J. L. Hug's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Stuttgart and Tübing. 1800, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847) surpasses Jahn's work in ability, and has obtained much credit among Protestants by its learned explanations, although these frequently swerve from the point in question. Hug's work has been translated into English by the Rev. D. G. Wait, LL.D.; but this translation is much surpassed by that



of Fosdick, published in the United States, and enriched by the addenda of Moses Stuart. The polemical and apologetical style prevails in the work of J. G. Herbst, *Ristorisch-kritische Einleitung. in die Schriften des Alten Testaments* (completed and edited after the death of the author by Welte, Carlsruhe, 1840); and in *L'Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament*, by J. B. Glaire (Paris, 1839, 4 vols.). The work of the excellent Feilmoser, who died in 1831, *Einleitung in die Bücher des Neuen Bundes* (2nd ed. Tübingen, 1830), forsakes the position of a true Roman Catholic, inasmuch as it is distinguished by a noble ingenuousness and candor. The same remark in a great measure applies to the still later work of Scholz, *Einl. in l. heil. Schriften d. A. und N.T.* (vol. 1 general introd. Cologne, 1845). Among the best Roman Catholic contributions to this branch of Biblical literature are the works of Reusch, *Lehrb. der Einleitung in dos A.T.* (Freib. 3rd ed. 1868), and Langen, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das N.T.* (Freib. 1868).

In Great Britain, besides the above works of Horne and Hamilton, we may especially name the following as introductory in their character. Collier's *Sacred Interpreter* (1746, 2 vols. 8vo) was one of the earliest publications of this kind. It went through several editions, and was translated into German in 1750. It relates both to the Old and New Testament, and is described by bishop Marsh as "a good popular preparation for the study of the holy Scriptures." Lardner's *History of the Apostles and Evangelists* (1756-57, 3 vols. 8vo) is described by the same critic as an admirable introduction to the New Testament. "It is a storehouse of literary information, collected with equal industry and fidelity." From this work, from the English translation of Michaelis's *Introduction* (1761), and from Dr. Owen's *Observations on the Gospels* (1764), Dr. Percy, bishop of Dromore, compiled a useful manual, called *A Key to the New Testament*, which has gone through many editions, and is much in request among the candidates for ordination in the Established Church. The *Key to the Old Testament* (1790), by Dr. Gray, afterwards bishop of Bristol, was written in imitation of Percy's compilation; but it is a much more elaborate performance than the *Key to the New Testament*. It is a compilation from a great variety of works, references to which are given at the foot of each page. Bishop Marsh speaks of it as "a very useful publication for students of divinity, who will find at one view what must otherwise be collected from many writers." It is now, however, almost entirely behind the times. Dr. Harwood's *Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New*

*Testament* (1767, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo), although noteworthy in this connection, is not properly an introduction to the New Testament, in the usual and proper sense of the term. It does not describe the books of the New Testament, but is a collection of dissertations relative partly to the character of the sacred writers, Jewish history and customs, and to such parts of heathen antiquities as have reference to the New Testament. The first volume of bishop Tomline's *Elements of Christian Theology* contains an introduction both to the Old and to the New Testament, and has been published in a separate form. It is suited to its purpose as a manual for students in divinity; but the standard of present attainment cannot be very high if, as Marsh states, "it may be read with advantage by the most experienced divine."

The latest and most important works in this department are the following: Hengstenberg, *Beitrdye zur Einleitung ins A. B.* (Berlin, 1831); Hertwig, *Tabellen z. Einleitung ins N.T.* [a useful compilation] (Berl. 1849; 3rd ed. 1865); Maier (Roman Catholic), *Einleitung in d. Schriften des N.T.* (Freib. 1852); Keil, *Lehrbuch der Historisch Kritischen Einleitung ins Alte Test.* (Frankf. and Erlang. 1853 [a highly judicious work in most respects]; translated in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1870, 2 vols.); Davidson, *Introd. to the O.T.* [a different work from that contained in Home above, and strongly Rationalistic] (London. 1862-3, 3 vols. 8vo); Davidson, *Introd. to the N.T.* [an excellent, though rather non-committal work] (Lond. 1848-50, 3 vols. 8vo; last edit. 1868 [more strongly inclining to Rationalism]); Scholten (decidedly Rationalistic), *Hist. Krit. Einl. ins N.T.* (Lpz. 1853, 1856); Bleek, *Einleitung in d. A.T.* (Berlin, 1860 [moderately Rationalistic]; translated into English, Lond. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, *Einleit. in d. N.T.* (Berl. 1862, 1865; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Weber, *Kurzgef. Einl. in d. Schrif. A. und N.T.* (Nordl. 1867, 8vo). Less generally known are the following: Haneberg, *Versuch e. Gesch. d. bibl. offebahrung, als Einleitung ins A. und N.T.* (Regensb. 1850); Prins, *Handbook to de Kennis v. d. heil. Schriften ed. o.e. U. Verbonds* (Rotterd. 1851-52, 2 vol.); Bauer (G. L.), *Entw. e. krit. Einl. in d. Schrift. d. A. T.* (Nürnb. 1794, 1801, 1806); Ackermann, *Introduct. in Libros Vet. Feed.* (Vien. 1825); Schmidt, *Hist. — krit. Einleitung ins N.T.* (Giessen, 1804, 2 vols.); Schneckenburger, *Beitr. z. Enl. ins NM T.* (Stuttg. 1832); Neudecker, *Lehrbuch d. hist. krit. Einleit. in N.T.* (Lpz. 1840); Roman Catholic: Reithmayr, *Einl. 1. d. kanonisch. Bich.* (Regensb. 1852). For other works, see Walch, *Biblictheca Theolog.* 3:31 sq.; 4:196

sq.; Danz, *Universal Worterb.* s.v. Bibel; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 11 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. Einleitung; Lange's *Commentary* (American ed.), 1, 62; compare *British and For. Evang. Review*, October, 1861; *Deutsche Zeitsch.f. christl. Wissensch.* April, 1861; *Revue Chret.* 1869, p. 745; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresber.* 1868, 4:759. **SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY.**

## Introibo

(*I will go in*), the word taken from the 5th verse of the 42nd Psalm (in the Vulgate), with which the Roman Catholic priest, at the foot of the altar, after having made the sign of the cross, begins the mass, and to which the servitor replies with the rest of the verse. The whole psalm is then recited alternately by the priest and the servitor. In masses for the dead, and during Passion-week, the psalm is not pronounced.

## Introit

(a.) (*Officium Saruns*, ἴαοΕοχ, Eastern; *Ingressa*, Ambrosian) is the name (from the Latin *ihtroire*, to enter) of a psalm or hymn, but now properly the former, sung in some churches as the priest goes up to the altar to celebrate the Eucharist. "Introitum autem vocamus antiphonam illam quam chorus cantat et sacerdos ut ascendit ad altare legit cum versu et gloria" (Martene, *De Antiq. Monach. Rit.*; II, 4:9). According to Symeon of Thessalonica, the introit typifies the union of men and angels. According to Freeman (*Princ. of Divine Service*, 2, 316), the true introit consists of the "Hymn of the only-begotten Son" in the East. and the *Gloria in Excelsis* in the further East and the whole Western Church. Neale too remarks (*Introd. to the East. Ch.* p. 363) that the "introits of the liturgies of St. Mark, and St. James, and the Armenian consist of the hymn 'Only begotten Son.'" But, besides the Introit *proper*, there are general in the Western Church a psalm or hymn, with antiphon, varying according to the season; and in the liturgy of Chrysostom we find no less than three of these. Walcott (*Sac. Archaeol.* p. 331) says the introit is of two kinds:

(1.) regular, that sung daily;

(2.) the irregular, which is chanted on festivals. The latter he describes as having been of old of a grand and solemn character. "In a great church there was a procession round the nave to the sound of bells and with incense, passing out by the small gate of the sanctuary and reentering by

the great doors. The deacon then went up with the Gospel elevated in both his hands, and set it on the midst of the altar, so as to be seen by the people. Then followed the introit, composed of several anthems, succeeded by prayers and the Trisagion. The priest and deacon intoned it, the choir and people took it up, and a candlestick with three lights, as a symbol of the Holy Trinity, was lighted." The introit is believed to have originated with pope Celestine (A.D. 422-432), c. 430 (comp. Bona, 3:48). Before that time the mass had immediately succeeded the Epistles of Paul and the Gospel. "Its structure is that of an antiphon, followed generally by a whole psalm or a portion of a psalm (compare, however, Neale, *Essays on Liturgy*, p. 138 sq.), and the Gloria Patri, and then by a repetition of the whole or part of the commencing antiphon. In the old Gregorian introit the antiphon was repeated three times, a custom found also in the Sarum rite; this triple recitation being connected mystically with the three laws viz., the Natural, the Mosaic, and the Evangelic." In the English Church the introit was introduced by Edward VI, in his Prayer-book, before every collect, epistle, and gospel. It is a psalm containing something proper for the particular Sunday or holiday to which they were applied; but they were afterwards struck out, and the choice of the psalm was left to the clergyman. The introits of each Sunday and holiday are given by Wheatley in his *Common Prayer*, p. 205. See Blunt, *Theol. Cyclop.* 1, 355 sq.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Augusti, *Flandbuch d. Christl. Archaöl.* 2, 773; Siegel, *Archaöl.* 3, 378. See also Mass.

**(b.)** This word also designates the verses sung at the entering of the congregation into the church, a custom as old as the 4th century, called *ingressa* in the Ambrosian Ritual. See Palmer, *Origines Lit.* 2, 19.

### Intrusion

(Lat. *intrudo*, I thrust upon), the unlawful appropriation or usurpation of a church benefice, i.e., if done without the co-operation of the person who, according to the canon, is entitled to the benefice. In the Church of Scotland, the General Assembly, in 1736, passed "an act against intrusion of ministers into vacant congregations;" and the reason assigned is the principle of the Church of Scotland, "that no minister shall be intruded into any church contrary to the will of the congregation .. so as none be *intruded* into such parishes, as they (the General Assembly) regard the glory of God and edification of the body of Christ." See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland*, 2, 218, 302.

## Intuition

*SEE ILLUMINATION; SEE INSTINCT; SEE SPIRITUALISM.*

## Intuition Of God

*SEE GOD.*

## Invention of the Cross

is the name of a festival in the Latin and Greek churches, celebrated May 3, in memory of the invention of the cross said to have been miraculously discovered at Jerusalem by Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine the Great, in 326. The legend of it runs as follows: Helena, being admonished in a dream to search for the cross of Christ at Jerusalem, took a journey thither with that intent; and having employed laborers to dig at Golgotha, after opening the ground very deep (for vast heaps of rubbish had purposely been thrown there by the spiteful Jews or heathens), she found three crosses, which she presently concluded were the crosses of our Saviour and the two thieves who were crucified with him. But, being at a loss to know which was the cross of Christ, she ordered them all three to be applied to a dead person. Two of them, the story says, had no effect; but the third raised the carcass to life, which was an evident sign to Helena that that was the cross she looked for. As soon as this was known, every one was for getting a piece of the cross, insomuch that in Paulinus's time (who, being a scholar of St. Ambrose, and bishop of Nola, flourished about the year 420) there was much more of the relics of the cross than there was of the original wood. Whereupon that father says "it was miraculously increased; it very kindly afforded wood to men's importunate desires without any loss of its substance." Dr. Schaff comments on it thus: "The legend is at best faintly *implied* in Eusebius, in a letter of Constantine to the bishop Macarius of Jerusalem (*Vita Const.* 3, 30—a passage which Gieseler overlooked though in 3, 25, where it should be expected, it is entirely unnoticed, as Gieseler correctly observes), and does not appear till several decennia later, first in Cyril of Jerusalem (whose *Epist. ad Constantium* of 351, however, is considered by Gieseler and others, on critical and theological grounds, a much later production), then, with good agreement as to the main fact, in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus of Nola, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other fathers. With all these witnesses the fact is still hardly credible, and has against it particularly the following considerations: (1.) The place of the crucifixion was desecrated under the

emperor Hadrian by heathen temples and statues, besides being filled up and defaced beyond recognition. (2.) There is no clear testimony of a *contemporary*. (3.) The pilgrim from Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 333, and in a still extant *itinerarium*, (*Vetera Rom. itinieraria*, ed. P. Wesseling, p. 593) enumerates all the sacred things of the holy city, knows nothing of the holy cross or its invention (comp. Gieseler, 1, 2, 279, note 37; Edinb. ed. 2, 36). This miracle contributed very much to the increase of the superstitious use of crosses and crucifixes. Cyril of Jerusalem remarks that about 380 the splinters of the holy cross filled the whole world, and yet, according to the account of the devout but credulous Paulinus of Nola (*Epist.* 31, al. 11) (whom we mentioned above), the original remained in Jerusalem undiminished—a continual miracle!” (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 450; compare particularly the minute investigation of this legend by Isaac Taylor, *The Invention of the Cross and the Miracles therewith connected, in Ancient Christianity*, 2, 277-315; Wheatley, *Common Prayer*, p. 61 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 351). **SEE CROSS.** (J. H. W.)

## Investiture

(Latin *investire*, to put on a vest or covering), in general, is defined by mediæval writers as the conferring or the giving of possession of a fief or a property by a suzerain lord to his vassal,” and was usually accompanied by a certain ceremonial, such as the delivery of a branch, a banner, or an instrument of office, more or less designed to signify the power or authority which it is supposed to convey (compare Gottfried, abbot of Vendome [Vindocinensis], *Tractatus de ordinatione’ Episcoporum et Investitura Laicorum*, in Melch. Goldasti *Apologice pro Henrico IV — dv. Gregorii VII, P. criminationses* [Hamb. 1611. p. 262]).

The contest about ecclesiastical investitures is so interwoven with the whole course of mediæval history that a brief account of its origin and nature is indispensable to a right understanding of many of the most important events of that period.

**1.** By the liberality of the northern nations, the Church of Rome had gradually attained considerable wealth, both personal and real. “The Carolingian and Saxon emperors, the kings of England and Leon, had vied with their predecessors in bestowing on her lavish benefactions, and the clergy were, in consequence, no strangers to wealth. Many churches possessed seven or eight thousand manses; one with two thousand passed for indifferently rich (comp. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, 2, pt. 1, ch. 7, p. 142,

small English edition). Of the lands possessed by the clergy, the greater part might be of little value at the time they had been given perhaps consisting of wild and deserted tracts of country; but they were capable of cultivation and improvement, and as civilization and population increased they became a source of gain and profit." Nay, this accumulation of lands in the hands of the clergy progressed so rapidly that it naturally excited the jealousy of the sovereigns. These provocations- were still further sharpened by another great source of clerical enrichment, viz. the payment of tithes, which seems to have received a legal sanction in the 9th century, but which in the 12th century had become universal. Still other revenues were derived from the free donations and offerings of the laity. "Some made oblations to the Church before entering on military expeditions; bequests were made by others in the terrors of dissolution." Indeed, it became at last a pious custom to assign a portion of the property of a deceased person to the clergy for their distribution among the poor and the needy. But by degrees crafty Romanists learned to rank their churches among the poor, "and as it was believed that the deceased would regard them with special favor, they absorbed the lion's share of the alms, until the *other poor* were forgotten altogether." Thus what began as a pious custom the Church gradually so distorted until it all flowed into her coffers, and was finally made a compulsory tribute. But, as if all these sources of income were not yet sufficient to meet the wants of an indolent clergy, dependent wholly for their support upon a superstitious and ignorant class, in the Middle Ages as well as in our own day, the penances were added, and, by being made canonical, were imposed upon repentant offenders; and acts of lawlessness, which it ought to have taken more than an ordinary lifetime to discharge, were allowed to be committed for money payments. "One day's fasting might be redeemed with a penny; a year's fasting with thirty shillings, or with freeing a slave that was worth that money (one of the few good things that the Church of the Middle Ages is guilty of). Many, in a glow of zeal, vowed to go on a crusade, but, when the first ardor had cooled down, were glad to purchase exemption. Many, to atone for their sins, set out on pilgrimages to well-known shrines; and, as the clergy had not failed to inculcate that no atonement could be so acceptable to Heaven as liberal presents, large offerings were presented to such churches by the remorse of repentance. At Rome, in the year of jubilee, two priests stood with rakes in their hands sweeping the uncounted gold and silver from the altars." No wonder, then, that the Church and her officers the bishops, as well as all the clergy, with possessions so vast, and

resources so unbounded and fertile, became the objects of suspicion to temporal princes, and objects of envy to the nobles.

2. But, while the enjoyment of these large possessions was undoubtedly the primary cause that provoked the distrust and displeasure of sovereigns, the struggle, which at the close of the 11th and at the beginning of the 12th century was especially fierce between Germany and England on the one side and Rome on the other, was directly brought about by the symbols incidental to feudal tenures. Investiture by the lord and an oath of fealty by the tenant, which were necessary in the case of all lay barons, had already, even in the old Frankish Church, been required of ecclesiastics before they were admitted to the temporalities of a see (Hallam, *Middle Ages*, 2, part 1, ch. 7, p. 181; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 356), and were claimed to be the special prerogatives of the king. But, instead of fealty and homage, to which the lay barons were subjected, the king used symbols in the investiture of ecclesiastics. It had been at first the custom for the king to deliver or send to the bishops on their installation a ring or a staff, the one as a symbol of the close union which was to exist between the bishop and his congregation, the other as an emblem of his office as guide and shepherd. The delivery of the symbols was in accordance with the fundamental legal principle which the sovereigns were anxious to impress on the ecclesiastics, viz. that all the possessions of the Church were only held by consent of the king and as loans (*beneficia*), for which reason it became also the bishop's duty to accompany the army when required (see Eichhorn, *Deutsche Staats u. Rechtsgesch.*, Gott. 1834, pt. 1, p. 202, 505, 516; Sugenheim, *Staatsleben d. Klerus 1. Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1839, part 1, p. 315). The bestowing of the symbols implied the installation into office, and was therefore called investiture. The investiture with both ring and staff was not habitual at first. King Clovis I (508) employed only the ring (Bouquet, *Rerum Gallic. scriptor.* 4, 616: "Quicquid est fisci nostri per anulum tradimus"); Clovis II (623), Louis of Germany, Arnulf, and also Otto I, conferred only the staff while the emperors Henry II and Conrad II gave the ring to the bishops merely as a pledge that they would afterwards be invested with the staff. It was not till after these emperors that the investiture with both ring and staff became general, and the sceptre was added to them still later. (See Mosheim, *Institutiones hist. eccles.* p. 408, note r.; Hüllmann, *Gesch. dess Ursprungs d. Stinde 1. Veutschland*, Berlin, 1830, p. 153; Planck, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirchl. Gesellschaftsvesfassung*, 3, 462.) In the ninth century the symbols were first



interpreted as referring not only to the investiture of the clergy into their office, but also as an obligation answering to the oath of fealty as given by the lay barons.

For nearly two centuries the practice had continued without exciting scandal or resistance, when the Church began to raise angry and frequent complaints against the assumption of this right by the lay suzerains. "On the part of the suzerains it was replied that they did not claim to grant by this rite the spiritual powers of the office, their function being solely to grant possession of its temporalities, and of the temporal rank thereto annexed. But the Church party urged that the ceremonial in itself involved the granting of spiritual powers, insomuch that, in order to prevent the clergy from electing to a see when vacant, it was the practice of the emperors to take possession of the crosier and ring until it should be their own pleasure to grant investiture to their favorites." The disfavor in which the practice had long been held by the Church was first expressed by Clement II (see Stenzel, *Gesch. Deutschl. u. d. Jänkischen Kaiser*, pt. 1, 117; 2, 130), but its 'most energetic opponent it really first found in the person of Gregory VII, who, having in the year 1074 enacted most stringent measures for the repression of simony, proceeded, in the beginning of the year 1075, to condemn, under excommunication, the practice of investiture, as almost necessarily connected with simony, or leading to it. "The prohibition was couched in the most imperious and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastic who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him-whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry), until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained-from all communion in the favor of St. Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the state. In the empire (then under Henry IV) it annulled the precarious power of the sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counselors, the leaders in the diets and national assemblies, became to a great degree independent of the crown; the emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates

were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was no fealty there could be no treason. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dis severed from the crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were now inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property, and became that of the Church and of God the pope might be, in fact, the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world” (Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, 3:416-417). These proceedings of the pope the kings could not, of course, possibly permit without a practical abdication of all their powers, and hence arose the conflicts of investiture which resulted so triumphantly for the papacy, not only in rising to a supremacy over the princes of the earth, but drawing into their own hands all civil government, and which enabled some of the incumbents of the papal see, e.g. Innocent III, to aspire to be the supreme disposers of the Christian world, with all its belongings (see Reichel, p. 348). Some of the sovereigns, such as Philip of France and William of England, paid no attention whatever to the pope’s mandate, and the latter, satisfied that they would not actively oppose him, was quite willing to let them alone; but far otherwise was his conduct towards the emperor Henry IV, whom he sought by every possible exertion to compel to submit to these decisions. For this the licentious and ambitious character of Henry had given him good cause. But for a time he failed to make any impression on the emperor, who paid no regard to the threats of Gregory VII, but continued to nominate not only to German, but also Italian bishoprics. Other causes widened the breach between the emperor and the pope. *SEE GREGORY VII*, After Hildebrand’s (Gregory VII) death, the rivalry for the papal throne assuaged for a time the controversy on investiture; each papal party, anxious to secure the greatest number of, and most powerful adherents, willingly made all possible concessions. But when Urban II, elected and supported by the Hildebrandian party, ascended the papal throne, the controversy was renewed by his declaration “Nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus,” and the subject was even brought before the Council of Clermont (1095). By canon 15 of this council clergymen were forbidden to accept any ecclesiastical office from a layman; the 16th canon applies this especially to kings and other civil authorities; canon 17 forbade bishops and priests binding themselves by feudal oaths to either kings or other laymen; and canon 18 threatened every one who, after two warnings, continued in these forbidden relations, with deprivation of

all office and power. Yet Urban found more difficulty than he had expected in bringing the princes to second him in his views, and he did not succeed in enforcing these decisions even in Italy, where Roger of Sicily stoutly defended the rights of the civil authorities. Urban, however, evaded the difficulty by naming Roger, to whom he was under many obligations, his legate in Sicily. The death of this pope, in 1099, by no means extinguished the opposition, but, instead, the contest became more earnest, and continued during the most of the 11th century. In the beginning of the 12th century it assumed a new form under Pascal II, whose name, of all popes, is most prominently connected with the question of investitures both in England and Germany. Pascal II had ascended the papal throne with the intention of following in the footsteps of his predecessors; but he lacked the strength of character necessary for determined action. "In England, William the Conqueror had maintained his supremacy over the Church with an iron arm. Thus no one was allowed to acknowledge the pope, when chosen, except by the king's permission; no one might receive letters from Rome unless they had been previously shown to him for approval. The archbishop was not permitted to frame any canon, although with the assistance of the bishop of the realm, unless it had been previously sanctioned by the sovereign. Nor was any bishop allowed to excommunicate a baron or minister of the crown on any charge, without having first obtained the king's consent. The same policy was pursued by his son William Rufus, without any difficulties being raised on the part of the popes. They had too many reasons for conciliating the friendship of the Normans in Italy to venture to oppose their wishes in England." Nor was it otherwise now when archbishop Anselm came forward, determined to execute the papal decisions concerning the investitures, and King Henry I felt his prerogatives invaded, and Anselm alone had to bear the whole brunt of Henry's indignation. *SEE ANSELM*. In 1107, an agreement which had been entered into between the king and the archbishop was finally proclaimed with great solemnity at a synod convened for this purpose. "By it Henry, whilst surrendering an unnecessary ceremony, retained a substantial power; and Anselm's scruples were set at rest by a letter from Paschal, in which he freed those who had received law investitures from the penalties pronounced by his predecessor... Still more fortunate than the English kings were the kings of Castile, who, by directly yielding when Urban's decree was first published, obtained from him an absolute privilege of nomination to all bishoprics in their dominions—a privilege which they have since retained by virtue of a particular indulgence renewed by the

pope for the life of each prince” (Reichel, p. 363; see Hallam, *Middle Ages*, 2, pt. 1, ch. 7, 190).

But it was in Germany that the struggle about investitures was waged most fiercely, and that it also continued longest. Taking advantage of the political troubles which were agitating the country, Paschal used every exertion to detach the Church entirely from the control of the state. “Not only had Paschal II begun his course by denouncing lay investiture as strongly as his predecessor Urban II, but he had also followed the tactics of Urban.” He not only put Henry IV a second time under the ban, but even committed one of the darkest crimes in the annals of history. He estranged from Henry the affection of those to whose love and consideration he was entitled by the most sacred of laws. Two of the sons of Henry IV were incited to rebellion against their own natural father (1101, 1104), which brought the emperor to an untimely grave of broken heart (1106). Paschal now thought, of course, that he had secured for himself the obedience of Germany, and with pride he announced that henceforth the Church would begin to enjoy anew her liberty indeed, for death had removed, and was fast removing, those who opposed her success (Mansi, *I. c.* p. 1209; Muratori, *Scriptores rerum Italic.* III, 1, 363); he even caused the laws on investiture to be reasserted by the councils of Troyes, Benevento (1108), and Lateran (1100). But for once Paschal II had made his reckoning without his host. His boast, alas, how empty “He had not to wait long before he discovered its vainness; for Henry V was no sooner in undisputed possession of the throne than he maintained as stoutly as his father had done his own right to invest bishops.” Strengthened in his opposition by the example of England, and of France also, he interpreted the actions of the councils as threats at his power, and after a vain endeavor to bring the pope to acknowledge his right in a conference at Chalons, he resorted to arms. At the head of a vast army he marched to Italy, and so terrified the pope that he obtained a very favorable compact without the least difficulty (Feb. 9, 1111). But the bishops refused to comply with it, and Henry hesitated not to force a favorable conclusion by imprisoning the pope and his cardinals. By a second treaty, which was now compacted (April 8, 1111), Pascal II actually agreed to surrender all the possessions and royalties with which the Church had been endowed, and which alone had formed the subject of claim on the part of the emperor. To seal the compact more firmly, the pope divided the host with the emperor, and, after coronation, Henry returned to Germany, satisfied that Rome had for

once been brought low (see Stenzel, pt. 1, p. 632 sq.). This treaty, however, never had any practical effect, for the Hildebrandian party disapproved of the pope's concessions, and "nothing remained for Paschal, weak and vacillating Paschal, but to annul the grant, and to assemble a council in the Lateran, and to plead before it that the agreement had been concluded under the pressure of circumstances, in order to save the cardinals and the city of Rome; that it was beyond his power to 'surrender any of the liberties and rights of the Church; that it was for the assembly to examine the agreement, and pronounce thereupon; but that for himself he would adhere to his oath, and undertake nothing personally against Henry," i.e. poor wretched Paschal had sworn to a compact which he felt he could not break himself, but for which, none the less determined to abrogate, he sought a pretext to surrender his authority into the hands of his inferiors, that they might execute the wishes of his heart, which he dared not openly espouse as a pope. The action of the pope, however, in accordance with his own wishes, was repudiated in a Lateran council in 1112 (Mansi, t. 21, p. 49 sq.), which even put the emperor again under the ban. Unfortunately, Henry had in the mean time made himself many enemies at home by his course concerning the investitures, and the excommunication 'still further increased his difficulties.; yet he succeeded in overcoming them all at the time when the papal see least expected it, and his whole power was then directed against the latter. Henry re-entered Italy, seized Rome, and the pope, compelled to flee, died at last in banishment, as by his policy he had well deserved (1118). Gelasius II was the next successor to the papal throne; but as he lived only a short time (111), the glory of concluding the long-protracted struggle was reserved for Calixtus II, but not before one preliminary contract had been concluded and as soon violated, nor before the utterance of a sentence of excommunication and dethronement on Henry V, at the great synod at Rheims (Labbe, 12). It was now agreed that every investiture should be retained, and each bishopric restored to its former incumbent, but that those belonging to the Church should be governed according to the canons, and the secular ones by the civil laws (Mansi, t. 21, p. 244; Stenzel, p. 690). Upon a second consideration, however, they relented and the question of the oath soon created new pretexts for the struggle between them, and, in a synod of Rheims (1119), Calixtus put the emperor under the ban, and deposed him (Mansi, 1. c., p. 250). In the mean time, archbishop Adalbert, of Mentz, created troubles in Germany. Calixtus strengthened his position in Rome, and even succeeded in taking the anti-

pope, Gregory VIII, whom the emperor had opposed to him, prisoner; yet the public sentiment of Germany was strong enough to compel the papal party finally to adopt the course which Ivo of Chartres and the monk Hugo of Fleury had commanded. "It was an intermediate course between the extreme views of the Gregorian party on the one hand, and the secularizing tendencies of their opponents on the other. It combated the Gregorian position that it was a degradation for the priesthood to own itself subject to any lay authority, and held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Caesar that which is Caesar's. It therefore maintained that the king ought not to invest the candidate bishop with staff and ring, these being the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and, as such, belonging to the archbishop; but it allowed homage to be done' to the emperor, and the use of some other symbol for bestowing the temporalities." The celebrated concordat of Worms, Sept. 1122 (Mansi, *I. c.* p. 273 sq.), finally settled the question to the satisfaction of all parties, and the Lateran Council of 1123 gave its full approval (comp. Mansi, *I. c.* p. 277). The emperor agreed to give up the form of investiture *with the ring and pastoral staff*, to grant to the clergy the right of free elections, and to restore all the possessions of the Church of Rome which had been seized either by himself or by his father; while the pope, on his part, consented that the elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his official, but with a right of appeal to the provincial synod: that investiture might be given by the emperor, but only *by the touch of the scepter*; and that the bishops and other church dignitaries should faithfully discharge all the feudal duties which belonged to their principality (see Montag. p. 436 sq.; Stenzel, p. 704). Lothair III, Henry's successor, rendered these conditions still more advantageous to the Roman see by substituting a more general profession for the feudal oath (see J. D. Olenschlager, *Erlau. terung d. gildenen Bulle*, Frankfort, 1766; *Urkundenbuch*, p. 19).. This measure, to some extent, at least, allayed the ill will which the hierarchical party bore to the Concordat of Worms. The pope had in reality secured but few actual advantages by the concordat. yet the freedom of election obtained by it in the place of the influence exercised over them by the emperor was sure in due time to be of great advantage to the papacy. It certainly had considerable effect in restraining one of the greatest abuses of the Middle Ages, if not in eradicating altogether the real evil of simony and corrupt promotion of unworthy candidates for ecclesiastical offices; and although, even as late as the 12th century, we find instances of the emperor's interference in the election of

German bishops, and even of his direct appointments to such offices (see Sugenheim, *Staatsleben d. Klerus im Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1839, pt. 1, p. 153), these instances are, after. all, only few in number, and disappear altogether after the times of Otto IV and Frederick II. Civil interference in ecclesiastical appointments ceased also in France, England, and Spain; but in Naples, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden, the kings continued to appoint bishops until the 13th century (Sugenheim, p. 197).

For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 165.. On the general subject, see Staudenmaier, *Geschichte d. Bischofswahlen* (Tübing. 1830, p. 249); Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, pt. 2, chap. 12; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope*, 2, 345; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, 3:415 4:146 sq.; Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 572 sq.; Butler, *Eccles. Hist. to 13th Cent.* p. 474 sq., 492 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* p. 327, et al.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 6:s.v.; (J. H. W.)

## Invisible Church

SEE CHURCH.

## Invisibles

is the name given to the school of theologians who held that the Church of Christ was not always visible. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 354; 2, § 256.

## Invitatores

SEE INVITATORY.

## Invitatory

is a short antiphon, suitable to the occasion, sung or recited before the *Venite Exultemus Dosmino*, or interpolated between the verses of this psalm and the *Gloria Patri* also. The 95th Psalm, as an "invitation to praise," is supposed to have been used by the early 'Christians, adopted, no doubt, from the Temple service. In the Greek as well as the Latin churches it is still in use, though the two churches differ somewhat in form. In the East the following three clauses only are used:

*“come, let us worship God our King;  
O come, let us worship and fall down before Christ our King and God;  
O come, let us worship before Christ himself, our King and God;”*

but in the Western churches the whole psalm has always been used, accompanied generally by the *invitatory*, the latter varying, of course, according to the subject of the office to which they invite thought. It always consists of two clauses: “both are said before the psalm, and at the end of the second, seventh, and last verses; the second clause only at the end of the fourth and ninth verses. The *Gloria Patri* is followed first by the second and then by both clauses. The Breviary of cardinal Quignones restricted the invitatory to the beginning and end of the psalms.” The ninefold repetition of the whole or a part of the invitatory is of great antiquity. Durandus thus refers to its mystical bearing: “The invitatory is repeated six times at full length, because six is the first perfect number; and the sixfold repetition, therefore, sets forth the perfection with which we should endeavor to perform the service of God. Three is an imperfect number, and therefore the imperfect repetition takes place three times.” On the *double feasts* of the Western Church the invitatory is doubled at matins, lauds, and vespers. In the English Church, where the order of daily prayer is chiefly taken from the corresponding offices of the Sarum Breviary (of which the rubric runs thus [after the *Gloria* and *Alleluia*): “*Sequatur invitatorium hoc modo. Ecce venit rex. Occuramus obviam Salvatori nostro. Ps. Venite; post 1, 2 et v, vers. psalmi repetatur totum invitatorium. Post. 2, vers. 4 et 6, vers. psalmi repetatur solum hac pars, Occuramus. Et deinde reincipiatur totum invitatorium*”), the opening sentences of matins and evensong are generally considered to be of a similar character, (compare Procter, *Common Prayer*, p. 182; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, 1, 152 sq.). Blunt (*Theol. Cyclop.* 1, 356), however, says that the true invitatory of the English Church “is in the fixed versicle ‘Praise ye the Lord,’ with its response, The Lord’s name be praised.’ The singing of *Alleluia* after the *Gloria Patri*, at the commencement of matins, was ordered in the Prayer-book of 1549. The response was inserted in 1661. The 95th Psalm, with this versicle and response, is to be considered as an unvarying invitatory in the modern English rite, exception Easter day, for which special provision is made.’. See also Neale, *Liturgical Essays*, p. 7 sq., et al.; *Comment. on the Psalms*, 1, 43 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, p. 332.

### Invocation of Angels

or the act of addressing prayers to angels, especially to the angel-guardian, prevails in the Roman and the Greek churches, as well as in all the different Eastern churches. They hold that angels are sharers of the divine nature,



though in a somewhat subordinate measure. In the same manner they also permit the invocation of saints (q.v.) even, and designate this worship under the technical term of *δουλεία*, in distinction from the worship of God himself, which they term *λατρεία*. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 141, 142, 338 sq. *SEE ANGELS; SEE VENERATION.*

### Invocation of the Holy Ghost

In the prayer of the mediaeval canon, retained also in the Scottish office on the consecration of the elements for the Lord's Supper, the Holy Ghost is thus invoked: "Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and *Holy Spirit* these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son."

### Invocation of Saints

a form of idolatry prevailing in the Roman, the Greek, and the different Eastern churches. They ignore the doctrine to which the Protestants tenaciously cling, that the rendering of divine worship to one Infinite Being must of necessity exclude the idea of rendering divine worship, no matter how modified and excused, to any other being, dependent upon and created by the Supreme Being. They also deny that the invocation of the created, instead of the Creator, does in any wise trench upon the honor due only to God, and that it is, as we assert, irreconcilable with Scripture, "which holds him forth as the sole object of worship, and the *only* fountain of mercy." They cannot, of course, disprove these truths from Scripture, neither can they furnish any authority from the holy book for a practice unknown to the early Church, and expressly condemned by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 481) and by the early fathers. The few passages which they frequently cite they themselves claim only to *imply* an intercommunion of the two worlds (as <sup><113B></sup>Matthew 13:3; <sup><247></sup>Luke 14:17; <sup><2313></sup>Exodus 23:13), and they are therefore obliged to have recourse to tradition. To this end they cite some of the Church fathers, such as Origen (*Opp.* 2, 273), Cyprian (*Ep.* 60, Dodwell's edition), Basil (*Opp.* 2, 155), Gregory Nazianzen (*Opp.* 1, 288), Gregory of Nyssa (2, 1017), Ambrose (2, 200), Chrysostom (4, 449), and especially the liturgies of the different ancient churches of Roman, Greek, Syrian, and even Egyptian rite. But, while these testimonies are generally credited, it must be remembered that they are only unscriptural additions, and that they originated after the infusion into the Church system of Alexandrian Neoplatonism and Oriental

Magianism, which left its traces even in the most orthodox form of Christian worship, and creed also, up to the 4th and 5th centuries, a period in the history of the Christian Church when heresies were, to use a common phrase, almost the order of the day. Nay, even the Roman Catholic Church admits that the worship of saints was carried to an excess not only in this age, but especially in the medieval period. The worship of saints and of the Virgin Mary then took the place of the worship of Christ, the only legal intercessor between God and man, and thus virtually ignored the mediatorship of Christ. It is true some of the more enlightened and less bigoted of the Romanists claim that the saints are only invoked, “not for the purpose of obtaining mercy or grace from themselves directly, but in order to ask their prayers or intercession with God on our behalf (see Bellarmine, *Controversie de Sanctorum Beatitudine*, lib. 1, cap. 17). But as we have already stated in our article on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, we repeat also here, that it is not for us to examine only the intent of the Romish liturgy, but also what her communicants understand it to mean. Here lies the greatest difficulty, to say the least, against the introduction of a mode of worship wholly unauthorized by the word inspired by God to serve as a guide in all things. It brings home again not only the question of the immaculate conception of Mary, but even the infallibility theory of the vicar of Rome. Protestants are unwilling to take any authority except the word of God; they refuse to acknowledge as infallible any one except the Infinite Being himself. It was this view that inaugurated the Reformation, however much it may have been hastened by the sale of indulgences (see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 2, § 257). “The Church of Rome is justly and scripturally charged with idolatry in the worship, adoration, and invocation which she addresses to saints and angels. Idolatry, in the scriptural application of the term, is of two sorts. and consists (1) either in giving the honor due to the one true God, as maker and governor of the world, to any subordinate being, (2) or in giving the honor due to Christ, as the sole mediator between God and man, to any subordinate mediator. The former is the idolatry forbidden by the Jewish law, and by that of nature. The latter is Christian idolatry, properly so called, and is the abomination condemned in severe terms by the Gospel. This species of idolatry is, without doubt, chargeable on any Christian Church that shall adopt, in its religious addresses, another mediator besides Jesus Christ. But the Church of Rome, not merely in the private writings of her divines, but in the solemn forms of her ritual, publicly professes, and by her canons and councils authoritatively enjoins, the worship of saints and

angels,' under the idea of mediators or intercessors; not, indeed, in exclusion' of Christ as the one or chief mediator, but in manifest defiance of his *sole* mediatorship. This charge is truly and justly brought against her, as she now stands, and hath stood for many ages, and cannot by any subterfuge be evaded. Therefore she must be content to have the imputation of daemon-worship, or anti-Christian idolatry, still adhering to her" (Elliott).

As a regular doctrine, the invocation of saints is taught in a canon *Touching the Invocation, Veneration, and on Relics of Saints and sacred Images*, issued by the Council of Trent in its 25th session. It reads as follows: "The holy synod enjoins on all bishops, and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, that, according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times (!) of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy fathers, and- to the decrees of sacred councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently touching the intercession and invocation of saints, the honor paid to relics, and the lawful use of images: teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Savior; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the Word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the *one mediator between God and amen, Jesus Christ*; or that! it is foolish to supplicate, orally or inwardly, those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which were the living members of Christ, and *the temple of the Holy Ghost*, and which are by him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which [bodies] many benefits are bestowed by God on men; so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and doth now also condemn them. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of

the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be awarded them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown unto them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear. And this, by the decrees of councils, and especially of the second synod of Nicaea, has been ordained against the opponents of images. And the bishops shall carefully teach this: that, by means of the histories of the mysteries of our redemption, depicted by paintings or other representations, the people are instructed, and strengthened in remembering and continually reflecting on the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and gifts which have been bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles of God through the means of the saints, and their salutary example, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so for these things they may give God thanks; may order their own life and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema.”

Most ridiculous is the defense which Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Divisions*, 1, § 86) advances in behalf of this species of idolatry, while yet in communion with the Romish Church; and his friends of the High-Church party of England and our own country may do well to read it before they carry much farther the laughable affectations which they term ‘; devotions.’ While defending the gross forgeries of Pius V in the missal and breviary of the Church, sometimes designated by Romanists as “revisions,” on the invocation of saints and of Mary, he says, “They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church. .. His Holy Spirit communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument, had taught them that the saints reigning with Christ, and his blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them did they ask their prayers; and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret of his success to his brother or friend, till he in turn was encouraged to ask. Then another, and an. other, as the secret was passed

about from house to hamlet, and from hamlet to town, and from one country to another, till at length it had spread over Christendom.” If this was the way in which the invocation of saints was practiced, to authorize its admission in the litany by Pius V in the 16th century, and its affirmation as a doctrine by the Council of Trent, then why adduce the Church fathers of the early age, and the practices of some Christian churches of an age when the Church of Christ was so greatly corrupted and overrun by innovation? The Protestants also believe in saints. They believe in imitating the noble character exemplified in their life while on earth, which is a very different thing from invoking them to intercede in Christ’s stead before the throne of God the Father. See Marheineke, *Symbolik*, 3, 439; Freeman, Claggett, and Whitby, in Gibson’s *Preservative*, 7; *Dublin Rev.* April, 1853; Pusey, *Rule of Elaith*, p. 55 sq.; Huss (John), *De Mysterio Antichristi*, c. 23; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 34, 614 sq.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, p. 753 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop. s.v.*; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.* **SEE IMAGES; SEE SAINTS.** (J. H.W.)

### Invocations

About the 8th century, says Procter (*On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 249), the *invocations of saints* (q.v.) were introduced into the churches of the West, and called the *Litany*, a name given to various other services. **SEE LITANY.** (Comp. Reiaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* 1, 356; Bingham, *Antiq.* 15, 1, § 2; Mabillon, *Analect.* 3, 669 sq.)

### Invocavit

a name sometimes given to the first Sunday in Lent on account of the *Introit* (q.v.), which opens, “Invocavit me et exaudiam eum,” etc. (<sup>1915</sup>Psalm 91:15). — Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 668.

### Iona

(formerly *loua*), one of the most famous of the Hebrides. It is about three miles long, and varies in breadth from a mile to a mile and a half. In 1861 it had a population of 264. Its remarkable fertility was regarded as miraculous in the Dark Ages, and no doubt led to its early occupation. Dunii, the highest point on the island, is 330 feet above the sea-level. Its history begins in the year 563, when St. Columba (q.v.), leaving the shores of Ireland, landed upon Iona with twelve disciples. Having obtained a grant, of the island, as well from his kinsman Conall, the son of Comghall,

king of the Scots, as from Bruidi, the son of Melchon, king of the Picts, he built upon it a monastery, which was long regarded as the mother-church of the Picts. and was venerated not only among the Scots of Britain and Ireland, but among the Angles of the north of England, who owed their conversion to the self-denying missionaries of Iona. From the 6th to the 17th century, the island was most generally called, *I, Ii, Ia, Io, Eo, Hy, Hi, Hii, Hie, Hu, Y or Yi* — that is, simply, “the Island;” or (on Columba’s account) *Icolmikill, I-Columb-Kille, or Hii-Colum-Kille* — that is, “the Island of Columbia of the Church.” From the end of the 6th to the end of the 8th century Iona was scarcely second to any monastery in the British Isles; but the fierce and heathen Norsemen burned it in 795, and again in 802. Its “family” (as the monks were called) of sixty-eight persons were martyred in 806. A second martyrdom, in 825, is the subject of a contemporary Latin poem by Walafridus Strabus, abbot of the German monastery of Reichenau, in the Lake of Constance. On the Christmas evening of 986 the island was again wasted by the Norsemen, who slew the abbot and fifteen of his monks. Towards the end of the next century the monastery was repaired by St. Margaret, the queen of king Malcolm Canmore. It was visited in 1097 by king Magnus the Barefooted, of Norway, being at that time a part of that kingdom, and so fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Man and the archbishop of Drontheim. In 1203 the bishops of the north of Ireland-disputed the authority of the Manx bishop, pulled down a monastery which he had begun to build in the island, and placed the abbey under the rule of an Irish abbot of Derry. The Scottish Church had long claimed jurisdiction in Iona, and before the end of the 13th century the island fell under the rule of the Scottish king. Its abbey was now peopled by Clugniac monks; and a nunnery of Austin canonesses was planted on its shores. Towards the end of the 15th century it became the seat of the Scottish bishop of the Isles, the abbey church being his cathedral, and the monks his chapter. No building now remains on the island which can claim to have sheltered St. Columba or his disciples. The most ancient ruins are the Laithrichean, or Foundations, in a little bay to the west of Port-a-Churraich; the Cobhan Cuildich, or Culdees’ Cell, in a hollow between Dunii and Dunbhuirg; the rath or hill-fort of Dunbhuirg; and the Gleann-an-Teampull, or Glen of the Church, in the middle of the island, believed to be the site of the monastery which the Irish bishops destroyed in 1203. St. Oran’s Chapel, now the oldest church in the island, may probably be of the latter part of the 11th century. St. Mary’s Nunnery is perhaps a century later. The Cathedral, or

St. Mary's Church, seems to have been built chiefly in the early part of the 13th century. It has a choir, with a sacristy on the north side, and chapels on the south side; north and south transepts; a central tower about seventy-five feet high, and a nave. An inscription on one of the columns of the choir appears to denote that it was the work of an Irish ecclesiastic who died in 1202. On the north of the cathedral are the chapter-house and other remains of the conventual or monastic buildings. In the "Reilig Oran"—so called, it is supposed, from St. Oran, a kinsman of St. Columba, the first who found a grave in it—were buried Ecgfrid, king of Northumbria, in 684; Godred, king of the Isles, in 1188; and Haco Ospac, king of the Isles, in 1228. No monuments of these princes now remain. The oldest of the many tombstones on the island are *two* with Irish inscriptions, one of them, it is believed being the monument of a bishop of Connor who died at Iona in 1174. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 619; Duke of Argyll, in *Good Words*, Sept. 1, 1869, p. 614 sq.; *Princeton Rep.* 1867, p. 1-22. **SEE COLUMBA.**

## Ionia

It has been suggested that in I Macc. 8:8, for the existing reading **χώραν τὴν Ἰνδικὴν καὶ Μήδειαν**, "India and Media," should be read **χ.τ. Ἴωνίαν καὶ Μυσίαν**, "Ionia and Mysia," on the ground that to include India and Media within the domain of Antiochus III is to contradict directly the voice of history, which confines that monarch's possessions to this side the Taurus range (Livy, *Hist.* 37:56; 38:38). **SEE INDIA.** This alteration is purely conjectural, as there is no MS. authority for it; and it is not easy to see, supposing it to be the correct reading, how the error in the text could have arisen. Michaelis supposes that, by a mistake on the part of the translator, **wdm** was read for **ysm**, and **wdh** or **wdnh** for **yfnh**, and that the nations intended are the Mysians and the **Ἐνετοί** (Homr, *II.* 2, 580) of Paphlagonia; but this is still more improbable than the former conjecture; and, besides, not only was Paphlagonia not within the domain of Antiochus but the Enetians did not at the time exist (Strabo, 12:8). Perhaps the conjectural emendation above mentioned may be adopted on the ground of its internal probability, as the only alternative seems to be to suppose gross geographical and historical ignorance on the part of the author. It is followed by Luther (who puts "Ionien" in the text), Drusius, Grotius, Houbigant, etc. Adopting the reading Ionia, the district referred to is that bordering on the AEGean Sea from Phocaea to Miletus. Its original inhabitants were Greeks, but in later times a large Jewish element was

found in the population (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 2, 3). Ionia, with its islands, was celebrated for its twelve, afterwards thirteen cities; five of which — Ephesus, Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos are conspicuous in the N.T. *SEE ASIA MINOR*. Under the Roman dominion the name Ionia remained, but its towns were distributed politically under other provinces. Ptolemy ranks them in Asia Proper, while Strabo (14, 631), Pliny (*I. N.* 5, 31), and Mela (1, 17) speak of Ionia as a distinct territory. In the account which Josephus gives (*Ant.* 16, 2, 3) of the appeal of the Jews in Ionia to Agrippa for exemption from certain oppressions to which they were exposed, the ancient name of the country is retained. He speaks of *πολὺ πλῆθος Ἰουδαίων* as inhabiting its cities. *SEE JAVAN*.

### Ionic Order

*SEE ARCHITECTURE*.

### Ionic Philosophy

*SEE PHILOSOPHY (GREEK)*.

### Ita

*SEE JOT*.

### Iperen, Joshua van

a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Middelburg, Feb. 23, 1726. He was descended from an old and respectable Flemish family. — His studies, in which he evinced very superior mental endowments, were pursued first at Groningen, and afterwards at Leyden, where he was permitted to enjoy the instructions and friendship of the celebrated professors A. Schultens and T. Hemsterhuys. In 1749 he was called to the pastoral charge of Lillo. Here he labored with zeal and fidelity for sixteen years. In 1752 he was made doctor of philosophy, and in 1766 was called to Veere where he remained ten years. Several of the most noted literary, scientific, and poetic societies successively elected him to membership. Zealand also appointed him a member of the commission to which was entrusted the work of preparing a new poetic version of the Book of Psalms. He took an important part in the performance of this duty. The work was approved in 1773, and still continues in use in the Reformed Church of Holland. It possesses a high degree of poetic merit. His income, both at Lillo and Veere, was small, which, with a numerous family to support, was the source of many trials



and perplexities. Accepting an appointment as preacher in Batavia, in the Dutch East India possessions, he went thither in 1778, accompanied by his wife and five children. He was cordially received, and an agreeable field of labor was opened to him. He labored here with redoubled zeal and fidelity, but the climate was adverse to his health, and in 1780, after the short space of two years, he rested from his labors on earth. A philological essay, dedicated to the Holland Society of Sciences, and published in 1755, was regarded as highly creditable to him in a linguistic point of view, and also as evincing a philosophical spirit. His *History of Church Psalms*, published in 1777, is said to exhibit extensive historical knowledge, combined with good taste. He seems to have excelled in various departments of knowledge. See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, 2, 190; H. Bouman, *Geschiedenis der Geldersche Hoogeschool*, 2, 190. (J. P.W.)

### Iphedei'ah

(Heb. *Yiphdeyah'*, *hyDpyas* *set free by Jehovah*; Sept. *Ἰφραδία*), one of the "sons" of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (<sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 8:25). B.C. post 1612 and ante 588.

### Ir

(Heb. *id. ry[æ* *city*; Sept. *Ἰρ* v.r. *Ἰρό*, Vulg. *Hir*), the father of Shupim (Shupham) and Hupim (Hupham), of the tribe of Benjamin (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 7:12); probably identical with one of the sons of Benjamin (<sup><1462></sup>Genesis 46:21), and therefore not (as often supposed) the same with Iri (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 7:7). *SEE BENJAMIN*; also comp. *SEE IR-NAHASH*, *SEE IR-SHEMIESH*, etc.

### I'ra

(Heb. *Ira'*, *ary[æ* *citizen*, otherwise *watchful*; Sept. *Ἰράς*, *Ἰρά*, *Ἰραί*, *Ἐἰρά*), the name of three of David's favorite officers.

**1.** Son of Ikkesh, a Tekoite, and one of David's thirty famous warriors (<sup><1235></sup>2 Samuel 23:26; <sup><13128></sup>1 Chronicles 11:28). He was afterwards placed in command of the sixth regiment of his troops (<sup><13719></sup>1 Chronicles 27:9). B.C. 1046-1014.

**2.** A Jethrite, another of David's thirty chief heroes (<sup><1238></sup>2 Samuel 23:38; <sup><13140></sup>1 Chronicles 11:40). B.C. 1046.

3. A Jairite and priest (<sup>h</sup>κρΑ.V. “chief ruler”), i.e. royal chaplain (<sup>1016</sup>2 Samuel 20:26). B.C. cir. 1022. As he was not of the sacerdotal family, the Rabbins hold that he was only one of David’s cabinet. See JAIR.

### I’rad

(Heb. *frad’*, dry[<sup>æ</sup>perh. runner; Sept. Γαιδάδ, apparently by erroneously reading ddy[<sup>æ</sup> Joseph. Ιαρέδης, *Ant.* 1, 3, 4; Vulg. *Is-ad*), one of the antediluvian patriarchs, of the Cainite line, son of Enoch and father of Mehujael (<sup>0048</sup>Genesis 4:18). B.C. considerably post 4045.

### I’ram

(Heb. *Ira-m’*, <sup>ury</sup>[<sup>æ</sup>citizen, otherwise watchful; Sept. Ἡράμ, but Ζαφώϊν in <sup>0136</sup>Genesis 36:43; Vulg. *Ifiraim*), the last-named of the Edomite phylarchs in Mount Seir, apparently contemporary with the Horite kings (<sup>0136</sup>Genesis 36:43; <sup>1305</sup>1 Chronicles 1:54). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

SEE IDUMIEA.

### Ireland

the more western of the two principal islands of which the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is composed, between lat. 51° 25’ and 55° 23’ N., and long. 6° 20’ and 10° 20’ W. Area, 32,513 sq. miles.

At the time when the island became known to the Greeks and the Romans its inhabitants were Celts. Of Celtic origin is the original name of Erin, which means “West Side,” and was changed by the Greeks into Ierne, and by the Romans, who made no endeavors to subjugate the island, into Hibernia. During the whole period of the rule of the Romans over Brittany the history of Ireland is enveloped in profound obscurity. According to later chronicles, Ireland is said to have had in the 3rd century five states, Momonia, Connacia, Lagenia, Ultonia, and Modia (Meath). As the people were akin to the Celts of Scotland, Ireland was, until the 4th century, often called Great Scotland (*Scotia major*). Christianity appears to have been brought to Ireland at an early time, perhaps as early as the 2nd century. A reference to Ireland is, in particular, found in the words of Tertullian, who says that parts of the British Islands which had ‘never been visited by the Romans were subject to Christ. In the 4th century a number of churches and schools are mentioned, and even before the 4th century missionaries went out from Ireland. Celestius; the friend and colaborer of Pelagius, was,

according to Jerome, an Irishman, and the son of Christian parents. That the Irish had received their Christianity not from Rome, but from the East, is shown by their aversion against the institutions of the Church of Rome. The first Roman missionary, who about 430 was sent to Ireland by pope Coelestius, was not well received, and had soon to return to Scotland. Two years later (432), the Scotch monk St. Patrick (q.v.) arrived in Ireland. He had spent his youth in Ireland as a slave, and had subsequently lived for some time in Gaul. With great zeal he preached Christianity throughout Ireland, converted several, and was, in particular, active for the establishment of convents, so that Ireland was called the island of the Saints. He settled finally as bishop of Armagh, which see thus received metropolitan power over all Ireland. According to some writers (Wiltsch, *Kirchl. Statistik*, 2, 48), Ireland was, however, without its own archbishop, being, until the 12th century, subject to the archbishop of Canterbury; according to others, pope Eugene, as early as 625, appointed four metropolitan sees at Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. Certain it is that the permanent division of Ireland into the four ecclesiastical provinces of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam took place about 1150 (according to Moroni in 1152, at the Council of Mellefont; according to Wiltsch in 1155). From this time the primacy of Armagh over all the sees of Ireland was generally recognized. The first bishops for a long time maintained their independence with regard to Rome. In the 7th century Rome endeavored to induce the Irish churches to conform themselves with regard to the celebration of Easter to the practice of the Roman Church instead of following, as heretofore, the rite of the Eastern churches. The Irish made a long resistance, until, in 717, the monks in Iona (q.v.) were on this account either expelled or coerced into submission. Most of the Irish churches then submitted; yet, as late as the 12th century, some monks were found who adhered to the Eastern practice of celebrating Easter. In the 9th century the Irish Church was considerably disturbed by the invasions of the Northmen, who destroyed many churches, and burned manuscripts and convents. These invasions were followed by a period of anarchy, during which the moral condition of the Irish clergy greatly degenerated. The complaints of Rome at this time referred chiefly to the peculiar ecclesiastical practices of the Irish the marriage of the clergy, the administration of baptism without chrisma, and the use of their own liturgy. The legates of the popes finally succeeded in obtaining the entire submission of the Irish Church to the Church of Rome about the middle of the 12th century, which until then is believed to have been without auricular confession, sacrifice of the mass,

and indulgences, and to have celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. In 1155 a bull of pope Hadrian IV allowed king Henry II of England to subject Ireland, the king, in his turn, promising the pope to protect the papal privileges. In 1172, a synod at Cashel regulated the ecclesiastical affairs in accordance with the wishes of Rome. During the time of the following kings of the house of Plantagenet the clergy were in a deplorable condition: the bishops carried the sword, and lived with their clergy in open and secret sins. The monks, who were very different from what they had been in former times, traversed the country as troublesome beggars, molesting the priests as well as the laity.

When Henry VIII undertook to make himself the head of the Church in his dominions he met in Ireland with a violent opposition. The opposition was the more popular as it was intimated that henceforth only such priests as understood the English language would be appointed. The Englishman, George Brown, who was appointed bishop of Dublin, met, therefore, in spite of his earnest and incessant labors in behalf of the Reformation, with but little success. The English liturgy was introduced in 1551, under Edward VI, but the order to hold divine service in the English language seems not to have been executed. The germs of Protestantism were wholly destroyed under the government of Mary. The people were not prepared for the Reformation, and the clergy were not as corrupt as in many other countries. Moreover, there were among the ministers who had been sent to Ireland as Protestant missionaries many adventurers, who, by disreputable conduct, strengthened the aversion of the people to Protestantism. Under the government of Elizabeth, an order was issued in 1560 to introduce the general use of the English liturgy and of the English language at divine service. Some years later, however, concessions appear to have been made in favor of the old Irish language. In 1602 the first translation of the New Testament into the Irish language by William Daniel appeared, but the translation of the whole Bible was not finished until 1665. The persistent endeavors of the English government to extirpate the native language established a close union between the Irish nationality and the Church of Rome. The excitement against England greatly increased when Elizabeth showed a design to confiscate the whole property of the Roman Catholic Church in behalf of the Protestant clergy. A number of revolts consequently occurred, which found a vigorous support on the part of the pope and the Spanish court. A plan submitted by the English lord lieutenant, Sir John Perrot, for thoroughly Anglicizing Ireland, was rejected

as being too expensive, and thus England was compelled to maintain at a heavy expense a large military force in Ireland. In 1595 the chieftain Hugh O’Niele, whom Elizabeth had made earl of Tyrone, placed himself at the head of a powerful insurrection, which was mainly supported by Irish soldiers who had returned from military service in foreign countries. The earl of Essex, with an army of 22,000 men, was unable to quell the insurrection; but his successor, lord Mountjoy, was more successful, and pacified the whole island. In 1601 the Irish again rose, aided by Spanish troops under Aquila and Ocampo; but the combined forces of Ocampo and O’Niele were, on Dec. 24, 1601, totally defeated by Mountjoy near Kinsale. The Spaniards left Ireland in January, 1602, and O’Niele made peace with the English. At the death of Elizabeth the whole of Ireland was under English rule. As a large number of Irish had perished in this conflict, 600,000 acres of land were confiscated in favor of English colonists. In view of the close alliance between the Church of Rome and the native Irish, the government of Elizabeth proceeded with equal severity against both: the public exercise of the Catholic religion was totally forbidden, and every inhabitant, under penalty of twelve pence, was commanded to be present at divine service celebrated in the Anglican churches. Decrees like this provoked a general dissatisfaction, which was carefully fomented by the Jesuits of the University of Douay, in the Netherlands (now belonging to France). On the accession of James I to the English throne the papal party was very powerful: it expelled the Protestant ministers from many places, and re-established the service of the Catholic Church. These attempts were forcibly suppressed, and new insurrections consequently were caused, all of which proved of short duration. In order to break the power of the Catholic chieftains, the government of James, following the example of queen Elizabeth, was especially intent upon wresting from them their landed property. Whoever was unable to prove, by means of a bill of feoffment, his title to his property, lost it. Thus, in the northern part of Ireland alone, about 800,000 acres were confiscated by the crown, which sold them to English speculators and to Scottish colonists, who founded the town of Londonderry. From this time dates the predominance of Protestantism in Ulster the northern province of Ireland. At the same time, however, many most beneficent measures were taken for improving the social condition of the people. The English law supplanted the previous lawlessness; all inhabitants were declared to be free citizens, and the country was divided into parishes. In 1615 an Irish National Parliament was called to sanction these measures. In consequence of the interference

of the government, there were among the 226 members of the lower house only 101 Catholics, while the upper house, consisting of 50 members, consisted almost entirely of Protestants. The Catholics were, moreover, excluded from the public offices, because most of them refused (hence their name "Recusants") to take the oath of supremacy, which designated the king of England as head of the Church: At the beginning of the reign of Charles I the Anglican Church was nevertheless in a deplorable condition. Many churches were destroyed, the bishoprics impoverished, the clergy ignorant, indolent, and impoverished. A convocation called in 1634 adopted the 39 articles of the Church of England, and retained the 104 articles of the Irish Church which had been adopted by the Parliament of 1615. The constitution of the Church of Ireland was defined in 100 canons, which were of a somewhat more liberal character than the 141 canons of the Church of England. The Roman Catholics were generally allowed to celebrate divine service in private houses, and many priests who had fled returned. At the same time the Irish nationality continued to be persecuted, and a number of new confiscations were added to the old ones. On Oct. 23, 1644, a bloody insurrection broke out under the leadership of Roger More, O'Neale, and lord Maguire, the descendants of former chieftains. Within a few days from 40,000 to 50,000 Protestant Englishmen were murdered (according to other accounts the number of killed amounted to only 6000), and an equally large number is said to have perished while trying to flee. The enraged Parliament ordered the confiscation of two and a half million acres of land, but, in consequence of its conflict with the king, was unable to achieve anything. The king's lieutenant, the marquis of Ormond, concluded peace with the Catholic Irish, who received the promise of religious toleration, and, in return, furnished to the king an army against the Parliament. When after the execution of the king, Ormond tried to gain the support of the Catholic Irish for the prince of Wales as king Charles II, the English Parliament sent an army of 10,000 men under Cromwell to Ireland, which conquered the whole island. The Catholics were punished with the utmost severity; all their landed property, about 5,000,000 acres, confiscated; about 20,000 Irish sold as slaves to the West Indies, and 40,000 others compelled to flee to Spain and France. The celebration of Catholic service was forbidden, and all Catholic priests ordered to quit Ireland within twenty days. The restoration of royalty caused no important changes in the condition of the people. Religious persecution ceased by order of Charles II, but the Protestants remained in possession of the confiscated property. The accession of the Catholic

James II filled the Irish Catholics with the greatest hopes, and when, after his expulsion, he landed, at the beginning of 1689, with a French army of 5000 men, he was received by the Catholics with enthusiasm. His army in a short time numbered more than 38,000 men, and he succeeded in capturing all the fortified places except Enniskillen and Londonderry. Large numbers of Protestants had to leave the country because their lives and property were no longer secure. Soon, however, the victories of William III over the Catholic party on the Boyne River, near Drogheda (July 1, 1690), and near Aughrim (July 13, 1691), completed the subjugation of Ireland. The peace concluded with the British general Ginkel at the surrender of Limerick promised to the Irish the free exercise of their religion as they had possessed it under Charles II. While James II had deprived 2400 Protestant landowners of their estates, now more than 12,000 Irishmen who had fought for James voluntarily went into exile. A resolution of the English Parliament ordered a new confiscation of 1,060,000 acres, which were distributed among the Protestants, who began to organize themselves into Orange societies. A number of rigorous and cruel penal laws were passed in order to extirpate the national spirit and the Roman Catholic Church. Bishops and other high dignitaries were exiled; the priests were confined to their own counties; all instruction in the Catholic religion and its public exercise were forbidden; the Catholic Irishmen were not allowed to own horses of higher value than £5, or to marry Protestants, and were excluded from all public offices. The irritation produced by these laws was still increased when the English Parliament, by imposing high duties on the exports from Ireland, dealt a heavy blow to the commerce and prosperity of the island, and when, in 1727, it deprived the Catholic Irish of the franchise. These harsh measures soon led to the establishment of several secret societies, as the "Defenders," the "Whiteboys" (about 1760), so called from the white shirts which they threw over their other clothes when at night they attacked unpopular landlords and their officers; and the "Hearts of Oak" (about 1763). During the American War of Independence, the Irish, under the pretext that the French might avail themselves of the withdrawal of most of the British troops to invade their island, formed a volunteer army, which, in the course of two years, increased to 50,000 men. Monster petitions numerously signed by Irish Protestants also, demanded the abolition of the penal laws, the restoration of the Irish Parliament, reform of the rotten electoral law, and relief of Irish commerce. Fear of a general insurrection induced the Parliament to mitigate the penal laws, and to allow the Catholics to establish schools, to own landed

property, and to exercise their religious worship. The onerous tithes which the Catholics had to pay to the Protestant clergy soon led to the establishment of another secret society, the "Right Boys," who, by means of oaths and threatened vengeance, endeavored to intimidate the Catholics from paying tithes. A still more dangerous movement was called forth by the outbreak of the French Revolution. The league of "United Irishmen," which, in November 1791, was formed at Dublin by former members of the volunteer army, endeavored, in union with the French convent, to make Ireland an independent republic. When the Catholics, at a meeting in Dublin in 1792, demanded equal rights with Protestants, the British Parliament abolished several penal laws, and gave to the Catholics the right of becoming attorneys-at-law and of marrying Protestants. In 1793 the law was abolished which fined the Catholics for, neglecting to attend the Protestant Church on Sunday; at the same time they were admitted to several lower public offices, and received the right to vote. The United Irishmen, nevertheless, assumed a threatening attitude, and a French corps of 25,000 men, under general Hoche, landed in Ireland. The latter had, however, to leave again in December 1796, and a new insurrection, which broke out in May 1798, was unsuccessful. In 1800 the Irish Parliament, bribed by the English Parliament, consented to the legislative union of Ireland with Great Britain, and in the next year the first united Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland assembled. The union of the two parliaments involved the union of the Anglican churches in the two countries, which now received the name of the United Church of England and Ireland. Several further concessions were, however, about this time made to the Catholics. In 1795 a Catholic theological seminary had been established at Maynooth, as the British government hoped that if the Catholic priests were educated upon British territory they would be less hostile to British rule. The rules against convents were also moderated, and at the close of the 18th century the Dominican order alone had in Ireland about forty-three convents. In 1805 the "Catholic Association" was formed to secure the complete political emancipation of the Catholics. It soon became the center of all political movements in Ireland, and, as the Orange lodges began likewise to be revived, frequent disturbances between Catholics and Protestants took place. In 1825 both associations were dissolved by the British government; but the Catholic association was at once reorganized by O'Connell, and gained considerable influence upon the elections. The unceasing agitation of O'Connell, aided by the moral support of the Liberal party in England, finally succeeded in inducing the British ministry to lay



before Parliament a bill of emancipation, which passed after violent debates, and was signed by George IV on April 13, 1829. The oath which the members of Parliament had to take was so changed that Catholics also could take it. At the same time they obtained access to all public offices, with the only exception of that of lord chancellor. This victory encouraged the Catholics to demand further concessions; in particular, the abolition of the tithes paid to the Protestant clergy, and the repeal of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. To that end O'Connell organized the "Repeal Association," to which the ministry of earl Grey opposed in 1833 the Irish Coercion Bill, which authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to forbid mass meetings and to proclaim martial law. When the liberal ministry of Melbourne rescinded the Coercion Bill and began to pursue a conciliatory policy towards Ireland, O'Connell dissolved the Repeal Association. Earl Mulgrave, since 1835 lord lieutenant of Ireland, filled the most important offices with Catholics, and in 1836 suppressed all the Orange lodges. In 1838 the British Parliament adopted the Tithe Bill. When, in August, 1841, the government fell again into the hands of the Tories, O'Connell renewed the repeal agitation so violently that in 1843 he was arrested and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, a sentence which was, however, annulled by the Court of Peers. The repeal agitation ended suddenly by the death of O'Connell in 1847, because no competent successor in the leadership of the party could be found. It was followed by the ascendancy of the more radical Young Ireland party, which did not, like O'Connell, court an alliance with the Catholic Church, but preferred to it an outspoken sympathy with the radical Republicans of France, and is on that account not so much interwoven with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland as the movements of O'Connell.

The ultramontane doctrines taught in the seminary of Maynooth called forth an agitation in Protestant England for a repeal of the annual subsidy which that seminary received from the British government. New offence was given to the bishops and the ultramontane party by the establishment of three undenominational "Queen's Colleges." The bishops' unanimously denounced the colleges as "godless," and warned all Catholic parents against them; they could, however, not prevent that ever from the beginning the majority of the students in these colleges were children of Catholic parents. The disregard of the episcopal orders showed a decline of priestly influence upon a considerable portion of the Catholic Irishmen. This decline of priestly influence became still more apparent when, during

the civil war in the United States, the Fenian organization was formed for the express purpose of making Ireland an independent republic. As it was chiefly directed against English rule in Ireland, the new organization, like all its predecessors, had to direct its attacks prominently against the Established Church of Ireland, and thus appeared to have to some extent an anti-Protestant character; but, being a secret society, it was excommunicated by the pope, and denounced by all the Irish bishops. The general sympathy with which it nevertheless met among the Catholic Irishmen, both of Ireland and the United States is therefore a clear proof that the Catholics of Ireland no longer obey the orders of their bishops as blindly as formerly.

The Established Church of Ireland, regarding itself as the legitimate successor of the medieval Catholic Church, and taking possession of all her dioceses, parishes, and Church property, retained for a long time the same diocesan and parochial divisions as the Roman Catholic Church. As late as 1833 the Church, notwithstanding its small membership, had 4 archbishoprics and 18 bishoprics: namely, Armagh, with 5 bishoprics; Dublin, with 4 bishoprics; Tuam, with 4 bishoprics; and Cashel, with 5 bishoprics. The income of these 22 archbishops and bishops was estimated at from £130,000 to £185,000. In 1833 the first decisive step was taken towards reducing the odious prerogatives of the Established Church. The number of archbishoprics was reduced to two, Armagh and Dublin, and the number of bishoprics to ten, five for each archbishopric. As the income was very unequally distributed, all the benefices yielding more than £200 had a tax of from ten to fifteen per cent imposed upon them, the proceeds of which were employed for church building, raising the income of poor clergymen, and other ecclesiastical purposes. In 1868, the English House of Commons, on motion of Mr. Gladstone, resolved to disestablish the Church of Ireland. The proposition was rejected by the House of Lords. Public opinion expressed itself, however, so strongly against the continuance of the privileges of the Irish Church, that the report of the royal commissioners on the revenues and condition of the Church of Ireland (dated July 27, 1868) recommended important reductions as to the benefices of the Irish Church. This report, a volume of more than 600 pages, is replete with interesting information, and is one of the best sources of information concerning the condition of the Church at this time. It states that the total revenue of the Church from all sources was at this time £613,984; 1319 benefices half a Church population of over forty persons,

and extending to 5000 and upwards. Four bishoprics were suggested for abolition, namely, Meath, Killaloe, Cashel, and Kilmore. The commissioners were in favor of leaving one archbishopric only, that of Armagh. All bishops were to receive £3000 a year income, and an additional £500 when attending Parliament. The primate was to get £6000, and the archbishop of Dublin, if continued, £5000. The abolition of all cathedrals and deaneries except eight was recommended. With a view to rearrangement of benefices, it was proposed that ecclesiastical commissioners should have extended powers to suppress or unite benefices. All benefices not having a Protestant population of forty were to be suppressed. The estates of all capitular bodies and of the bishoprics abolished were to be vested in ecclesiastical commissioners, and the surplus of all property vested in them to be applicable at their discretion to augmentation of benefices. The ecclesiastical commission was to be modified by the introduction of three unpaid laymen and two paid commissioners, one appointed by the crown, the other by the primate. The management of all lands was to be taken out of the hands of ecclesiastical persons and placed in those of the ecclesiastical commissioners. Mr. Gladstone having become, towards the close of the year 1868, prime minister, introduced in March 1869, a new bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. It passed a second reading in the House of Commons, after a long and excited debate, by a vote of 368 to 250, showing a majority in favor of the passage of 118; and in the House of Lords by a majority of 33 in a house of 300 members. The amendments adopted by the House of Lords were nearly all rejected by the Commons, and on July 26 it received the royal assent. The bill, which contains sixty clauses, is entitled "A bill to put an end to the establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect to the royal College of Maynooth." The disestablishment was to be total, but was not to take place until Jan. 1, 1870, when the ecclesiastical courts were to be abolished, the ecclesiastical laws to cease to have any authority, the bishops to be no longer peers of Parliament, and all ecclesiastical corporations in the country to be dissolved. The disendowment was technically and legally to be total and immediate. Provision was made for winding up the ecclesiastical commission, and the constitution of a new commission, composed of ten members, in which the whole property of the Irish Church was to be vested from the day the measure received the royal assent. A distinction was made between public endowments (valued at £15,500,000), including everything in the nature of

a state grant or revenue, which were to be resumed by the state, and private endowments (valued at £500,000), which were defined as money contributed from private sources since 1660, which were to be restored to the disestablished Church. Provision was made for compensation to vested interests, including those connected with Maynooth College and the Presbyterians who were in receipt of the *regium donum*. Among these interests, the largest in the aggregate were those of incumbents, to each of whom was secured during his life, provided he continued to discharge the duties of his benefice, the amount to which he was entitled, deducting the amount he might have paid for curates, or the interest might, under certain circumstances, be commuted, upon his application for a life annuity. Other personal interests provided for were those of curates, permanent and temporary, and lay compensations, including claims of parish clerks and sextons. The amount of the Maynooth grant and the *regium donum* was to be valued at fourteen years' purchase, and a capital sum equal to it handed over to the respective representatives of the Presbyterians and of the Roman Catholics. The aggregate of the payments would amount to about £8,000,000, leaving about £7,500,000, placing an annual income of about £30,000,000 at the disposal of Parliament. This was to be appropriated "mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, but in such a way as not to interfere with the obligation imposed upon property by the poor laws." A constitution for the disestablished Church was adopted by a General Convention, held in Dublin in 1870. The Church will be governed by a General Synod, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Delegates. The House of Bishops has the right of veto, and their veto prevails also at the next synod; but seven bishops must agree upon a veto to make it valid. The bishops will be elected by the Diocesan Convention, but the House of Bishops will in all cases be the court of selection when the Diocesan Synod does not elect by a majority of two thirds of each order a clergyman to fill the vacant see, The primate (archbishop of Armagh) shall be elected by the Bench of Bishops out of their own number. The property of the Church is to be vested in a "Representative Church Body," which is to be permanent. It is to be composed of three classes: the *ex officio*, or archbishops and bishops; the elected members, who are to consist of one clerical and two lay representatives for each diocese; and the co-opted members, who are to consist of persons equal in number to such dioceses, and to be elected by the *ex-officio* and representative members. The elected members are to retire in the proportion of one third by rotation. The Convention also

adopted a resolution against the introduction of the ritualistic practices which have crept into the Established Church of England.

The following table shows the population connected with the Anglican Church, according to the official census of 1881, in each of the counties, together with the number of Roman Catholics, and the population of other religious denominations in each:

Counties	Total	Roman Catholics	Protestant Episcopal -ians	Presbyterians	Metho-dists	All Other Deno-minations
Leinster	1,279,190	1,095,459	157,622	12,633	6,712	6,764
Munster	1,513,558	1,244,876	68,352	3,794	4,421	2,467
Ulster	1,739,542	831,784	377,936	466,107	34,494	29,221
Connaught	817,197	779,769	31,760	2,969	2,042	657
Total	5,159,839	3,951,888	635,670	485,503	47,669	39,109

The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is governed by four archbishops, whose sees are in Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and twenty-four bishops; they are all nominated by the pope, generally out of a list of three names submitted to him by the parish priests and chapter of the vacant diocese, and reported on by the archbishops and bishops of the province. In case of expected incapacity from age or infirmity, the bishop names a coadjutor, who is usually confirmed by the pope, with the right of succession. In many of the dioceses a chapter and cathedral corps have been revived, the dean being appointed by the cardinal protector at Rome. The diocesan dignitaries are the vicars-general, of whom there are one, two, or three, according to the extent of the diocese, who have special disciplinary and other powers; vicars-forane, whose functions are more restricted; the archdeacon, and the parish priests or incumbents. All of these, as well as the curates, are appointed by the bishop. The whole of the clergy are supported solely by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. The episcopal emoluments arise from the mensal parish or two, the incumbency of which is retained by the bishop, from marriage licenses, and from the *cathedraticum*, an annual sum, varying from £2 to £10, paid by each incumbent in the diocese. The 2425 civil parishes in Ireland are amalgamated into 1073 ecclesiastical parishes or unions, being 445 livings less than in the Anglican Church. The incomes of the parish priests arise

from fees on marriages, baptisms, and deaths, on Easter and Christmas dues, and from incidental voluntary contributions either in money or labor. The number of priests in Ireland in 1853 was 2291 (of whom 1222 were educated at Maynooth College); in 1889 it was 3353. The curates of the parish priests form more than a half of the whole clerical strength; and scattered through the cities and towns are 70 or 80 communities of priests of various religious orders or rules, hence called *Regulars*, who minister in their own churches, and, though without parochial jurisdiction, greatly aid the secular clergy. All the places of public worship are built by subscriptions, legacies, and collections. There are numerous monasteries and convents; the latter are supported partly by sums, usually from £300 to £500, paid by those who take the vows in them, and partly by the fees for the education of the daughters of respectable Roman Catholics. Various communities of monks and nuns also devote themselves to the gratuitous education of the children of the poor. Candidates for the priesthood, formerly under the necessity of obtaining their education in continental colleges, are now educated at home. The principal clerical college is that of Maynooth, which was founded in 1795 as Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth. The Irish Parliament made to it an annual grant of £14,000; the English Parliament sanctioned the grant, but reduced it to £8927, out of which the professors and 480 students were supported. The Irish lord Dunboyne founded 20 more scholarships. In 1845, the government, under the administration of Sir Robert Peel, raised the annual grant to £26,000; more recently this sum was again raised to £38,000. In 1869, when the Anglican Church was disestablished, a capital sum equal to the amount of the Maynooth grant, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic University at Dublin was established at a synodal meeting of the Catholic bishops held on May 18, 1854. At a conference held in 1863 the bishops resolved to enlarge the university, and to erect a new building at the cost of £100,000. There are, besides, the Catholic colleges of St. Patrick, Carlow; St. Jarlath, Tuam; St. John's, Waterford; St. Peter's, Wexford; St. Colman's, Fermoy; St. Patrick's, Armagh; St. Patrick's, Thurles; St. Kvrnan's, Kilkenny; St. Mel, Longford; All Hallows (devoted exclusively to prepare priests for foreign missions), and Clonliffe, Dublin, all supported by voluntary contributions.

There are also for the education of Irish priests two colleges in Rome, the Irish College and the College of St. Isidor, and one in Paris. The number of

religious communities of men has decreased during the last hundred years. The Dominicans, at the time of Benedict XIV, had 29 houses, in 1890 only 13 houses, with about 50 monks'; the Augustinies had formerly 28, now 11 convents; the Carmelites have 19 houses, formerly 167; the Jesuits 5 colleges, 1 home and 70 members; the Lazarists, Passionists, and Redemptorists 2 houses each; the brothers of the Christian Schools have a large number of institutions.

The following is a statistical summary of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in 1889:

### Picture for Ireland

The first *Presbytery* in Ireland was formed at Carrickfergus in 1642, and gave rise to the *Synod of Ulster*. The *Presbyterian Synod of Munster* was formed about 1660. The *Presbytery of Antrim* separated from the Synod of Ulster in 1727, and the *Remonstrant Synod* in 1829. A number of seceders formed themselves into the *Secession Synod of Ireland* about 1780. In 1840, the General and Secession Synods, having united, assumed the name of the *General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, comprising, in 1888, 600 congregations, arranged under 37 presbyteries. The ministers were supported by voluntary contributions, the rents of seats and pews, and the interest of the *regium dosnum*, or royal gift. This was first granted in 1672 by Charles II, and in 1869 26 (first class) ministers received from the state £92 6s. 2nd. each, and 551 (second class) £69 4s. 8d. each per annum. As the ministers in the first class died, their successors only received the latter amount. The *regiums donum*. as annual grant, was abolished by the Irish Church Bill, but a capital sum equal to the amount of the *donum*, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Presbyterian body. The total sum for *regium donum* voted by Parliament for the year ending March 31, 1869, was £40,547. The minutes of the General Assembly for 1869 state that in the year ending March 31 there were 628 ministers (besides 51 licentiates and ordained ministers without charge), 560 congregations, and 262 manses. The seat rents produced £38,011; the stipends paid to ministers, £37,853; raised for building or repairing churches, manses, and schools, £17,830; Sabbath collections, £13,575; mission collections, £12,124; other charitable collections, £6,835. The Congregational Debt was £37,167.

The Presbyterians have the General Assembly's College at Belfast, and Magee College at Londonderry. The latter was opened Oct. 10, 1865. In

the year 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the late Rev. William Magee, Presbyterian minister of Lurgan, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near the city of Londonderry. The citizens of Derry subscribed upwards of £5000 towards the erection of the building, which cost about £10,000. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college.

*Remonstrant Synod of Ulster.* — This synod was formed in May, 1830, in consequence of the separation of seventeen ministers, with their congregations, from the General Synod of Ulster, on the ground that, contrary to its usages and code of discipline, it required from its members in 1827 and 1828 submission to certain doctrinal tests and overtures of human invention. There are 4 presbyteries and 27 congregations in this synod.

*The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland,* consisting of 4 presbyteries and 25 congregations, is unconnected with the *General Assembly*. It did not participate in the *regium donum*.

*United Presbytery or Synod of Munster.* — This body was formed in 1809 by the junction of the Southern Presbytery of Dublin with the Presbytery of Munster, and is one of the three non-subscribing Presbyterian bodies of Ireland, the other two being the *Presbytery of Antrim* (now consisting of 11 congregations) and the *Remonstrant Synod of Ulster*. A few years ago these three bodies united to form the “General Non-subscribing Presbyterian Association of Ireland,” for the promotion of their common principles, the right of private judgment, and non-subscription to creeds and confessions of faith. The General Association meets triennially for these objects, while the three bodies of which it is composed retain their respective names and independent existence, being governed by their own rules and regulations.

The *Irish Conference* of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Great Britain numbered in 1869 19,659 *members*, 627 members on trial, and 174 ministers. The president of the British Conference is also president of the Irish Conference. The Primitive Methodist Society (also called Church Methodists) numbered in 1869 8763 members in Ireland. They regard



themselves as belonging to the Anglican Church. According to the census of 1881, the total *Methodist population* of Ireland amounted to 47,669. There were also, according to the same census, 4532 Independents, 4327 Baptists, 3695 Friends, 18,798 belonging to other sects, and 453 Jews.

The commissioners of public instruction and the census commissioners return the numbers in the principal religious denominations, and their percentage of the general population have been as follows:

Profession	1861		1881		Decrease between 1861 and 1881	Increase between 1861 and 1881
	Number	Percent	Number	%	Number	Number
Irish Church	693,357	11.9	635,670	12.3	57,687	
Roman Catholics	4,505,265	77.7	3,951,888	76.6	553,379	
Presbyterians	523,291	9.0	485,503	9.4	37,788	
Methodists	45,399	0.8	47,669	0.9		2270
Other Denomina-tions	31,655	0.6	38,656	0.8		7001
Jews	393		453			60
Total	5,798,967	100.0	5,159,839	100.	648,852	9331

The census commissioners of 1861, in their report on religion and education (p. 5). remark that “the Wesleyan Methodists, by a peculiarity of their constitution, although frequenting places of worship distinct from those of the Established Church, very generally declined to be reckoned as dissenters, and were therefore included (by the commissioners of public instruction of 1834) among the members of the Established Church.”

Between the years 1834 and 1861 the Roman Catholic population showed a decline of 1,930,975 persons-the difference between 6,436,060 in 1834 and 4,505,265 in 1861-or nearly a third of what was their entire number in 1834; and, distributing this loss over the original dioceses (as given in the list of Anglican dioceses), as in the case of the Established Church, we find that it has to be divided among thirty out of the thirty-two, the only exceptions being the dioceses of Dublin and Connor, in both of which the number of Roman Catholics is something in excess of what it was in 1834. The total Roman Catholic population of the thirty dioceses in which it is found to have declined was 5,949,509 in 1834, and 4,005,104 in 1861,

showing a loss of 1,944,405, or nearly a third of the former population. In 1834 the number of Presbyterians in Ireland was returned as 643,058, and in 1861 it had fallen to 523,291, exhibiting a reduction of 119,767, or rather less than a fifth of their number in 1834. This reduction distributes itself over ten of the thirty-two (original Anglican) dioceses those, namely, of Achonry, Armagh, Clogher, Connor, Derry, Down, Dromore, Kilfenora, Kilmore, and Raphoe, the total Presbyterian population of which amounted in 1834 to 637,784, and in 1861 to 505,196, showing a reduction of 132,588, or 20.8 per cent of the original numbers. In twenty-two dioceses the Presbyterians have very considerably increased, their gross population having been only 5274 in 1834, and 18,095 in 1861, showing an increase of 243.1 per cent. The proportion per cent of the members of the Established Church to the general population had risen since 1834 in twenty-one out of the thirty-two dioceses, had remained stationary in two, and fallen in nine.

In 1831 the grants of public money for the education of the poor were entrusted to the charge of the lord lieutenant, to be expended on the instruction of the children of every religious denomination, under the superintendence of commissioners appointed by the crown, and named "The Commissioners of National Education." The principles on which the commissioners act are, that the schools shall be open alike to Christians of every denomination; that no pupil shall be required to attend at any religious exercise, or to receive any religious instruction which his parents or guardians do not approve, and that sufficient opportunity shall be afforded to the pupils of each religious persuasion to receive separately, at appointed times, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians think proper. In 1845 the commissioners were incorporated under the name of "The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland," with power to hold lands to the yearly value of £40,000, to purchase goods and chattels, to receive gifts and bequests to that amount, to erect and maintain schools where and as many as they shall think proper, to grant leases for three lives or thirty-one years, to sue and to be sued by their corporate name in all courts, and to have a common seal, a power being vested in the lord lieutenant to fill up vacancies, to appoint additional members, provided the total number does not exceed twenty, and to remove members at his pleasure.

The following return gives the number of schools and pupils at different periods, and the amount of parliamentary grants annually voted for their maintenance:

Year	School	Pupils	Parliam. Grants	Year	Schools	Pupils	Parliam. Grants
1840	1978	23,560	L50,000	1860	5632	804,000	L270,722
1845	3426	432844	75,000	1865	6372	922,084	325,583
1850	4321	480623	120,000	1868	6586	967,563	360,195
1855	5124	535905	215,200	1880	7590	1,083,020	727,366

The religious denomination of the children who, on Dec. 31, 1888, were on the rolls of the national schools, was as follows:

	Irish Church	Roman Catholic	Presbyterians	Other Denom.	Total
Ulster	76,684	185,462	113,028	8,647	383,821
Munster	7,481	279,774	595	583	288,433
Leinster	12,576	204,786	1,397	553	219,312
Connaught	5,477	185,035	609	333	191,454
Ireland	102,218	855,057	115,629	10,116	1,083,020
Percent	9.4	79.0	10.7	0.9	

See Herzog, *Allgen. Real-Encyklop.* 7, 63; Wiggers, *Kirchliche Geogr. u. Statistik*; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. 2u. Statistik*, 2, 1 sq.; Thom, *Irish Almanac*; Porter, *Comp. Annal. eccl. Hib.* (Rom. 1690); Warseus, *Hibernial Sacra.* (Duibl. 117); Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dubl. 1829).

### Ireland, Council of

(*Concilium Hibernicum*), a title of four different councils. The first of these was held about 456. By this council were published thirty-four canons under St. Patrick's name, and two other bishops, Auxililus and Jeserinus (or Iserinus). From the 6th of these canons it is evident that the priests, deacons and other clergy (to whom they are addressed) were married (comp. Wilkins, *Conc.* 1, 2). Another council was held about the same time, or shortly after, also said to have been presided over by St. Patrick; but for this assertion no evidence exists, and there is not only no possibility of determining the presiding officer, but even the place and date where and when it convened are very doubtful, except that the mention of a *heathen* population in Canon 2 makes it certain that it cannot have been much later than the council above alluded to. By this council, which, for

convenience sake, we may call the 2nd, 32 canons were published, the 7th of which forbids “to re-baptize any who have received the outward form, by whomsoever administered, since the iniquity of the sower infects not the seed itself.” A third council was held in 684, according to Mansi, who adds that the canons of this and other councils held about this time form together the code known as the “Irish Code” (part of it is given in the *Spicilegium* of D’Achery, 1, 491). Another council was held about 1097, but its enactments are of but little importance. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 267 sq.; Labbe, 10:613; Wilkins, *Concil.* 1,4, 374. (J. H.W.)

### Ireland, John, D.D.

an eminent English divine, was born at Ashburton, Devonshire, in 1761. He matriculated at Oxford as Bible clerk of Oriel College in 1780, and afterwards became successively vicar of Croydon, Surrey, in 1793, prebendary of Westminster in 1802, dean of Westminster and rector of Islip in 1816. He died in 1842. He was one of the earlier writers for the *Quarterly Review*, and founded four scholarships, an exhibition, and a professorship at Oxford. His principal works are, *Five Discourses*, with notes (Lond. 1796, 8vo): — *Vindicie regice*; or, a defence of the kingly office (Lond. 2nd ed. 1797, 8vo): — *Nitice sacrae*; or, an inquiry into the scriptural doctrine of marriage and divorce (Lond. 1821, 8vo): — *Pagaism and Christianity compared* (Lond. 1809, 8vo):—*The Plaque of Marseilles in the year 1720* (Lond. 1834, 4to). — Darling, *Cyclop. Bib.* (. 5., Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 933.

### Irenaeus

(*Elprilvaio*), one of the most distinguished of the early Church fathers, standing, with his disciple Hippolytus, “both of Greek education, but both belonging, in their ecclesiastical relations and labors, to the West,” at the head of the old Catholic controversialists, and called by Theodoret; “the Light of the Western Church,” was bishop of Lyons, in France, during the latter half of the 2nd century.

**1. Life.** — Of the personal history of Irenaeus, especially in his youth, but little is known. The dates of his birth are very variably given by different critics. Thus Dodwell places it about A.D. 97, Grabe about 108, Tillemont about 120, Du Pin about 140. Most of the latest students of the Church fathers incline to put it between the years 120 and 140. The place of his birth, also, is not definitely known. It is probable, however, from his very

early acquaintance with Polycarp, the illustrious bishop of Smyrna, of which he himself tells us (3, 3, 4; comp. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* p. 191, Bohn's edition), that he was born somewhere in Asia Minor; and some have assigned the city of Smyrna as his native place. Harvey, one of the editors of his works, however, thinks that Irenaeus was born in Syria, and that he came to Smyrna while yet very young; was there attracted by the teaching of bishop Polycarp, and became at once one of his most ardent disciples. "Through this link he still was connected with the Johannean age. The spirit of his preceptor passed over to him." Addressing a former friend of his own, Florinus, who had lapsed to Valentinianism, whom he earnestly endeavored to bring back to the Church, he bears witness to this connection in the following words: "These opinions, Florinus, that I may speak in mild terms, are not part of sound doctrine; these opinions are not consonant with the Church, and involve their votaries in the utmost impiety; these opinions even the heretics beyond the Church's pale have never ventured to broach; these opinions those presbyters who preceded us, and who were conversant with the apostles, ) did not hand down to thee. For, while I was yet a boy, I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, distinguishing thyself in the royal court, and endeavoring to gain his approbation. For I have a more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time than of recent events (inasmuch as the experiences of childhood, keeping pace with the growth of the soul, become incorporated with it), so that I can even describe the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and discourse his going out and his coming in, his general mode of life and personal appearance, together with the discourses which he delivered to the people; also how he would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; and how he would call their words to remembrance... What I heard from him, that wrote I not on paper, but in my heart, and, by the grace of God, I constantly bring it fresh to my mind." It is not known at what time Irenaeus removed to Gaul, but it is supposed by some that he accompanied Photinus (whom he afterwards succeeded as bishop) on his mission to Gaul to establish churches at Lyons and Vienne. So much is certain, that he was a presbyter at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius, according to Eusebius (*ut sup.* p. 171; compare p. 157), and was sent by his people to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome (A.D. 176-192), as a mediator in the Montanistic disputes. While yet on this mission Photinus suffered martyrdom, and Irenaeus was elected as his successor (about A.D. 177). He at once returned and zealously devoted himself, by tongue and pen, for the upbuilding of the Christian Church, so greatly

suffering at this time in Further Gaul from the persecutions of the heathen government. He is supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under Septimius Severus, A.D. 202; but the ‘silence of Tertullian and Eusebius, and most of the early Church fathers, makes this point very doubtful. “Ireneus was the leading representative of the Asiatic Johannaan school in the second half of the 2nd century, the champion of catholic orthodoxy against Gnostic heresy, and the mediator between the Eastern and Western churches. He united a learned Greek education and philosophical penetration with practical wisdom and moderation, and a just sense of the simple essentials in Christianity. We plainly trace in him the influence of the spirit of John. The true way to God,’ says he, in opposition to the false Gnosis, ‘is love. It is better to be willing to know nothing but Jesus Christ the crucified, than to fall into ungodliness through our curious questions and paltry subtleties.’ He was an enemy of all error and schism, and, on the whole, the most orthodox of the ante-Nicene fathers, except in eschatology. Here, with Papias and most of his contemporaries, he maintained the millenarian views which were subsequently abandoned by the Catholic Church” (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 488, 489). Ireneus’s death is commemorated in the Roman Church, June 28.

**II.** *Writings of Irenaeus.* — His writings, which are very extended, covering, — in their translation into English, so far as now known, between six and seven hundred pages of the “Ante-Nicene Library” of the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, are perhaps the most valuable relic of early Christian antiquity. But ‘their preciousness bears no proportion to their bulk.’ “Indeed,” says a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (Jan. 1869, p. 2), “it would be possible to compress into a very few pages all the statements of fact that can be deemed really valuable to us at the present day.” Yet the same writer adds (p. 4) that the work of Irenaeus is to us “invaluable for the light it sheds on the views which prevailed in the primitive Church respecting many most important points.” Especially valuable, and the most important of all the writings of Irenaeus, is his work *Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδονύμου γνώσεως*, generally published under the Latin title *De Refutatione et Eversione Falsce Scientie* (“A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called”), and more commonly even under the shorter title of *Adversus Icpreses* (“Against Heresies”). This work, which was mainly directed against the Gnostic error of that day, was composed during the pontificate of Eleutherus, and “is at once the polemic theological masterpiece of the ante

Nicene age, and the richest mine of information respecting the Gnostics, particularly the Valentinian heresy, and the Church doctrine of that age” (Schaff). The work is divided into five books. The first of these contains a minute description of the tenets of the various heretical sects, with occasional brief remarks in illustration of their absurdity, and in confirmation of the truth to which they were opposed. In his second book, Irenaeus proceeds to a more complete demolition of those heresies which he has ‘already explained, and argues at great length against them, on grounds principally of reason. The three remaining books set forth more directly the true doctrines of relation, as-being in utter antagonism with the views held by the Gnostic teachers. “In the course of this argument many passages of Scripture are quoted and commented on; many interesting statements are made, bearing on the rule of faith; and much important light is shed on the doctrines held, as well as the practices observed by the Church of the 2nd century.” As an introduction to the study which he describes, and with which he manifestly had taken great pains to make himself familiar, and as an expose and refutation of them, for which the great learning of the writer, acknowledged by nearly all his critics, fortunately coupled with a firm grasp of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, especially fitted him, this work is truly invaluable. And though it must be admitted that on some points Irenaeus has put forth very strange opinions, it cannot be denied that, upon the whole, his *Adversus Iphaereses* “contains a vast amount of sound and valuable exposition of Scripture in opposition to the fanciful systems of interpretation which prevailed in his day.” The *Adversus Ilicereses* was written in Greek, but it is unfortunately now no longer extant in the original. The English translator of it for Clark’s (Edinburgh) edition says that “it has come down to us only in an ancient Latin version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius.” The text, both of the Latin and of the Greek, as far as extant, is often most uncertain, and this has made it a difficult task for translation into English. In all only three MSS. of it are known to exist at present; but there is reason to believe that Erasmus, who printed the first edition of it (1526), had others at hand in his preparation of the work for the press. The Latin version, spoken of above as the only complete version of it, was, according to Dodwell (*Dissertt. Iren.* 5, 9,10), prepared in the 4th century; but it is known that Tertullian in his day, used the same version, and it is highly probable, therefore, that it was made even as early as the beginning of the 3rd century. It is certainly to be deplored that the

other codices which Erasmus must have used have not come down to us, or that they are, at least, not known to us, for they might, perhaps, enable us to determine more definitely his meaning in many passages now quite obscure to us in their barbaric Latin. From 1526, when Erasmus printed his first edition, to 1571, several editions were produced. But all these had depended on the ancient barbarous Latin versions, and were moreover defective towards the end by five entire chapters. These latter were first supplied in print by Prof. Fuardentins, of Paris, in an edition of 1575, which was reprinted in six successive editions Gallasius, a minister of Geneva, also had in 1570 supplied the Latin with the first portions of the Greek text from Epiphanius. In 1702, Grabe, a Prussian, resident in England, published an edition at Oxford, which contained considerable additions to the Greek text, besides some fragments. But the first really valuable edition was that by the Benedictine Massuet (Paris, 1712; Venice, 1724, 2 vols. fol.), since (1857) added to the Migne edition of the fathers, of which, very unfortunately, all the stereotype plates have lately been destroyed by fire. Another edition, containing the additions which have been made to the Greek text from the recently discovered *Philosophoumisena* of Hippolytus, and thirty-two fragments of a Syriac version of the Greek text of Irenaeus, culled from the Nitrian collection of Syriac MSS in the British Museum, all of which in several instances rectify the readings of the barbarous Latin version, was prepared by Wigan Harkey, at Cambridge, in 1837, under the title *So Irencei Episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus Haereses*, and may be considered the best now extant. It is also enriched with an introduction of great length, which supplies much valuable information on the sources and phenomena of Gnosticism, and the life and writings of Irenaeus. It furthermore contains notes, which display great research and erudition, and are especially deserving of notice on account of the hypothesis which the writer seeks to establish, that Irenaeus understood Syriac, and that the version of the Scriptures used by him was in the Syriac. An attempt has also been made by H. W. J. Thiersch (in the *Studien is. Krifiken*, 1845) to translate the Latin version of the first four chapters of the third book back into the original, in order to lead to a better understanding of Irenaeus's meaning. Objections to the genuineness of this work of Irenaeus were of course made by the so-called "liberal" German theologians, as it is one of the "historic links associating the Christianity of the present day with that of our Lord's apostles and disciples," and a work on which "we depend for satisfactory evidence respecting the-canon of the New Testament" (see



below, under “Doctrines of Irenaeus, Froude’s attack against Irenaeus as a witness for the Gospels). They were made first by Semler, but were “so thoroughly refuted,” says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1, 489, foot-note), “by Chr. G. F. Walch (*De Asuthentia librolrum Irenaei*, 1774), that Mohler and Stieren might have spared themselves the trouble.?”

Besides *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus also wrote, according to Eusebius, “several letters against those who at Rome corrupted the doctrine of the Church: one to Blastus, concerning schism; another to Florinuis (already alluded to), concerning the monarchy, or to prove that God is not the author of evil; and concerning the number eight;” but these are all lost to us with the exception of a few fragments. Eusebius also mentions “a discourse of Irenaeus against the Gentiles, entitled *περὶ ἐπιστήμης* (*Concerning Knowledge*); another inscribed to a brother named Marcianus, being a demonstration of the apostolical preaching; and a little book of sundry disputations;” but these, also, are mainly lost to us. Pfaff, in 1715, discovered at Turin four more Greek fragments, which he attributed to Irenaeus as their author. The genuineness of these has been called in question by some Roman divines, “though,” says Dr Schaff, “without sufficient reason.” These four fragments treat

(1) of true knowledge (*Γνωσις ἀληθινή*) “which consists, not in the true solution of subtle questions, but in divine wisdom and the imitation of Christ;”

(2) on the Eucharist;

(3) on the duty of toleration in subordinate points of difference with reference to the Easter difficulties;

(4) on the object of the incarnation, “which is stated to be the purging away of sin, and the final annihilation of all evil.” An edition containing the Prolegomena to the earlier editions, and also the disputations of Maffei and Pfaff on the fragments- of Irenaeus just mentioned, was published by H. Stieren under the title *S. Ireneei Episcopi Lugdun. quae super sunt omnia* (Lips. 1853, 2 vols.).

**II. Doctrines.** — We have already said that the writings of Irenaeus are invaluable to us as an index of the views which the primitive Church of Christ held on many very important points that have become matters of controversy between the different branches of the Christian Church up to

our own day. In this, of course, we shall be mainly dependent upon his extensive work against Heretics, or the Gnostics; and though some of his views, especially on the millennium, may not have our approval, we must none the less commend the whole work for the fervent piety which constantly impresses us in the perusal of it.

**1. God and Creation.** — The doctrine of the unity of God as the eternal, almighty, omnipresent, just, and holy creator and upholder of all things, which the Christian Church inherited from Judaism, was one which the early Christian writers were especially called upon to vindicate against the absurd polytheism of the pagans, and particularly against the dualism of the Gnostics. Accordingly we find most of the creeds of the first centuries, especially the Apostles' and the Nicene, begin with the confession of faith in God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of the visible and the invisible. In like manner, “with the defense of this fundamental doctrine laid down in the very first chapters of the Bible, Irenaeus opens his refutation of the Gnostic heresies, saying, in the language of Justin Martyr, that he would not have believed the Lord himself if he had announced any other God than the Creator. He repudiates everything like an *a priori* construction of the idea of God, and bases his knowledge wholly on revelation and Christian experience.” So also on the doctrine of creation, Irenaeus, and with him Tertullian, “most firmly rejected the hylozoic and demiurgic views of paganism and Gnosticism, and taught, according to the book of Genesis (comp. ~~1980~~ Psalm 33:9; 148:5; ~~4003~~ John 1:3), that God made the world, including matter, not, of course, out of any material, but out of nothing, or, to express it positively, out of his free, almighty will by his word. This free will of God, a will of *love*, is the supreme, absolutely unconditioned and all-conditioning cause and final reason of all existence, precluding every idea of physical force or of emanation. Every creature, since it proceeds from the good and holy God, is in itself, as to its essence, good (comp. ~~0003~~ Genesis 1:31). Evil, therefore, is not an original and substantial entity, but a corruption of nature, and hence can be destroyed by the power of redemption. Without a correct doctrine of creation there can be no true doctrine of redemption, as all the Gnostic systems show.”

**2. Person of Christ.** — On the relation which Christ sustained to the Father also, the views of Irenaeus are important, because he is, after Polycarp, “the most faithful representative of the Johannean school.” He certainly ‘keeps more within the limits of the simple Biblical statements,’ and in the simpler way of the Western fathers, among whom he may-be counted,

notwithstanding his early Greek training. “He ventures no such bold speculations as the Alexandrians, but is more sound, and much nearer the Nicene standard. He likewise uses the terms **λόγος** and Son of God interchangeably, and concedes the distinction, made also by the Valentinians, between the inward and the uttered word, in reference to man, but contests the application of it to God, who is above all antitheses, absolutely simple and unchangeable, and in whom before and after, thinking and speaking, coincide. He repudiates also every speculative or a *priori* attempt to explain the derivation of the Son from the Father; this he holds to be an incomprehensible mystery. He is content to define the actual distinction between Father and Son by saying that the former is God revealing himself; the latter, God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other is the actual, appearing revelation itself. Hence he calls the Father the invisible of the Son, and the Son the visible of the Father. He discriminates most rigidly the conceptions of generation and of creation. The Son, though begotten of the Father, is still, like him, distinguished from the created world, as increate, without beginning, and eternal—all plainly showing that Irenaeus is much nearer the Nicene dogma of the substantial identity of the Son with the Father than Justin and the Alexandrians. If, as he does in several passages, he still subordinates the Son to the Father, he is certainly inconsistent, and that for want of an accurate distinction between the eternal Logos and the actual Christ. The **λόγος ἄσαρκος** and the **λόγος ἔνσαρκος**, expressions like ‘My Father is greater than I,’ which apply only to the Christ of history, he refers also, like Justin and Origen, to the eternal Word. On the other hand, he has been charged with leaning in the opposite direction towards the Sabellian and Patripassian views, but unjustly, as Duncker, in his monograph *Die Christologie des heilig. Irenaeus* (p. 50 sq.), has unanswerably shown. Apart from his frequent want of precision, he steers in general, with sure Biblical and churchly tact, equally clear of both extremes, and asserts alike the essential unity and the eternal personal distinction of the Father and the Son. The incarnation of the Logos he ably discusses, viewing it both as a restoration and redemption from sin and death, and as the completion of the revelation of God and of the creation of man. In the latter view, as finisher, Christ is the perfect Son of man, in whom the likeness of man to God, the *similitudo Dei*, regarded as moral duty, in distinction from the *imago Dei*, as an essential property, becomes for the first time fully real. According to this, the incarnation would be grounded in the original plan of God for the education of mankind, and independent of the fall; it would

have taken place even without the fall, though in some other form. Yet Irenaeus does not expressly say this; speculation on abstract possibilities was foreign to his realistic cast of mind” (Dr. Schaff, 1, § 77, 78).

We now pass to a consideration of Irenaeus’s views on the doctrine of Christ’s *humanity*. Here, again, his first task is to refute Gnostic Docetists. “Christ,” he contends against them, “must be a man, like us, if he would redeem us from corruption and make us perfect. As sin and death came into the world by a man, so they could be blotted out legitimately and to our advantage only by a man; though, of course, not by one who should be a mere descendant of Adam, and thus himself stand in need of redemption, but by a second Adam, supernaturally begotten, a new progenitor of our race, as divine as he is human. A new birth unto life must take the place of the old birth unto death. As the completer, also, Christ must enter into fellowship with us, to be our teacher and pattern. He made himself equal with man, that man, by his likeness to the Son, might become precious in the Father’s sight.” Irenaeus (to quote Dr. Schaff still further) “conceived the humanity of Christ not as mere corporeality, though he often contends for this alone against the Gnostics, but as true humanity, embracing body, soul, and spirit. He places Christ in the same relation to the regenerate race which Adam bears to the natural, and regards him as the absolute universal man, the prototype and summing up of the whole race. Connected with this is his beautiful thought, found also in Hippolytus in the tenth book of the *Philosophoumena*, that Christ made the circuit of all the stages of human life, to redeem and sanctify all. To apply this to advanced age, he singularly extended the life of Jesus to fifty years, and endeavored to prove his view from the gospels against the Valentinians. The full communion of Christ with men involved his participation in all their evils and sufferings, his death, and his descent into the abode of the dead.” Also on the doctrine of the mutual relation of the divine and the human in Christ, which was neither specially discussed nor brought to a final, definite settlement until the Christological controversies of the 5th century, Irenaeus, in a number of passages, throws out hints which deserve consideration from their importance. “He teaches unequivocally a true and indissoluble union of divinity and humanity in Christ, and “repels the Gnostic idea of a mere external and transient connection of the divine Σωτήρ with the human Jesus. The foundation for that union he perceives in the creation of the world by the Logos, and in man’s original likeness to God and destination for permanent fellowship with him. In the act of union, that is, in the

supernatural generation and birth, the divine is the active principle, and the seat of personality; the human, the passive or receptive; as, in general, man is absolutely dependent on God, and is the vessel to receive the revelations of his wisdom and love. The medium and bond of the union is the Holy Ghost (see below), who took the place of the masculine agent in the generation, and overshadowed the virgin womb of Mary with the power of the Highest. In this connection he calls Mary the counterpart of Eve, the ‘mother of all living’ in a higher sense, who, by her believing obedience, became the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race, as Eve, by her disobedience, induced the apostasy and death of mankind—a fruitful parallel, which was afterwards frequently pushed too far, and turned, no doubt, contrary to its original sense, to favor the idolatrous worship of the blessed Virgin. Irenaeus seems, at least according to Dorner (*Christology*, 1, 495), to conceive the incarnation as progressive, the two factors reaching absolute communion (but neither absorbing the other) in the ascension; though before this, at every stage of life, Christ was a perfect man, presenting the model of every age” (Schaff, 1, § 79).

**3. *The Holy Ghost.*** — On the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Irenaeus, more nearly than the Greek Church fathers, especially the Alexandrians, represents the dogma of the perfect, substantial identity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; “though his repeated figurative (but for this reason not so definite) designation of the Son ‘and Spirit as the hands’ of the Father, by which he made all things, implies a certain subordination (see Irenaeus’s views given below under “Trinity”). He differs from most of the fathers in referring the Wisdom of the book of Proverbs not to the Logos, but to the Spirit, and hence he must have regarded him as eternal. Yet he was far from conceiving the Spirit as a mere power or attribute; he considered him an independent personality, like the Logos. ‘With God,’ says he (*Adv. Hares.* 4, 20, § 1), ‘are ever the Word and the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, through whom and in whom he freely made all things, to whom he said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.”’ But he speaks more of the operations than of the nature of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit predicted in the prophets the coming of Christ; has been near to man in all divine ordinances; communicates the knowledge of the Father and the Son; gives believers the consciousness of sonship; is fellowship with Christ, the pledge of imperishable life, and the ladder on which we ascend to God” (Schaff, 80).

4. *The Trinity.* — On the doctrine of the Trinity, the language of Irenaeus is perhaps plainer and more incontrovertible than that of any other of the early Church fathers, and yet both Arians and Socinians have sometimes presumed to claim him as a supporter of their peculiar theories. But we have his own expressions making both Christ and the Holy Spirit parts of the supreme divinity. Nay, Christ is often expressly declared to be God. Thus, in a passage in which Irenaeus is commenting on the prophecy respecting the birth of Emmanuel he says: “Carefully, then, has the Holy Ghost pointed out, by what has been said, his birth from a virgin, and his essence, *that he is God*, for the name Emmanuel indicates this” (3:21, 4); and again, in allusion to the Father: “*With him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, he made all things; to whom, also, he spoke, saying, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness.’*” Indeed, Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1, 286) seems hardly justified in his statement that “of a supra-mundane trinity of essence Irenaeus betrays but faint indications.” He continually quotes from Genesis, with the object of showing that both Christ and the Holy Spirit existed with the Father anterior to all creation (“*ante omnem constitutionem*”). With a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (1869, p. 12), we are inclined to believe that the word “hands” is used by Irenaeus to indicate that they are both *co-workers of the Father* rather than his subordinate workman (compare Ebrard, *Kirchen und Dogmengesch.* 1, 110 and 111, note 8). “In all things and through all things there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one Spirit, and one salvation to all that believe in him.” Another very beautiful passage “reveals the doctrine of the Trinity as being, in fact, wrapped up in the official title by which the Savior is designated.” Says he: “In the name of *Christ* (3, 18, 3) is implied he that anoints, he that is anointed, and the unction itself with which he is anointed. And it is the Father who anoints, but the Son who is anointed by the Spirit, who *is* the unction, as the word declares by Isaiah, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me,” thus pointing out the anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the Unction which is the Spirit” certainly “a rich and pregnant thought, which will bear much consideration. It is very striking and satisfactory to find the doctrine of the three divine persons thus developed out of the very name which the Savior bears. Nor does there seem anything fanciful in the reasoning; for, as we cannot think of an anointed one without necessarily thinking also of one who anoints, and of the unction with which he is anointed, we are thus led to conceive, by a simple remembrance of our

Lord's official designation, of the Father, the anointer, the Son, the anointed, and the Spirit, the living unction who came down, in infinite fullness, from the Father on the Son—the three-one God, being by means of a single word thus brought before us as the God of our salvation" (*Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* 1869, p. 13). With all these direct testimonies staring us in the face, it is certainly ridiculous to see the efforts on the part of some Rationalistic theologians to assert that Irenaeus was not strictly Trinitarian in his views on this subject. But more than this: it was this self-same Irenaeus who *opposed* the Philonic doctrine of the Xyog, which other Church fathers, especially of the Alexandrian school, seemed so ready to accept, as Theophilus of Antiochia, and even Tertullian (comp. Ebrard, *Kirchen- ut. Dognmengesch.* 1, 116).

**5. Redemption.** — Of all the Church fathers, Irenaeus was the first who gave a careful analysis of the work of redemption, "and his view," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1, 297), "is by far the deepest and soundest we find in the first three centuries. Christ, he teaches, as the second Adam, repeated in himself the entire life of man, from birth to death and hades, from childhood to manhood, and, as it were, summed up that life and brought it under one head (this is the sense of his frequent expression, **Ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις**, recapitulare, recapitulatio), with the double purpose of restoring humanity from its fall and carrying it to perfection. Redemption comprises the taking away of sin by the perfect obedience of Christ, the destruction of death by victory over the devil, and the communication of a new divine life to man. To accomplish this work, the Redeemer must unite in himself the divine and human natures; for only as God could he do what man could not, and only as man could he do, in a legitimate way, what man should. By the voluntary disobedience of Adam the devil gained a power over man, but in an unfair way, by fraud (*dissuasio*). By the voluntary obedience of Christ that power was wrested from him by lawful means (by *suadela*, persuasion, announcement of truth, not overreaching or deception). This took place first in the temptation, in which Christ renewed or recapitulated the struggle of Adam with Satan, but defeated the seducer, and thereby liberated man from his thralldom. But then the whole life of Christ was a continued victorious conflict with Satan, and a constant obedience to God. This obedience was completed in the suffering and death on the tree of the cross, and thus blotted out the disobedience which the first Adam had committed on the tree of knowledge. It is, however, only the negative side. To this is added the



communication of a new divine principle of life, and the perfecting of the idea of humanity first effected by Christ." *SEE REDEMPTION; SEE ORIGEN.*

**6. The Sacraments.** — On this subject, perhaps more than upon on other on which Irenaeus has written, we meet with a vagueness of expression which hardly enables us definitely to determine what he actually believed. But even "Romanists tacitly admit that he says nothing of confirmation, ordination, marriage, or extreme unction favorable to the sacramental character which they assign to these rites. And this is a very strong negative testimony against the correctness of their opinions. If such an early writer as Irenaeus, in the course of a lengthened theological work, which naturally led him to the ordinances as well as doctrines of the Church, has not a word to say in regard to the above so-called sacraments, the inference is pretty clear that they were not recognized as such in his day... Massuet makes a very lame attempt to prove from the writings of Irenaeus that the sacrament of *penance* was practiced in the Church of his day. There can be no doubt that the passages to which he refers (1, 6, 3; 13, 5) prove that public confession of flagrant sins was common in the Church of the 2nd century. This was called *exomologesis*, and seems to have been indispensable for the removal of the censures of the Church. But there is nothing to indicate its sacramental character, and not a shadow of support can be derived from it for the popish practice of auricular confession" (*Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 18). *SEE CONFESSION.*

*Of Infant Baptism* the first clear trace is found in the writings of our author, who thus writes of the sacrament of baptism (2, 22, 4): "Christ came to save all who are regenerated by him, infants and little children, and boys, and youths, and elders." He thus applies it to all ages, Christ having passed through all the stages of life for this purpose. Neander says of this passage (*Hist. Christian Dogmas*, 1, 230): "If by the phrase *renasci in Denum* (in the Latin transl.) baptism is intended, it contains a proof of infant baptism. *Inifntes* and *parvuli* are distinguished; the latter possess a developed consciousness, hence to them Christ is a pattern of piety, while to the *infantes* he merely gives an objective sanctification: we must therefore understand the latter to mean quite little children." But the statement of Irenaeus leads us to infer that he believed in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which is strengthened by another passage (3, 17, 1): "And again giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God,



he said to them, ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’” (Compare an article on this subject in the *American Presbyterian Review*, April, 1867, p. 239 sq.; Schaff, *Church History*, 1, 402.)

On the *Lord’s Supper*, also, the indefinite statements of Irenseus have given rise to much dispute. Romanists stoutly affirm that he declares in favor of their doctrine of transubstantiation, and the real presence; but this arises from a variable reading of one passage, of which Neander says (p. 238), “According to one reading it is said, *Verbuem quod offertur Deo*, which must mean the Logos which is presented to God; therefore, the sacrifice would refer to the presentation of Christ himself. Yet we can hardly make up our minds to accept this as the opinion of Irenaeus, who always says that Christians must consecrate all to God in Christ’s name; for example, *Ecclesia offert per Jesum Christum*. We cannot doubt that the other reading is the correct one, *Verbum per quod effertur Deo*.” Dr. Schaff also declines to give the Romanists a hearing on this point, and argues further, that Irenaeus “in another place (4:18 *and passim*) calls the bread and wine, after consecration, ‘antitypes,’ implying the continued distinction of their substance from the body and blood of Christ. This expression in itself, indeed, might be understood as merely contrasting here the Supper, as the substance, with the Old-Testament Passover, its type; as Peter calls baptism the antitype of the saving water of the flood (~~1~~ 1 Peter 3:20, 21). But the connection, and the *usus loquendi* of the earlier Greek fathers, require us to take the term antitype in the sense of type, or, more precisely, as the antithesis of archetype. The bread and wine represent and exhibit the body and blood of Christ as the archetype, and correspond to them as a copy to the original. In exactly the same sense it is said in ~~3024~~ Hebrews 9:24 (comp. 8:5), that the earthly sanctuary is the antitype, that is, the copy of the heavenly” (1, 387). We think Irenseus speaks more definitely of this ordinance in one of the Fragments (38, Massuet), from which it clearly follows that he by no means believed in the *opus operatum* of the Romanists. (Comp. *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, Jan. 1869, p. 19, 20.)

**7. The Church.** — By the peculiar attitude in which Irenaeus placed himself when combating the Gnostic heresies, he became unconsciously one of the most elaborate writers on the early Church that now remains to us, and the utterances of no other of the early Church fathers have so frequently been misinterpreted to prop up the claims of Romanism as those of Irenaeus. It

is beyond question that the Romanists, as well as High Church prelatists, however hesitatingly-, misconstrued the statements of Irenaeus in defense of the Church of Christ against Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion, and other schismatics, who in his time threatened the very life of the early Christian Church, as statements favoring the doctrine of *apostolic succession* (q.v.). Irenaeus, evidently in defense of his Church, and as an opponent of the heretics, presents a “*historical chain of bishops.*” Says he (3, 3, 1), “We are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successors of these bishops to our own times.” But, in naming the bishops in their historical order, he “never dreams of ascribing to them any sort of spiritual influence or authority which was propagated from one to another. To show that he could link historically Eleutherius, who was then head of the Church of Rome, with the apostles, who were supposed to have founded that Church, was the sole and simple object contemplated by our author in reference to the succession.” In his arguments with the Valentinians, Marcionites, and others, he endeavors to prove, by constant appeals to the Scriptures, that their doctrines were not in harmony with the inspired writings. “Had he found ‘the truth’ among them, he would have had no occasion to treat of the *succession* at all, but would at once have owned them as forming a part of the Catholic Church,” which he defined, not as Romanists and High-Churchmen, to be only where the pope’s supremacy is acknowledged, or the Episcopal Church doctrines are adhered to, but, he says, “*Ubi ecclesia*”—pitting the Church first, in the genuine catholic spirit (3, 24) — “*ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia,*” or, as Dr. Schaff says, Protestantism would put it conversely: “Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God and all grace.”

**8. *The Millennium.*** — The peculiar millennial views of Irenaeus, which stamp him, by his close adherence to Papias, as a Chiliast, we hardly care to touch; they are certainly the weak spot in our author, and deserve to be passed not only without comment, but even unnoticed. They are brought out specially near the end of his great work (<sup>4162</sup>Matthew 5:32-36), declaring a future reign of the saints on earth; arguing that such promises of Scripture as those in <sup>4134</sup>Genesis 13:14; <sup>4167</sup>Matthew 26:27-29, etc., can have no other interpretation.

**9. *The Easter Controversy.*** — The personal character of Irenaeus, of which we have as yet said but little, in perhaps best illustrated by his conduct ‘in

the Easter controversy (q.v.). Determined to work for a union of all Christians (4, 33, 7), he displayed an irenic disposition in all disputes about unessential outward things, and more especially in his mediation between Victor, then bishop of Rome, and the Asiatic churches.

**10. *Testimony to the Scriptures.*** — The influence which Irenaeus exerted at this time, and in other controversies that preceded, adds additional interest to the writings of this Church father, and makes especially valuable any testimony that he may have left us on the authenticity of the sacred writings. A leading representative of the Asiatic Johannian school of the second half of the 2nd century, born ere the apostle John had departed this life, and consequently called by Eusebius “a disciple of the apostles,” and by Jerome “the ‘disciple of John the apostle,’” he bears us such direct testimony in behalf of the Gospels, or, as Eusebius terms them, the “Homologoumena,” that it becomes to us of the very highest importance among the external proofs of their genuineness, more especially at the present moment, in face of the denials of this truth by Rationalists, and by those “who take up themes which lie outside of their chosen studies, or with which they are not profoundly conversant,” among them figuring no less a personage than the distinguished English historian Froude (*Short Essays on Great Subjects*). Now what does Irenaeus say of the Gospels? “We have not received,” he says, “the knowledge of the way of our salvation by any others than those by whom the Gospel has been brought to us; which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of the faith.” Here follows a declaration that the first Gospel was written among the Jews by Matthew; the second by Mark, a companion of Peter; the third by Luke, a companion of Paul; and the fourth by John, of whom he says, “Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he likewise published a gospel while he dwelt in Ephesus, in Asia.” “Let us assume now that Irenaeus—between whom and the apostles there is only one intervening link—was an honest man and an intelligent man; in short, that he is a competent witness. At the time when he knew Polycarp, were the four Gospels extant and acknowledged authorities in the Church? We will here confine the question to the Gospel of John (q.v.), which is now so much a topic of controversy. Was or was not this gospel received as the production of him whose name it bears by Polycarp and his contemporaries at the time to which Irenaeus, in his graphic reminiscence, refers? If it was thus received—received in the

neighborhood of Ephesus, in the very region where John had lived to so advanced an age, and where his followers and acquaintances survived—it will be very difficult to disprove its genuineness. But if it was not thus received, when, we ask, can it be supposed to have first seen the light? Who contrived a book of which Polycarp had known nothing, and palmed it off on him and on the whole circle of Johannean disciples and churches in Asia? How is it that Irenaeus knows nothing of the late discovery or promulgation of so valuable a book? Why does he not mention the momentous fact—if, indeed, it be a fact that after his interviews with Polycarp there was found somewhere, or put forth by somebody, this priceless treasure? It is obvious that Irenaeus would have had something to say of the extraordinary concealment and final appearance of this Gospel history had he remembered a time or known of a time since John's death when this Gospel had not been a familiar and prized possession of the Church. This testimony of Irenaeus is a tough piece of evidence. Here we have specific declarations as to what he had himself seen and heard. Yet the — attempt is made to disparage the value of this testimony on the ground of the following passage, which stands in connection with his statements about the composition of the several gospels: 'Nor can there be more or fewer gospels than these. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four catholic spirits, and the Church is spread all over the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the Church, and the spirit of life, in like manner was it fit it should have four pillars, breathing on all sides incorruption and refreshing mankind. Whence it is manifest that the Word, the former of all things, who sits upon the cherubim and upholds all things, having appeared to men, has given us a Gospel of a fourfold character, but joined in one spirit.' (Here follows a brief characterization of the several gospels in their relation to one another.) That this is a fanciful (if one will, a puerile) observation there is no reason to deny; but how it can in the least invalidate the credibility of the author's testimony on a matter of fact within his cognizance, it is impossible to see. If these analogies had exerted any influence in determining Irenaeus's acceptance of the four gospels of the canon, the case would be different. But Froude admits that such was not the fact. He accepts the Gospels on account of the historical proof of their genuineness, as he repeatedly affirms, and independently of these supposed analogies. It is the established and exclusive authority of the four gospels that sends him after these fancied analogies and accounts for the suggestion of them. The suggestion of them, therefore, strengthens instead of weakens the evidence

in behalf of the canonical evangelists, because it shows how firm and long-settled must have been the recognition of them in the Church. It is even a hasty inference from such a passage that the author was intellectually weak. If this inference is to be drawn from such an observation, the ablest of the fathers, as Augustine, must be equally condemned. Men who are not deficient in ability may say sometimes rather foolish things.... On the whole, Irenaeus is distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his understanding. (See Schaff in the first part of our article.) He is rather averse to speculation, being of a practical turn. There is hardly one of the early ecclesiastical writers who, in all the qualities that made up a trustworthy witness, is to be set before him. There is no reason to doubt that, in his statements concerning the origin and authority of the Gospels, he represents the Christians of his time. It is not the sentiment of an individual merely, but the state of things, the general judgment of the Church, which he brings before us. No good reason can be given for this general, exclusive recognition of the Gospels now included in our canon, no even plausible solution of the fact can be rendered, unless it be granted that they were really handed down from the days of the apostles, and were thus known to embody the testimony of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the events which they record. Had Polycarp known nothing of John's Gospel or, knowing of it, had he rejected it-it is impossible that Irenaeus and his contemporaries should have been ignorant of the fact. It is proved by the most convincing array of circumstantial evidence that Polycarp, a personal acquaintance of John the Apostle, an honored bishop in the neighborhood where John had labored and died, considered the fourth gospel to be his composition" (Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale College, in the *Independent*, Feb. 4, 1869; comp. the reply to Dr. Davidson *Introd. to the N.T.* Lond. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo], in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 4-8). In a similar strain argues Mr. Westcott (*History of the New Test. Canon*): "In the same Church where Irenaeus was a presbyter — 'zealous for the covenant of Christ' — Photinus was bishop, already ninety years old. Like Polycarp, he was associated with the generation of St. John, and must have been born before the books of the N.T. were all written. And how, then, can it be supposed with reason that forgeries came into use in his time, which he must have been able to detect by his own knowledge that they were received without suspicion or reserve in the church over which he presided? It is possible to weaken the connection of facts by arbitrary hypotheses; but, interpreted according to their natural meaning, they tell of a Church united by its head with the times of St. John, to which

the books of the N.T. furnished the unaffected language of hope, and resignation, and triumph. And the testimony of Irenaeus is the testimony of the Church." But not only to the authenticity of the Gospels does Irenaeus bear his testimony. He also furnishes conclusive evidence in support of other N.T. books which have been questioned (see *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1869, p. 7 sq.).

**11. Canon of Scripture.** — Not a little surprising, but agreeably so, it must be to the Christian of the present day to find that in the days of Irenaeus, even when the canon of Scripture could not be expected to have been so accurately defined as it afterwards was, we find, with the exception of the spurious additions to Daniel, found in the Septuagint, and the books of Baruch, quoted under the name of Jeremiah, no writings of the O.T., acknowledged as forming part of the O.T. canon, which Protestants do not include in it at the present day. So likewise of the N.T., the only book not now accepted, but to which Irenaeus credited canonical authority, is the "Shepherd of Hermas." Altogether, "with the most inconsiderable exceptions .... the canon of both the O. and N.T., then accepted by the Church, was coincident and conterminous with our own." But more than this, by the language which Irenaeus uses, we find the Church of his day harmonizing with and justifying that very highest claim that has ever been advanced in support of the inspired authority and infallible accuracy of the canonical writings. The utterance which Irenaeus has made on this subject Romanists have sought to turn to account in their assertions of the authority of tradition as co-ordinate with that of Scripture. But though, as was natural in such an early writer, Irenaeus often refers to the apostolic traditions preserved in the churches, he never ascribes to these an authority independent of Scripture.

**12. Literature.** — *Heaven, Life of Irenaeus* (Lond. 1841); Schaff, *Irenaeus*, in *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, vol. 5 (Mercersb. 1852); Gervaise, *La Vie de S. Irenee* (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 8vo); 'Stieren, art. "Irenaeus," in Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklop.* vol. 2, sec. 22; Massuet, *Dissertationes in Irenaei libros*, prefixed to his edition of the *Opera*; Deyling, *Irenceus, evangelice veritatis confessor ac testis* (Lips. 1721), against Massuet; Ceillier, *Hist. geogr. des Auteurs sacres et Eccles.* 1, 495 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7, 75 sq.; Bohringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biographien*, vol. 1; Mohler, *Patrologie*, vol. 2; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philos.* 1, 345 sq.; Duncker, *Des heil. Iren. Christol. 1. Zusamenhang 2. d. theol. und anthropol. Grundlehren dargestellt* (1843, 8vo); Graul, *D.*

*christlich Kirche a. d. Schwelle d. Iren. Zeitalters* (Lpz. 1860), a very valuable little work of 168 pages, in which “the position of Irenaeus is sketched with a bold and firm hand;” Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3, 192 sq.; Schaff, *Church History*, vol. 1 (see Index); Neander, *Church History*, vol. 1 (see Index); Shedd, *History of Doctrines* (see Index); Harrison, *Whose are the Fathers-?* (see Index); Augusti, *Dogmengesch.* vol. 1 and 2; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.* (see Index); *Bullet. Theolog.* 1869, Oct. 25, p. 319; *Rev. de deux Mondes*, 1865, February 15, art. 8; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1853, p. 226; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 7:46 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Irenaeus, St.

a Tuscan martyr, flourished in the second half of the 3rd century. But very little is known of the history of his life. He suffered martyrdom during the persecutions under the emperor Aurelius (275), and is commemorated in the Roman Church July 3. Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclus.* vol. 4; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:948.

### Irenaeus, St

another martyr, was bishop of Sirmium (now Sirmish, a Hungarian village), his native country, at the beginning of the 4th century. Many inducements were offered him by the then governor of the country, Probus, who, no doubt, acted under instructions from the emperors Diocletian and Maximus, to renounce Christianity, but, all proving futile, he was at last beheaded, after having been subjected to various tortures. Though but little is known of this Irenaeus’s personal history, it is evident, from the efforts of the governor to secure his adhesion to the heathen practices, that he was a man of great influence. The date of his death is not accurately known. Some think it to be March 25, the day on which his death is commemorated by Romanists; others put it April 6, A.D. 304. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Bioq. Généralé*. 25:948; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. sacr.* 3:27; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 3:651 sq.; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschland*, v, 715 sq.

### Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre

flourished in the first half of the 5th century, He was originally a count of the empire, and first took part in ecclesiastical affairs at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he represented the emperor Theodosius as

assistant to Candidius; to settle the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, and their respective followers. Both he and Candidius favored Nestorius, and, failing to prevent his condemnation at the council, did their utmost, on their return to court, to counteract on the emperor's mind the influence and decision of the Cyrillians against Nestorius. For a time they succeeded well, as their representations "bore on their very face the impress of truth." But the Cyrillian party predominating, and John, the secretary of Cyril, appearing himself at court to counteract the efforts of Irenaeus and Candidius, the feeble sovereign was soon turned in favor of the Cyrillian party, and Irenaeus himself was banished from the court about A.D. 435. He at once betook himself to his friends, the Oriental bishops, and by them was raised to the bishopric of Tyre in 444. The emperor now issued an edict condemning the Nestorians. and, in addition, it was ordered that Irenaeus should be deposed from the bishopric, and deprived of his clerical character. In 448 the sentence was finally executed. 'After his retirement Irenaeus wrote a history of the Nestorian struggle; under the title of *Tragdia seu Comsenitarii de rebus in Synodo Ephesina ac in Oricite gestis*. The original, which was written in' Greek, is lost, and only parts of it remain to us in a Latin translation published by Christian Lupus, under the inaccurate title of *Variorum Patrum Epistole ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentis* (Lotv. 1682). See Mansi, *Sacr. Concil. Nov. Collect.* 5, 417, 731; Tillemont, *lam. Eccles.* 14; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* sub. ann. 444; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* <sup><0239></sup>*Genesis* 25:949; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 468 sq.

## Irenaeus

a pseudonym for the celebrated Church historian *SEE JOHANN KARL LUDWIG GIESELER* (q.v.).

## Irenaeus, Christoph

one of the most zealous defendants of the doctrine of the Flacians, was born at Schweidnitz, near the middle of the 16th century. First a deacon at Aschersleben, he was afterwards called to Eisleben as regular pastor, and finally appointed court preacher at Weimar. Accused of favoring the views of Flacius, a consistent though much persecuted follower of Luther, he was, with other prominent preachers guilty of the same failing, dismissed from his position in 1572. He now removed to Austria; where he published in 1581 a pamphlet against the first article of the *Concordien formel*, under



the title of *Christoph Irenaei Examen d. ersten Artikels u. d. Iirbel-Geistes i. d. neuen Concordienbuch von der Erbsiinde*. The date of his death is not known to us. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 781. *SEE FLACIUS*.

### Irenasus, Falkovski

a learned Russian priest, was born May 28, 1762. He acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Latin, French, and German, then went to Hungary to study philosophy, history, and mathematics. He was married, but his great merits caused him to be appointed bishop, although, according to the general rules of the Greek Church, marriage is a bar to a candidate for this office. He died April 29, 1823. Irenaeus wrote *Chronologie ecclesiastique* (Moscow, 1797): — *Christiance, orthodoxe dogmatico-polemicae Theologic Compendium* (Moscow, 1802, 2 vols. 8vo), and commentaries on Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians (Kief, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo). See Gagarin, *De la Theol. dans Eglise Russe* (Par. 1857), p. 53. (J. N. P.)

### Irenaeus, Klementievski

a very able Russian theologian, was born at Klementief (Vladimir district) in 1753. Of his early history but little is known to us. He enjoyed the reputation of a great savant, and held the bishopric of Tvar, and, later, the archbishopric of Pskof, and died at St. Petersburg April 24, 1818. Of course he belonged to the monastic order of the Russo Greek Church, for, as is well known, the higher ecclesiastical offices of Russia are accessible only to monastic orders (compare Eckardt, *Modern Russia*). Archbishop Irenaeus wrote *Commentaries on the Twelve minor Prophets: — St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and to the Hebrews: —* and also published some of his sermons, delivered before the royal household at St. Petersburg (1794). He likewise translated into Russian the writings of several of the Church fathers, and cardinal Bellarmine's *Commentary on the Psalms* (Moscow, 1807, 2 vols. 4to); and two other works on ascetism by Bellarmine. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 949.

### Irene

(Εἰρηνή, *Peace*), empress of Constantinople, and one of the most extraordinary, though corrupt characters of the Byzantine empire, was born in Athens about A.D. 725. An orphan, 17 years of age, without any fortune except her beauty and talents, she excited the admiration of the

then reigning emperor, Leo IV, and in A.D. 769 became his lawful wife. — Her love for power, it is said, caused her to commit the crime of murder, for her husband, who died in 780, is generally believed to have been poisoned by her. During his reign she had acquired not only the love, but also the confidence of the emperor, and in his testament he declared her empress guardian of the Roman world, and of their son Constantine VI,” who was, at the decease of Leo IV, only ten years of age. Educated in the worship of images, she was herself an ardent opponent of the iconoclasts, who held sway during the reign of her husband, and who, even at one time, had caused her banishment from his court on account of her secret worship of images, and her conspiracies with image-worshippers against iconoclasm. “But, as soon as she reigned in her own name and that of her son, Irene most seriously undertook the ruin of the iconoclasts, and the first step of her future persecution was a general edict for liberty of conscience. In the restoration of the monks, a thousand images were exposed to public veneration; a thousand legends were invented of their sufferings and miracles. As opportunities occurred by death or removal, the episcopal seat were judicially filled; the most eager competitors for earthly or celestial favor anticipated and flattered the judgment of their sovereign; and the promotion of her secretary, Tarasius, gave Irene the patriarch of Constantinople, and the command of the Oriental Church.” But the decrees of a general council could only be repeated effectually by a similar assembly, and to this end she convened a council of bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 786. By this time, however, the people and the army had learned to abhor the worship of images in place of the true God, and the council was opposed by a mob, assisted by the troops, and even driven from the capital. This by no means intimidated Irene in her marked course. She had determined on the reintroduction of image-worship and the extirpation of all iconoclasts, and well did her zeal for the restoration of this gross superstition deserve to be rewarded by the Church (Greek) with a saintship (which she still occupies in the Greek calendar). A second council was convened only a year after the first had been broken up, but this time at Nice. “No more than 18 days were allowed for the consummation of this important work; the iconoclasts appeared not as judges, but as criminals or penitents; the scene was decorated by the legates of pope Adrian and the Eastern patriarchs, the decrees were framed by the president Tarasius, and ratified by the acclamations and subscriptions of 350 bishops. They unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the fathers and

councils of the Church; but they hesitate whether that worship be relative or direct; whether the godhead and the figure of Christ be entitled to the same mode of adoration. Of this second Nicene Council the acts are still extant; a curious monument of superstition and ignorance, of falsehood and folly” (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Romans’ Empire*, 5, 37 sq.).

Meanwhile, however, the young emperor was attaining the maturity of manhood; “the maternal yoke became more grievous; and he listened to the favorites of his own age, who shared his pleasures, and were ambitious of sharing his power.” But Irene was by no means ready to concede to her son the power which she preferred to hold in her own hand, and, ever vigilant, she soon penetrated the designs of her son. As a consequence, there arose at court two factions. The young and the vigorous gathered around the heir presumptive, and in 790 he actually succeeded in assuming himself the government of affairs. As Constantine VI he became the lawful emperor of the Romans, and Irene was dismissed to a life of solitude and repose. “But her haughty spirit condescended to the arts of dissimulation: she flattered the bishops and eunuchs, revived the filial tenderness of the prince, regained his confidence, and betrayed his credulity. The character of Constantine was not destitute of sense or spirit; but his education had been studiously neglected; and the ambitious mother now exposed to the public censure the vices which she herself had nourished, and the actions which she herself had secretly advised.”

Meanwhile a powerful conspiracy was also concocted against Constantine, and only reached his ears when he knew it to be impossible for him to successfully resist. In haste he fled from the capital. But his own guards even had been bought in the interests of Irene, and the emperor was seized by them on the Asiatic shore, and transported back to Constantinople to the porphyry apartment of the palace where he had first seen the light. “In the mind of Irene ambition had stifled every sentiment of humanity and nature;” and it was decreed, in a bloody council which she had assembled, that Constantine must by some means be forever rendered incapable of assuming the government himself. While asleep in his bed, the hirelings of Irene entered the room of the prince and stabbed their daggers with violence and precipitation into his eyes, depriving him not only of his eyesight, but rendering his life even critical. As if this crime were in itself not sufficiently great, the youth was even deprived of his liberty when it was found that he had survived the fatal stroke, and confined in a dungeon, where he was left to pine away. Thus the unnatural mother, guilty of a crime unparalleled in the history of crimes, secured for herself the reins of government. But still Irene was not

free from anxieties. Though the punishment which her crime deserved did not immediately follow the bloody deed, it yet came surely. Her two favorites, Stauracius and AETius, whom she had raised, enriched, and entrusted with the first dignities of the empire, were constantly embroiled with each other, and their jealousies only ceased with the death of the former, A.D. 800. In order to secure her possession of the throne, she sought a marriage with Charlemagne; but the Frank emperor had evidently no relish for a woman who had committed so many crimes, and the scheme proved abortive. Two years later, her treasurer, Nicephorus, rebelled against her, and, suddenly seizing her person, banished her to the isle of Lesbos, where she was forced to spin for a livelihood. Here she died of grief, AD. 803. *SEE ICONOCLASM.* (J. H. W.)

### Irenical Theology

is a term (from εἰρήνη, *peace*) used to designate the art or science of conciliating any differences which arise in religion and in the Church from one-sided theories or misapprehension. Making peace implies a previous warfare, hence irenic theology is closely allied to polemics (q.v.), which, in its true character, should be but a struggle for peace. For the σύνδεσμος τῆς εἰρήνης, or “bond of peace” (<sup>4045</sup>Ephesians 4:3), embraces all Christians, and the ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, or “speaking the truth in love” (<sup>4045</sup>Ephesians 4:15), contains two commandments which cannot be separated. Hence we find in the Christian Church, from her earliest days up to our own times, attempts to secure peace and unity by conciliating all differences and by reuniting those who had separated from each other. Such was particularly the case when schism occurred first between the Latin and the Greek churches, then between the Romish and the Protestant, and, again, between the Lutheran and the Reformed. Irenical attempts accompanied each of these separations, as is evinced by the large number of works known as *Irenicum*, *Unio*, *Concordier*, etc. But the labor of dogmatical peace-makers, or, as some call them, the angels of peace upon earth, is so profoundly, so quietly, and unostentatiously done, that the general mass of professional theologians hardly become aware of it. As a regular science, however, or systematic theory, these efforts at peaceful agreement on the points of difference could only spring from a well defined and developed state of Christian doctrine, and Christian life and its theory. Hence irenic theology is comparatively modern, and its system but little developed as yet. No one can deny that in the N.T., in the works of the apologists, apostles, and fathers, and down through a long

series of ecclesiastical writings, and particularly in those of the mystics and pious ascetics, there are many pacificatory elements which might serve as material for an irenical system. After the Reformation we find such fragments side by side with the most violent polemical works. We might mention in this connection Erasmus (*De amabili ecclesie concordia*), George Wicel, H. Cassander, Fr. Junius, besides Melancthon, Martin Bucer, etc. It was against one of these peace-makers, David Paraeus († 1615) that Leonhard Hutter wrote his *Irenicum vere Christianum* (2nd edit. Rostock, 1619), in which, however, he admits that the attainment of ultimate unity and peace is problematical. Among the most active in the cause of union we find, in the Reformed Church, Hugo Grotius († 1645), and, in the Lutheran, George Calixtus († 1656). The Jesuits, however, managed to interfere in all these attempts, and to render them abortive by proposing sophistical and impossible bases of union. On the other hand, untimely propositions on both sides, dictated either by fear or worldly motives, threw discredit on the cause itself. It was now decried as Babelianism, Samaritanism, neutralism, syncretism, etc. Still there continued to appear persons who believed, in the possibility of union, and labored zealously for it. Among them were John Fabricius of Helmstadt († 1729), a disciple of Calixtus, and the Scotch divine, John Dury, or Dureeus (1630-78), who, knowing the relation between the Protestant confessions, labored with a truly Christian spirit to secure this end. His principal work, *Irenicorum tractatuum Prodromus* (Amstelod. 1662, 8vo), is in itself a sort of irenical theory, as it treats of the manner of removing the obstacles to union, of the grounds sufficient for evangelical unity, of the causes and means of religious reconciliation, and of the true method of accomplishing that result. Similar works, like the *vice ad pacem*, etc., appeared in the Reformed Church, and also, though not so numerous, in the Lutheran. Among the Romanists even, we find some earnest peacemakers, but their efforts met with little success. Among the most prominent was the Spaniard, Christopher Roja de Spinola appointed bishop in Austria in 1668; he made great efforts towards reconciling the churches, and was countenanced by the emperor Leopold and pope Innocent XI, but was afterwards disowned by the latter, and Spener himself was obliged to caution all against holding secret intercourse with him. He gained to his views the Lutheran abbot Molanus, of Loccum, in Hanover, who, in turn, found a zealous and distinguished advocate of unity in Leibnitz. Correspondence was begun with Bossuet on this subject, and Leibnitz wrote a very ingenious *Systema Theologia*, which was only published in

1819, at Paris, and afterwards in German by the Roman Catholic Lorenz Doller (Mayence, 1820), with a preface, in which he asserts that Leibnitz was at heart a Romanist. This brought an answer of G. E. Schulze, *Ueber die Entdeckung das. Leibnitz ein Katholik gewesen* (Getting. 1827). The negotiations in the mean time proved unsuccessful, and matters remained unchanged; but still the irenical tendency was clearly gaining ground. Soon after the impulse towards a living faith given by Spener and his school, there appeared a large number of works for and against the union of the Protestant churches, which finally led, in Prussia, to some practical results. These, however, we shall not dwell upon here, our present object being only to show the development of irenical theology. John Christopher Kocher († 1772) published a *Bibliotheca theologica irenicae* (Jeene, 1764), which, though short, is valuable. He defines irenical theology (§ 3) as being “that part of controversial theology which inquires into the import of such doctrines and religious ceremonies as either whole ecclesiastical bodies or personal members contend about, with a view to preserve the peace and unity of the Church of God, or to restore them to the position which they first held.” The tendency to unity now gradually became transformed into a general toleration; nothing was done towards the actual settlement of the differences, though much preparation was made in that direction by the humanistic tendency, and the spirit of inquiry into all religious systems. (On the literature of the subject in that period, see Winer, *Landbuch der theol. Literaturg.* 1, 356-60.) Among the works which advocated a union of the churches, but rather from a practical than a scientific point of view, are to be mentioned first those of Joseph Planck († 1833) and Marheineke († 1845); then those of J. A. Stark († 1816); Theoduls Gastmahl, the crypto-catholic Protestant court-preacher of Darmstadt (7th edit. 1828, 8vo); the *Christliche Henotikon* of Dr. C. F. Bohme (Halle, 1827); and *Ideen 2. d. innern Zusammenhang v. Glaubenseinigung u. Glaubenseinigung in d. Evangel. Kirche*, by Daniel of Cologne (Leipzig, 1823).

In Germany, Marheineke; who, in imitation of Planck, transformed symbolics into a comparison of the different Christian confessions, greatly advanced the real scientific character of irenical theology, partly as the general union of the churches, partly as that of the different confessions. The same spirit, though joined to much partiality, pervades also the Roman Catholic *Symbolik* of Adam Mohler, and in a more liberal tone Leopold Schmid's *Geist des Katholicismus oder Grundlegung der christlichen*

*Irenik* (1848). On the contrary, such works as Dr. F. A. Staudenmaier's (*t* 1856) *Zum religiösen Frieden d. Zukunft* (1846, 2 vols. 8vo) disfigure Protestantism to such an extent, and are written in so illiberal a tone, that, if such were more abundant, they would kindle again the fiercest strife. Yet the scientific basis of religious and denominational peace has made much progress since Schleiermacher gave a scientific development to polemics and apologetics. This is especially evident in J. Peter Lange's *Christliche Dogmatik*, the third part of which (Heidelberg, 1852) contains a clever sketch of practical dogmatics, or of polemics and irenical theology. According to him, it is the province of irenical theology to bring out of the different religious opinions those which coincide with the Christian dogma, to free them from all errors and excesses, and to bring them into the life and consciousness of the Church, or to submit them to the Christian dogmas (§ 5). It has therefore to search out the hidden efforts of truth in all religious manifestations. All distortions of truth are evidences of the existence of an original truth. Irenical theology is again divided into *elementary*, i.e. an exposition of the struggles of truth and of the means of assisting it; and *concrete*, i.e. an exposition of the organic liberation and development of truth in humanity until the completion of the Church. Sin, however, will always remain an obstacle to absolute peace till it is finally abolished in the kingdom of God. For this we must prepare ourselves by adhering to Meldenius's maxim: "In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas." See Dr. F. J. Liicke, *Ueber d. Alter dieses kirchlichen Friedensspruches* (Gott. 1850). — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 7:60; Ersch u. Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, 2, 23.

### Ir-ha-Heres

in the A. Vers. "THE CITY OF DESTRUCTION" (**srhhiry**[~~ar~~-*he*'res, v.r. *Ir-ha-che*'res, **srj hiry**[~~as~~ Sept. Ἀχερές, Vulg. *Civitas Solis*), the name or appellation of a city in Egypt, mentioned only in <sup>23:18</sup>Isaiah 19:18. The reading **srh**, *Heres*, is that of most MSS., the Syr., Aq., and Theod.; the other reading, **srj**, *Cheres*, is supported by the Sept., but only in form, by Symm., who has πόλις ἡλίου, and the Vulg. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 391, *a*; 522) prefers the latter reading. There are various explanations; we shall first take those that treat it as a proper name, then those that suppose it to be an appellation used by the prophet to denote the future of the city.

1. “*The city of the Sun,*” a translation of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, generally called in the Bible On, the Hebrew form of its civil name AN, *SEE ON*, and once *Beth-shemesh*, “the house of the sun” (<sup>246B3</sup>Jeremiah 43:13), a more literal translation than this supposed one of the sacred name. *SEE BETH-SHEMESH*. This explanation, however, is highly improbable, for we find elsewhere both the sacred and the civil names of Heliopolis, so that a third name, merely a variety of the Hebrew rendering of the sacred name, is very unlikely. The name *Beth-shemesh* is, moreover, a more literal translation in its first word of the Egyptian name than this supposed one. It may be remarked, however, as to the last part of the word, that one of the towns in Palestine called Beth-shemesh, a town of the Levites on the borders of Judah and Dan, was not far from a Mount Heres, *srj Arhi* (<sup>400B5</sup>Judges 1:35), so that the two names, as applied to the sun as an object of worship, might probably be interchangeable. *SEE HERES*.

2. “*The city ‘Heres,*” a transcription in the last part of the word of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, HA-RA, “the abode (liter. “house”) of the sun.” This explanation, however, would necessitate the omission of the article.

3. Jerome supposes *srj* to be equivalent to *ϡrj*, “a potsherd,” and to be a name of the town called by the Greeks *Ostracine*, *Ὀστρακίνη* (“earthen”). Akin with this is the view of others (see Alexander ad loc.), who suppose that reference is made to *Tacpanes*, the brick-kilns of which are mentioned by (<sup>240B</sup>Jeremiah 43:9).

4. “*A city preserved,*” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be preserved. Gesenius, who proposes this construction, if the last half of the word be not part of the name of the place, compares the Arabic *charasa*, “he guarded, kept, preserved,” etc. It may be remarked that the word HERES or HRES, in ancient Egyptian, probably signifies “a guardian.” This rendering of Gesenius is, however, merely conjectural, and has hardly been adopted by any other leading interpreter.

5. The ordinary rendering, “*a city destroyed,*” lit. “a city of destruction;” in the A.V. “the city of destruction,” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be destroyed, according to Isaiah’s idiom. Some maintain that the prophet refers to five great and noted cities of Egypt when he says, “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the



language of Canaan;” but they cannot agree as to what these cities are. Others suppose that by *five* a round number is meant; while others think that some proportional number is referred to—five out of 20,000, or five out of 1000. Calvin interprets the passage as meaning five out of *six-five* professing the true religion, and *one* rejecting it; and that *one* is hence called “City of destruction,” which is not its proper name, but a description indicative of its doom. Egypt and Ethiopia were then either under a joint rule or under an Ethiopian sovereign. We can, therefore, understand the connection of the three subjects comprised in this and the adjoining chapters. Chap. 18 is a prophecy against the Ethiopians, 19 is the Burden of Egypt, and 20, delivered in the year of the capture of Ashdod by Tartan, the general of Sargon, predicts the leading captive of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, probably the garrison of that great stronghold. as a warning to the Israelites who trusted in them for aid. Chap. 18 ends with an indication of the time to which it refers, speaking of the Ethiopians—as we understand the passage—as sending “a present” “to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion” (ver. 7). If this be taken in a proper and not a tropical sense, it would refer to the conversion of Ethiopians by the preaching of the law while the Temple yet stood. That such had been the case before the Gospel was preached is evident from the instance of the eunuch of queen Candace, whom Philip met on his return homeward from worshipping at Jerusalem, and converted to Christianity (~~483~~ Acts 8:26-39). The Burden of Egypt seems to point to the times of the Persian and Greek dominions over that country. The civil war agrees with the troubles of the Dodecarchy, then we read of a time of bitter oppression by “a cruel lord and [or “even”] a fierce king,” probably pointing to the Persian conquests and rule, and specially to Cambyses, or Cambyses and Ochus, and then of the drying of the sea (the Red Sea; compare 11:15), and the river, and canals, of the destruction of the water-plants, and of the misery of the fishers and workers in linen. The princes and counselors are to lose their wisdom and the people to be filled with fear, all which calamities seem to have begun in the desolation of the Persian rule. It is not easy to understand what follows as to the dread of the land of Judah which the Egyptians should feel, immediately preceding the mention of the subject of the article: “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called Ir-ha-heres. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt; for

they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a savior, and a great one, and he shall deliver them” (19:18-20). The partial or entire conversion of Egypt is prophesied in the next two verses (21, 22). The time of the Greek dominion, following the Persian rule, may here be pointed to. There was then a great influx of Jewish settlers, and as we know of a Jewish town, Onion, and a great Jewish population at Alexandria, we may suppose that there were other large settlements. These would “speak the language of Canaan,” at first literally, afterwards in their retaining the religion and customs of their fathers. The altar would well correspond to the temple built by Onias; the pillar, to the synagogue of Alexandria, the latter on the northern and western borders of Egypt. In this case Alexander would be the deliverer. We do not know, however, that at this period there was any recognition of the true God on the part of the Egyptians. If the prophecy is to be understood in a proper sense, we can, however, see no other time to which it applies and must suppose that Ir-haheres was one of the cities partly or wholly inhabited by the Jews in Egypt: of these, Onion was the most important, and to it the rendering, “One shall be called a city of destruction,” would apply, since it was destroyed by Titus, while Alexandria, and perhaps the other cities, yet stand. If the prophecy is to be taken tropically, the best reading and rendering are matters of verbal criticism. *SEE ISAIAH.*

### Ir-ham-Melach

(~~Ir-ham~~Ir-ham-Melach [*city of the salt*, so called prob. from the salt rocks still found in that vicinity; Sept. ἡ πόλις τῶν ἁλῶν, *Vulg. civitas salis*, Auth. Vers. “City of Salt”), a city in the Desert of Judah, mentioned between Nibshan and En-gedi (~~Ir-ham~~Joshua 15:62); probably situated near the south-western part of the Dead Sea. Compare the “Valley of Salt” (~~Ir-ham~~2 Samuel 8:13; ~~Ir-ham~~Psalm 60:2).

### Ir-hat-Temarim

(~~Ir-hat~~Ir-hat-Temarim [*city of the palms*, so called prob. from a palm grove in its neighborhood; Sept. πόλις φοινίκων, or ἡ πόλις τῶν φοινίκων, *Vulg. civitas palmarum*, Auth. Vers. “city of palmtrees”), a place near or identical with JERICHO (~~Ir-hat~~Deuteronomy 34:3; ~~Ir-hat~~Judges 1:16; 3:13; ~~Ir-hat~~2 Chronicles 28:15), which now, however, is utterly destitute of palm-trees.

## I'ri

(Heb. *I-i'*, *yr̄yā'ē* *citizen*; Sept. **Οὐρί**, Vulg. *Urai*), the last-named of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 7:7). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. See IR.

I'RI also appears in the A.Vers. of the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 8:62) as the name (**Οὐρία** v.r. **Οὐρί**, Vulg. *Jorus*) of the father of the priest Marmoth; evidently the URIAH *SEE URIAH* (q.v.) of <sup><1883></sup>Ezra 8:33.

## Iri'jah

(Heb. *Yiriyah'*, *hyr̄yā'jā* *seen by Jehovah*; Sept. **Σαρουίας**, Vulg. *Jerias*), son of Shelemiah, and a captain of the ward at the gate of Benjamin, who arrested the prophet Jeremiah on the pretence that he was deserting to the Chaldaeans (<sup><2673></sup>Jeremiah 37:13, 14). B.C. 589.

## Irish Church

*SEE IRELAND.*

## Irmensaul

a statue of unknown form and significance, which was erected at Eresberge, in Hessen or Westphalia, and worshipped by the ancient Saxons. In 772. Charlemagne, having conquered the country and brought the people under subjection, destroyed it, to discontinue the idolatrous worship. It is said that he found in' the inside a great amount of gold and silver. In the cathedral of Hildesheim they show a column of green marble which is claimed to be the column of Irmensaul. See Grimm, *Irmenstrasse u. Irmensäule* (Vienna, 1815); Von der Hagen, *Isrmin, seine Sdule u. s. Wege* (Bresl. 1817). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 9:66. (J. N. P.)

## Ir-na'hash

[many *Ir'nahash*] (Heb. *Ir-Nachash'*, *vtn;ry[ā]* *serpent city*; Sept. **πόλις Ναᾶς**, Vulg. *urbs Naas*, Auth. Vers. margin, "city of Nahash"), a place founded (rebuilt) by Tehinnah, the son of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah (<sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 4:12). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 116) thinks it the present *Dir-Nachas*, one mile east of Beth-Jibrin; prob. the same marked (perh. inaccurately) *Dar-Hakhas* on Zimmerman's map, a short distance north-east of Beit-Jibrin. Van de Velde likewise identifies it with "*Deir-Nakhaz*,

a village with ancient remains east of Beit-Jibrin” (*Memoir*, p. 322). *SEE NAHASH.*

## Iron

(**I z r B̄i** *barzel*’; Chald. **I z r P̄i** *parzel*’; Gr. **σίδηρος**, Lat. *ferrum*). There is not much room to doubt the identity of the metal denoted by the above terms. Tubal-Cain is *the first-mentioned* smith, “a forger of every instrument of iron” (**Q002**Genesis 4:22). As this metal is rarely found in its native state, but generally in combination with oxygen, the knowledge of the art of forging it, which is attributed to Tubal-Cain, argues an acquaintance with the difficulties that attend the smelting of this metal. Iron melts at a temperature of about 3000° Fahrenheit, and to produce this heat large furnaces supplied by a strong blast of air are necessary. But, however difficult it may be to imagine a knowledge of such appliances at so early a period, it is perfectly certain that the use of iron is of extreme antiquity, and that therefore some means of overcoming the obstacles in question must have been discovered. What the process may have been is left entirely to conjecture; a method is employed by the natives of India, extremely simple and of great antiquity, which, though rude, is very effective, and suggests the possibility of similar knowledge in an early stage of civilization (Ure, *Dict. Arts and Sciences*, s.v. Steel). The smelting furnaces of Aethalia, described by Diodorus (5, 13), remains of which still exist in that country, correspond roughly with the modern bloomeries (Napier, *Metallurgy of the Bible* p. 140). Malleable iron was in common use, but it is doubtful whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. *SEE METAL.*

The mineral wealth of Canaan is indicated by describing it as “a land whose stones are iron” (Deuteronomy 8. 9), a passage from which it would seem that in ancient times it was a plentiful production of that vicinity (compare **Q882**Job 28:2), as it is still in Syria, especially in the region of Lebanon (Volney’s *Tray.* 1, 233). There appear to have been furnaces for smelting at an early period in Egypt (**Q881**Deuteronomy 4:20; comp. Hengstenberg, *Mois. u. Aeq.* p. 19). Winer, indeed (*Realo.* s.v. Eisen), understands that the basalt which predominates in the Hauran (Burckhardt, 2, 637) is the material of which Og’s bedstead (**Q883**Deuteronomy 3:11) was made, as it contains a large percentage of iron. But this is doubtful. Pliny (36, 11), who is quoted as an authority, says, indeed, that basalt is “ferrei coloris atque duritise,” but does not hint that iron was ever extracted from it. The

book of Job contains passages which indicate that iron was a metal well known. Of the manner of procuring it, we learn that “iron is taken from dust” (38, 2). Iron was prepared in abundance by David for the building of the Temple (<sup><1327B></sup>1 Chronicles 22:3), to the amount of one hundred thousand talents (<sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 29:7), or, rather, ‘without weight’ (<sup><1324></sup>1 Chronicles 22:14). Working in iron was considered a calling (<sup><4417></sup>2 Chronicles 2:7). *SEE SMITH*. In Ecclus. 38:28, we have a picture of the interior of an iron-smith’s (<sup><23412></sup>Isaiah 44:12) workshop: the smith, parched with the smoke and heat of the furnace, sitting beside his anvil, and contemplating the unwrought iron, his ears deafened with’ the din of the heavy hammer, his eyes fixed on his model, and never sleeping till he has accomplished his task. The superior hardness and strength of iron above all other substances is alluded to in <sup><2740></sup>Daniel 2:40; its exceeding utility, in Sir. 39:31. It was found among the Midianites (<sup><4612></sup>Numbers 31:22), and was part of the wealth distributed among the tribes at their location in the land (<sup><4628></sup>Joshua 22:8).

The market of Tyre was supplied with bright or polished- iron by the merchants of Dan and Javan (<sup><2679></sup>Ezekiel 27:19). Some, as the Sept. and Vulg., render this “wrought iron” so De Wette “geschmiedetes Eisen.” The Targum has “bars of iron,” which would correspond with the *stricture* of Pliny (34, 41). But Kimchi (*Lex. s.v.*) expounds **t/v**[; ‘*ashoth*, as “pure and polished” (= Span. *acero*, steel), in which he is supported by R. Sol. Parchon, and by Ben-Zeb, who gives “glanzend” as the equivalent (comp. the Homeric *ai’Owa* *ῥail pot*, *Il.* 7, 473). If the Javan alluded to were Greece, and not, as Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2, 21) seems to think, some place in Arabia, there might be reference to the iron mines of Macedonia, spoken of in the decree of AEmilius Paulus (Livy, 45, 29); but Bochart urges, as a very strong argument in support of his theory, that, at the time of Ezekiel’s prophecy, the Tyrians did not depend upon Greece for a supply of cassia and cinnamon, which are associated with iron in the merchandise of Dan and Javan, but that rather the contrary was the case. Pliny (34, 41) awards the palm to the iron of Serica, that of Parthia being next in excellence. The Chalybes of the Pontus were celebrated as workers in iron in very ancient times (AEsch. *Prom.* 733). They were identified by Strabo with the Chaldee of his day (12, 549), and the miles which they worked were in the mountains skirting the seacoast. The produce of their labor is supposed to be alluded to in <sup><24152></sup>Jeremiah 15:12, as being of superior quality. Iron mines are still in existence on the same coast, and the ore is found “in small

nodular masses in a dark yellow clay which overlies a limestone rock” (Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. Chalybes).

From the earliest times we meet with manufactures in iron of the utmost variety (*some* articles of which seem to be anticipations of what are commonly supposed to be modern inventions). Thus iron was used for chisels (<sup><627b></sup>Deuteronomy 27:5), or something of the kind; for axes (<sup><699b></sup>Deuteronomy 19:5; <sup><116b></sup>2 Kings 6:5,6; <sup><208b></sup>Isaiah 10:34; comp. Homer, *II.* 4:485); for harrows and saws (<sup><102b></sup>2 Samuel 12:31; <sup><310b></sup>1 Chronicles 20:3); for nails (<sup><122b></sup>1 Chronicles 22:3), and the fastenings of the Temple; for weapons of war (<sup><970b></sup>1 Samuel 17:7; <sup><832b></sup>Job 20:24), and for war chariots (<sup><677b></sup>Joshua 17:16, 18; <sup><0019></sup>Judges 1:19; 4:3, 13). The latter were plated or studded with it, or perhaps armed with iron scythes at the axles, like the *currus falcati* of the ancient Romans. Its usage in defensive armor is implied in <sup><120b></sup>2 Samuel 23:7 (compare <sup><669b></sup>Revelation 9:9), and as a safeguard in peace it appears in fetters (<sup><49518></sup>Psalms 105:18), prison gates. (<sup><4420></sup>Acts 12:10), and bars of gates or doors (<sup><9476></sup>Psalms 107:16; <sup><262></sup>Isaiah 45:2), as well as for surgical purposes (<sup><5042></sup>1 Timothy 4:2). Sheet-iron was used for cooking utensils (<sup><2448></sup>Ezekiel 4:3; compare <sup><1809></sup>Leviticus 7:9), and bars of hammered iron are mentioned in <sup><8408></sup>Job 40:18 (though here the Sept. perversely renders *σίδηρος χυτός*, “cast-iron”). We have also mention of iron instruments (<sup><6872></sup>Numbers 35:7); barbed irons, used in hunting (<sup><8407></sup>Job 41:7); *an iron bedstead* (<sup><6811></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11); iron weights (shekels) (<sup><9707></sup>1 Samuel 17:7); iron tools (<sup><1107></sup>1 Kings 6:7; <sup><1165></sup>2 Kings 6:5); horns (for symbolical use, <sup><1121></sup>1 Kings 22:11); trees bound with iron (<sup><2745></sup>Daniel 4:15); gods of iron (<sup><2704></sup>Daniel 5:4), etc. It was used by Solomon, according to Josephus, to clamp the large rocks with which he built up the Temple mount (*Ant.* 15:11, 3), and by Hezekiah’s workmen to hew out the conduits of Gihon (Ecclus. 48, 17). Images were fastened in their niches in later times by iron brackets or clamps (Wisd. 13:15). Agricultural implements were early made of the same material. In the treaty made by Porsena was inserted a condition like that imposed on the Hebrews by the Philistines, that no iron should be used except for agricultural purposes (Pliny, 34:39). It does not follow from <sup><8924></sup>Job 19:24, that it was used for a writing implement, though such may have been the case (comp. <sup><2370></sup>Isaiah 17:1), any more than that adamant was employed for the same purpose (Jeremiah 17:1), or that shoes were shod with iron and brass (<sup><6825></sup>Deuteronomy 33:25). Indeed, iron so frequently occurs in poetic figures that it is difficult to discriminate between its literal and metaphorical

sense. In such passages as the following, in which a “yoke of iron” (<sup><4634></sup>Deuteronomy 28:48) denotes hard service; “a rod of iron” (<sup><4919></sup>Psalms 2:9), a stern government; “a pillar of iron” (<sup><2418></sup>Jeremiah 1:18), a strong support; “and *threshing instruments* of iron” (Amos 1:3), the means of cruel oppression: the hardness and heaviness (Ecclus. 22:15) of iron are so clearly the prominent ideas, that, though it may have been used for the instruments in question, such usage is not of necessity indicated. “The furnace of iron” (<sup><4948></sup>Deuteronomy 4:28; <sup><1085></sup>1 Kings 8:51) is a figure which vividly expresses hard bondage, as represented by the severe labor which attended the operation of smelting. Iron is alluded to in the following instances: Under the same figure, chastisement is denoted (<sup><3218></sup>Ezekiel 22:18, 20, 22); reducing the earth to total barrenness by turning it into iron (<sup><4633></sup>Deuteronomy 28:23); strength, by a bar of it (<sup><1818></sup>Job 40:18); affliction, by iron fetters (<sup><9470></sup>Psalms 107:10); prosperity, by giving silver for iron (<sup><2317></sup>Isaiah 60:17); political strength (<sup><2023></sup>Daniel 2:33); obstinacy, by an iron sinew in the neck (<sup><2481></sup>Isaiah 48:1); giving supernatural fortitude to a prophet, making him an iron pillar (<sup><2418></sup>Jeremiah 1:18); destructive power of empires, by iron teeth (<sup><2707></sup>Daniel 7:7); deterioration of character, by becoming iron (<sup><2468></sup>Jeremiah 6:28; <sup><3218></sup>Ezekiel 22:18), which resembles the idea of the iron age; a tiresome burden, by a mass of iron (Ecclus. 22:15); the greatest obstacles, by walls of iron (2 Macc. 11:9); the certainty with which a real enemy will ever show his hatred, by the rust returning upon iron (Ecclus. 12:10). Iron seems used, as by the Hebrew poets, metonymically for the sword (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 10:34), and so the Sept. understands it **μάχαιρα**. The following is selected as a *beautiful comparison* made to iron (<sup><1717></sup>Proverbs 27:17), “Iron (literally) uniteth iron; so a man uniteth the countenance of his friend,” gives stability to his appearance by his presence.

It was for a long time supposed that the Egyptians were ignorant of the use of iron, and that the allusion in the Pentateuch were anachronisms, as no traces of it have been found in their monuments; but in the sepulchers at Thebes butchers are represented as sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their aprons, which, from its blue color, is presumed to be steel. The steel weapons on the tomb of Rameses III are also painted blue; those of bronze being red (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 3, 247). One iron mine only has been discovered in Egypt, which was worked by the ancients. It is at Hammami, between the Nile and the Red Sea; the iron found by Mr. Burton was in the form of specular and red ore (*ibid.* 3:246).



That no articles of iron should have been found is readily accounted for by the fact that it is easily destroyed by exposure to the air and moisture. According to Pliny (34, 43), it was preserved by a coating of white lead, gypsum, and liquid pitch. Bitumen was probably employed for the same purpose (35, 52). The Egyptians obtained their iron almost exclusively from Assyria Proper in the form of bricks or pigs (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 415). Specimens of Assyrian ironwork overlaid with bronze were discovered by Mr. Layard, and are now in the British Museum (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 191). Iron weapons of various kinds were found at Nimrfdid, but fell to pieces on exposure to the air. Some portions of shields and arrow-heads (*ib.* p. 194, 596) were rescued, and are now in England. A pick of the same metal (*ib.* p. 194) was also found, as well as part of a saw (p. 195), and the head of an axe (p. 357), and remains of scale-armor and helmets inlaid with copper (*Nineveh*, 1, 340). It was used by the Etruscans for offensive weapons, as bronze for defensive armor. The Assyrians had daggers and arrow-heads of copper mixed with iron, and hardened with an alloy of tin (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 418). So in the days of Homer war-clubs were shod with iron (*I.* 7, 141); arrows were tipped with it (*II.* 4, 123); it was used for the axles of chariots (*II.* 5, 723), for fetters (*Od.* 1, 204), for axes and bills (*II.* 4, 485; *Od.* 21:3, 81). Adrastus (*II.* 6, 48) and Ulysses (*Od.* 21, 10) reckoned it among their treasures, the iron weapons being kept in a chest in the treasury with the gold and brass (*Od.* 21, 61). In *Od.* 1, 184, Mentis tells Telemachus that he is traveling from Taphos to Tamese to procure brass in exchange for iron, which Eustathius says was not obtained from the mines of the island, but was the produce of piratical excursions (Millin, *Mineral. Hon.* p. 115, 2nd ed.). Pliny (34, 40) mentions iron as used symbolically for a statue of Hercules at Thebes (comp. <sup>2023</sup>Daniel 2:33; 5:4), and goblets of iron as among the offerings in the temple of Mars the Avenger, at Rome. Alyattes the Lydian dedicated to the oracle at Delphi a small goblet of iron, the workmanship of Glaucus of Chios, to whom the discovery of the art of soldering this metal is attributed (Herod. 1, 25). The goblet is described by Pausanias (10, 16). From the fact that such offerings were made to the temples, and that Achilles gave as a prize of contest a rudely-shaped mass of the same metal (Homer, *II.* 23, 826), it has been argued that in early times iron was so little known as to be greatly esteemed for its rarity. That this was not the case in the time of Lycurgus is evident, and Homer attaches to it no epithet which would denote its preciousness (Millin, p. 106). There is reason to suppose that the discovery of brass preceded that of iron (Lucret. 5, 1292), though little weight can be



attached to the line of Hesiod often quoted as decisive on this point (*Op. et Dies*, 150). The Dactyli Idaei of Crete were supposed by the ancients to have the merit of being the first to discover the properties of iron (Pliny, 7:57; Diod. Sic. 5, 64), as the Cyclopes were said to have invented the ironsmith's forge (Pliny, 7:57). According to the Arundelian marble Iron was known B.C. 1370, while Larcher (*Chronologie d'Herod.* p. 570) assigns a still earlier date, B.C. 1537. **SEE STEEL.**

## Iron

(Heb. *Yiron'*, *אֵירוֹן* *place of alarm*; Sept. *Ἰερόν*), one of the "fenced" cities of Naphtali, mentioned between En-hazor and Migdal-el (<sup><0638></sup>Joshua 19:38). De Saulcy (*Narrat.* 2, 382) thinks it may be the *Yaroun* marked in Zimmerman's map north-west of Safed, the *Yaron* observed by Dr. Robinson (new ed. of *Researches*, 3. 61, 62, notes). Van de Velde likewise remarks that *it is* "now *Yarun*, a village of Belad Besharah. On the north-east side of the place are the foundations and other remains of the ancient city" (*Memoir*, p. 322).

## Ironside, Gilbert, D.D.

a bishop in the Church of England during the period of the Restoration. Of his early history but little is known to us. He was the rector of a small church in an obscure little village in Dorsetshire when he was promoted to the see of Bristol immediately after the Restoration. Wood (*Athen. Oxon.* 3:940) says of him that he owed his promotion to a poor bishopric solely to his great wealth. He died in 1671. Bishop Ironside is the author of a work entitled *The Sabbath* (Oxford, 1637, 4to). See Stoughton, *Eccles. History of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 1, 494. *C*

## Iroquois

**SEE INDIANS.**

## Ir'peel

(Hebrew *Yirpeel'*, *אֵרְפֵּאל* *restored by God*; Sept. *Ἰερφαήλ*), a city in the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Rekem and Taralah (<sup><06827></sup>Joshua 18:27). The associated names only afford a conjectural position somewhere in the district west of Jerusalem, possibly at *el-Kustul* (Lat. *castellum*), on

a conical hill about half way between Kuloniyeh (Lat. *colonia*) and Soba (Robinson, *Researches*, 2, 328).

## Irregularity

is a technical term for the want of the necessary canonical qualifications for the acquisition and exercise of an ecclesiastical office. These requisite qualifications are set forth in *canones* or *regule* enacted from time to time by the Church for that purpose. It was based first on the apostolic examples given in ~~5400~~1 Timothy 3:1 sq.; 5:22; ~~5006~~Titus 1:6 sq.; and, after the notion of the Levitical priesthood gained ground among the clergy, on the regulations of the O.T., which were explained in a mythical sense. The qualifications themselves can all be reduced to this, that the party ordained should not be in disrepute for crime, or in a state which would render him unfit for and incapable of ordination. Innocent III (in c. 14, X. *De purgatione canonica* [5, 33] an. 1207) distinguishes “*nota delicti*” and “*nota defectus*” as “*impedienda ad sacros ordines promovendum;*” and subsequent canonists have therefore divided the impediments in a like manner. In early times divers expressions were made use of to designate these impediments, but since Innocent III *irregularitas* has become the technical name of them in canon law (c. 33, X. *De testibus* [2, 20] an. 1203). **SEE INCAPACITY.**

The *Greek Church* in general adhered more to the principles which had been established during the first six centuries (see *Canones Apostolorum, Conc. Neocesar.* an. 314, can. 9 [c. 11, dist. 34]; ‘*Concil. Niccen.* eod. an., *Trullianum*, an. 692, can. 21), whilst the Evangelical Church has so far adopted also later regulations, which were in accordance with its general spirit. The formulas of confession and ecclesiastical discipline still continue, however, to refer expressly to the above-named passages of Scripture.

**I. Irregularity on Account of a Crime.** — The apostle demands that he who is to assume an office over the congregation should be unimpeached. Church discipline has gradually defined the offenses which compose irregularity. Originally it consisted of all offenses that necessitated public penance; after the 9th century, of such as were publicly known (*delictum manifestum, notorium*), and all faults entailing dishonor, in which the “*infamibus portae non pateant dignitatum*” of c. 87, *De regalisjuris*, was practically adhered to (comp. c. 2, *Cod. Just.* “*de dignitatibus,*” 12:1, Constantin.). There are, besides, other offenses named by the law which,

even though secret (*delicta occulta*), constitute irregularity, namely, heresy, apostasy, schism, simony, Anabaptism, subreption of the ordination, promotion without passing through the regular hierarchical degrees, ministrations without consecration, performance of worship whilst under excommunication or interdict, disregard of the rule of celibacy, etc. (see Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplina*, pt. 2, lib. 1, cap. 56-65; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, No. 11; Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopadie*, s.v. Ordination).

Whilst the Greek Church generally adhered to these regulations, the Evangelical Church naturally deviates from them in many particulars, in consequence of the absence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the abolition of the rule of celibacy, etc. That a person who has undergone punishment for crime is incapable of being ordained is self-evident. If a party is in bad repute, the congregation has a right to oppose his appointment, in case the imputations are well founded. This is a law among all Christian denominations.

The Romish Church suppresses the consequences of irregularity on account of crime by means of a dispensation which the bishops are empowered to give when the crime is not public, except in case of premeditated murder (*Concilium Trident.* Sess. 24, cap. 6, “De reform. verb.,” Sess. 14, cap. 7, “De reform.”). In this case the dispensation can come only from the pope himself. So also for public offences, except he delegates special powers to the bishop for that purpose. In the Greek Church, on the contrary, the strict regulations of old are maintained, whereby irregularity for heavy offences cannot be removed (Thomassin, *Vetus et nova eccles. disciplina*, cap. 1x, § 12),

**II. Irregularity caused by Want of Qualification.** Irregularity for offense constitutes also irregularity for want of sufficient qualification, as it entails the loss of good reputation (*defectus fiamae*); to this are, however, added other causes which are considered as defects. Among these are:

**1. Defectus cetatis** (want of the canonical age). — The age appointed for ordination has undergone various changes. According to the present canon law, the primary consecration of the Romish Church can be imparted in the seventh year; it is the tonsure (c. 4, *De temporib. ord.* in 6 [1, 9] Boniface VIII; *Cone. Trid.* Sess. 23, cap. 4, “De reform.”). The age demanded for the other orders is: for subdeacons, the twenty-second; deacons, the twenty-third; presbyters, the twenty-fifth; bishops must be over thirty

(*Conc. Trid.* Sess. 23, cap. 12, “De reform.”). Yet ‘the pope can grant dispensations. In the Greek Church, the old rule demanding that deacons should be twenty years old when ordained, and presbyters thirty; is still retained (*Nov. Justin.* 137, cap. 1; *Cone. Trullianum.*, can. 12). The evangelical churches generally require full majority, or twenty-five years; in some countries ordination is given at twenty-one. Dispensations are also granted under certain circumstances. The Church of England requires candidates to deacons’ orders to be twenty-three, presbyters twenty-four, and bishops thirty.

**2. Defectus natalium** (legitimorum). — Illegitimacy was no obstacle to ordination in the ancient Church (c. 8, dist. 56, Hieronymus). It has been considered so since the 9th century; yet the rule was not very strictly enforced (*Concil. Weldense*, an. 845 [in cap. 17, can. 1, qu. 7]; Regino, *De discipl. eccl.* lib. 1, c. 416 sq.). Especial action was taken concerning the children of ordained priests (*Concil. Pictaviense*, an. 1078 [c. 1, X. “De filiis presbyterorum ordinandisve non,” 1, 17]; *Claramontan.* an. 1095 [comp. c. 14, dist. Ivi, Urban II), etc.’; see especially dist. 56, tit. 10:1, 17; lib. 6:1, 11; *Cone. Trid.* Sess. 25, cap. 15, “De reform.”), and justified their laws by the passage of the O.T., <sup>(1820)</sup>Deuteronomy 23:2 (comp. c. 10, § 6, X. “De renunciati.” 1, 9, Innocent III, an. 1206). This defect, however, can be remedied (a) by recognition (c. 6, X. “Qui filii sint legitimi,” 4:17, Alexander III); (b) by entrance into a convent or foundation of regular canons (c. 11, dist. 56, Urban II; c. 1, 10. “De filiis presbyterorum,” etc.). This regulation, abolished by Sixtus V, was restored by Gregory XVI in 1591, but with this condition, that such persons should be disabled from prelatical honors. (c) By dispensation; which, for *ordines minores*, and for *majores* when the defect is not publicly known, can be granted by the bishop; otherwise, for *ordines majores*, and benefits connected with cure of souls, the dispensation can be granted only by the pope (c. 1, “De filiis presbyterorum,” in 6 [1, 11; comp. c. 20, 25, X. “De electione” [1, 6]). The Greek Church does not recognize this defect (Thomassin, cap. 81, § 4), neither does the evangelical Church, although many jurists consider the canonical principle on which it is based as common law (Wiese, *Kirchenrecht*, pt. 3, sec. 1, p. 160; Eichhorn, *Deutsches Privatrecht*, § 89; *Kirchenrecht*, 1, p. 704).

**3. Delecius corporis.** — In imitation of the Mosaic law (<sup>(18217)</sup>Leviticus 21:17-20 sq.), it was at an early time demanded that the candidates for orders’ should have no bodily blemishes such as might render them unfit

for the duties of their office, or a subject of dislike to the people (*Constif. Apost.* lib. 7, cap. 2, 3; *Canones Apostolorum*, cap. 76, 77). The Church became subsequently very strict on this point, and declared all bodily defects sufficient ground for irregularity (cap. 2, dist. 33; cap. 7, dist. 34; c. I, dist. 36; c. 1, 3, dist. 55, etc.), but finally returned again to the former rules (tit. 10, “De corpor. vitiatis Cordinandis vel non,” 1, 20). Thus ordination is refused to the deaf, dumb, and blind (*Con. Apostol.* 77, c. 6, X. “De clerico aegrotante vel debilitato,” 3:6); also to those who have but one eye, especially if the one wanting is the left (*oculus canonis*), as in reading mass the Missal is placed on the left side (cap. 13, dist. 55), the lame (c. 10, dist. 55; c. 56, dist. 1, “De consecr.”), epileptics (c. 1, 2, can. 7, qu. 2; c. 21, X. “De electione” is 6), lepers (c. 3, 4, X. “De clerico engrot.” 3:6), those who had mutilated themselves (c. 21 sq; *Apost.* c. 7 sq., dist. 55), hermaphrodites (Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s.v.). In some of these cases there can be dispensations granted, as, for instance, for the loss of the left eye, when the right has gained more strength so as to compensate for the defect (Ferraris, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, no. 12). The Greek Church has retained the original principle, and its application by the Evangelical Church appears fully justified..

**4. De Jectus anime** (want of spiritual capacity). — Thus madness, imbecility, etc., are grounds of irregularity (c. 2-5, dist. 33).

**5. Defectus scientip** (the want of adequate educational preparation). — In accordance with various passages of the O.T. (~~300B~~ Jeremiah 1:9; ~~2006~~ Hosea 4:6; ~~300B~~ Malachi 2:7, etc.), even the early Church demanded of its officers to have enjoyed special educational advantages, which alone-could qualify them to act as teachers of the people (comp. dist. 36-38, etc.), and the civil laws also insisted on this point (Novella, 5. 6, cap. 4, etc., *Capitulares* of Charlemagne; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, vol. 2, § 124). With regard to the different orders special regulations were gradually adopted. The Council of Trent prescribes: “Prima tonsura non initientur, qui sacramentum confirmationis non susceperint et fidei rudimenta edocti non fuerint, quique legere et scribere nesziant. Minores ordines iis qui saltem Latinam linguam intelligant... conferantur. Subdiaconi et diaconi ordinentur... in minoribus ordinibus jam probati, ac libris et iis quee ad ordinem exercendum pertinent instructi. Qui...ad ordinem presbyteratus assumuntur... ad populurr docenda ea, que scire omnibus necesse esf ad salutem, ac ministranda sacramenta diligenti examine precedente idonei comprobentur. Qui cunque posthac ad ecclesias cathedrales erit

assumendus... antea in universitate studiorum magister sive doctor aut licentiatus in sacra theologia vel jure canonico merito sit promotus, aut publico alicujus academic testimonio idoneus ad alios docendos tendatur” (*Concil. Trid.* Sess. 23:cap. 4, 11, 13, 14, “De reform;” Sess. 22, cap. 2, “De reform.”). No dispensations can be granted for this case; still the pope may direct that a party be ordained without possessing the necessary instruction, but should not act in the office until he has remedied this defect. Otherwise the party thus ordained is to be deposed (c. 15, X. “De aetate” [1, 14]), The Evangelical Church has from the beginning attached much importance to the proper preparation and natural attainments of candidates. They are therefore generally subjected to examinations before ordination. *SEE LICENTIATE*; *SEE MINISTRY*; *SEE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION*; and also the different articles on Christian denominations.

**6. Defectus fidei** (want of a well-grounded faith). — In consequence of the prescription of the apostle (<sup>5186</sup>1 Timothy 3:6; 5:22) that no *h̄sesaʃTa* should be ordained, the Church commanded that none should be ordained immediately after conversion (*Canon. Apost.* 79; *Concil. Nicen.* 325, c. 2 [c. 1, dist. 47]; Gregorius, anno 599 [c. 2, eod.]), and especially none who had been baptized in sickness (*clinici*) (*Cone. Neocaesar.* an. 314, c. 12 [c. 1, dist. 57]). Its original strictness-against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. “In fine de rescriptis” [1, 3]); Gonzalez Tellez, *Comment.* No. 7; Lancelot, *Instit. jur. can.* lib. 1, tit. 7:§ 12). It was, however, always the rule that no new convert could be raised at once to high offices (c. 1 sq., dist. 61), and this rule has been maintained in the Greek Church (Synod. 1 et 2, anno 861, c. 17). In the Evangelical Church it was also forbidden to raise any proselyte to office, but this is not generally adhered to in practice.

**7. Defectus perfectae lenitatis** (want of meekness). — It applies to those who have departed from the principle *Ecclesia no sirit sanquinem*. Hence, to those who have shed blood in war (*Cone. Tolet.* 1, anno 400, c. 8 [c. 4, dist. 51].; Innocent I, anno 404 [c. 1, cod.]; c. 24, X. “De homicidio” [5, 12], Honorius III); also those who have sat as accuser, witness, lawyer, judge, or juryman in a criminal court, and taken part-in a sentence of death (*Concil. Tolet.* 4, anno 633, c. 31; *Cone. Tolet.* 11:anno 675, c. 6 [c. 29, 30, can. 23, qu. 8]; c. 5, 9, X. “Iu clerici vel monachi negotiis secularibus se immisceant,” 3, 50; comp. c. 21, X. “De homicidio,” 5. 12, etc., especially the glosses to c. 1, dist. 41, “Ad. 5. sacerdotium”); also all who

had practiced surgery, in so far as cutting and cauterizing were concerned (*quae ad ustionem vel incisionem inducit*) (c. 9, X. cit. 3:50).

**8. Defectus sacramenti (marimonii)** (want of adherence to the rule of monogamy). — The apostolic command about the bishops and deacons being the husbands of one wife (<sup><SARD></sup>1 Timothy 3:2,12; <sup><SIB></sup>Titus 1:6) was by the Church considered as forbidding not only actual bigamy (*bigamia vera sen simultanea*), but also second marriage (*bigamia successiva*) (dist. 26; c. 1, 2, dist. 33, tit. 10: “De bigamis non ordinandis,” 1, 21, etc.). The idea of bigamy was subsequently extended to include marriage with a widow or a deflowered virgin (*bigamia interpretativa*) (c. 2, dist. 33; c. 10, 13, dist. 34; c. 8, dist. 1; c. 10, § 6, X. “De renunciatione,” 1, 9; c. 33, X. “De testibus,” 2, 20; c. 4, 5, 7, X. “De bigamis non ord.” 1, 21; *Novella Justiniani*, 6, cap. I, § 3; cap. 5, 123; cap. 12); also the continuation of the marriage relation after a woman had committed adultery (c. 11, 12, dist. 34). Finally, it was considered bigamy for those who, by a vow of chastity, had been joined in spiritual marriage to the Church, like monks, or who had attained high ecclesiastical positions, to marry even a virgin (*bigamia similitudinaria*) (c. 24, can. 27m qu. 1 [*Conc. Ancyr. an. 314*]). In this case the irregularity results *non propter sacramenti defectum. sed propter affectum intentionis cum opere subsecuto*, as Innocent III expressly declares (c. 4 and 7. X. “De bigamis non ord.”). This constitutes a real offense, for which, however, the bishop can give a dispensation (c. 4, X. “De clericis conjugatis,” 4:3; c. 1, X. “Qui clerici vel voventes matrim. contrahere possunt,” 4, 6). In cases of real bigamy, the dispensation is granted by the pope himself for higher, and by the bishop for minor orders (see glosses on c. 17, dist. 34, and on c. 2. X. “De bigamis non ord.”). The Greek Church follows the same principles, whilst the Evangelical Church thinks there is nothing reprehensible in repeated marriages, even with widows (see <sup><SARD></sup>Romans 7:2, 3; <sup><SIB></sup>1 Corinthians 7:39).

**9. Defectus famae** (a bad reputation). — On the many cases of this kind which may produce irregularity, but are distinguished from those in which irregularity results from a misdeed, see Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, no: 12, a; E. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, vol. 1, c. 53.

**10. Defectus libertatis** (want of liberty). — No one who is not perfectly free to dispose of himself can be ordained until consent has been given to it by the party on whom he depends. Thus slaves require the assent of their master (*Canones Apostolorum*, c. 82; c. 1, 2, 4 sq., 12, 21, dist. 54; c. 37,



can. 17, qu. 4, tit. 10:”De servis non ordinandis,” 1, 18). But on being ordained with the consent of their master they become free; when they are ordained without his consent he can reclaim them within one year (*Novella Justiniani*, 123, cap. 17, “Auth. si servus” [c. 37, *Cod. de episcopis et clericis*, 1, 3]). Yet we find among the clergy of the Middle Ages some who remained in the dependence of their former masters after their ordination, though with some restrictions (see Frith, *Die Ministerialen*, Cologne, 1836, § 272, p. 462-465). Those who are liable to civil or military duties are to free themselves from such obligations before ordination (*Cod. Theodos.* tit. “De decurionibus,” 12:1; c. 12, 53, *Cod. Justin.* “De episcopis et clericis,” 1, 3; *Noella*, 123, cap. 1, pr. § 1; cap. 15. “Auth. sed neque curialem” [*Cod. de episcopis et clericis*, 1, 3]; c. 1-3, dist. 51; c. 3, can. 23, qu. 6, etc.). Those who have accounts to settle are to do so before being ordained (*Conc. Carthag.* anno 348, c. 8; and c. 3, dist. 54, cap. un. X. “De obligatis ad ratiocinia ordinandis vel non,” 1, 19; c. 1, disit. iv [Gelasius, 494]; c. 1, dist. 53 [Gregor. 1, 598]). Those who are married require the consent of their wife, who is then to take the vow of chastity or to enter a convent (c. 6, dist. 38 [*Concil. Arelat.* 2, 461?]; c. 8, X. “De clericis conjugatio” [3, 3], Innocent III, an. 1207; comp. c. 5, 8, X. “De conversione conjugatorum” [3, 32], Alex. III; c. 4, “De tempore ordinat.” in 6 [1, 9], Boniface VIII). According to Greek canon law the presbyter may be married; and it is only in case he should be made bishop that his wife is obliged to enter a convent (*Cone. Trullian.* an. 692, c. 48). Children need the consent of their parents until they have reached the age of puberty (fixed at 14) (c. I, can. 20, qu. 2; c. 5, dist. 28). See Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesie*, 7, 1, 7. part 2. lib. 1. cap. 12-92, *Phillips, Kirchenrecht*, vol. 1, § 46-53. — Herzog, *Real Encyclopadie*, 7:67 sq. 7. (J. N. P.)

### Irresistible Grace

As already stated in the article on GRACE, the word *grace* is the hinge of three great theological controversies. One of these, on the nature of depravity and regeneration, between the orthodox doctrine of the Church and Pelagianism, comprehends the question of irresistible grace. Some of the followers of Augustine, in their attempt to oppose Pelagianism, says the Rev. O. Adolphus (*Compendium Theologicum*, p. 144, 3rd edit. Cambridge, England, 1865), of the Church of England, and himself a believer in predestination, carry their views of the *absolute predestination* of a limited number to the ultimate attainment of salvation, through the



influence of the irresistible grace of God causing *their final perseverance*, to such an extreme in their logical deductions that there appeared persons who charged the Augustinian system with leading to the dangerous conclusions that human actions are immaterial, and human efforts for the conversion of the wicked unavailing, in the face of *God's free gift of grace* in accordance with his *secret decrees*, predetermined from everlasting. For the Arminian argument, on the other hand, *SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE ELECTION; SEE PREDESTINATION; SEE WILL.*

## Irrigation

### Picture for Irrigation 1

### Picture for Irrigation 2

Gardens in the East anciently were, and still are, when possible, planted near streams, which afford the means of easy irrigation. (See the curious account of ancient garden irrigation in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 19, 4.) This explains such passages as <sup><0013></sup>Genesis 2:9 sq., and <sup><2013></sup>Isaiah 1:30. But streams were few in Palestine, at least such as afforded water in summer, when alone water was wanted for irrigation: hence rain-water, or water from the streams which dried up in summer, was in winter stored up in reservoirs, spacious enough to contain all the water likely to be needed during the dry season. *SEE POOL; SEE WELL.* In fact, many of our own large nurseries are watered in the same manner from reservoirs of rain-water. The water was distributed through the garden in numerous small rills, which traversed it in all directions, and which were supplied either by a continued stream from the reservoir, or had water poured into them by the gardeners, in the manner shown in the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* abridgm. 1, 33 sq.). *SEE GARDEN.* These rills, being turned and directed by the foot, gave rise to the phrase "watering by the foot," as indicative of garden irrigation (<sup><5110></sup>Deuteronomy 11:10). Thus Dr. Thomson says (*Land and Book*, 2, 279), "I have often watched the gardener at this fatiguing and unhealthy work. When one place is sufficiently saturated, he pushes, aside the sandy soil between it and the next furrow with his foot, and thus continues to do until all are watered." The reference, however, may be to certain kinds of hydraulic machines turned by the feet, such as the small water-wheels used on the plain of Acre and elsewhere. At Hamath, Damascus, and other places in Syria, there are large waterwheels, turned by the stream, used to raise water into

aqueducts. But the most common method of raising water along the Nile is the *Shadeif*, or well-sweep and bucket, represented on the monuments, though not much used in Palestine. (On the whole subject, see Kitto, *Nat. Hist. of Pal.* p. 293 sq.). See **WATER**.

### Ir-she'mesh

(Heb. *id.* **רְיָאֵן**, **ry[æ]n** pause **רְיָאֵן**,\* **v**, *city of the sun*; Sept. **πόλις Σόμες**, Vulg. *Hirsemes*, *id est civitas solis*), a town on the border of Dan, mentioned between Eshtaol and Shaalabbin (<sup><1694></sup>Joshua 19:41); probably the same as the BETH-SHEMIESH **SEE BETH-SHEMIESH** (q.v.) of <sup><1650></sup>Joshua 15:10.

### I'ru

(Hebrew *Irru'*, **רְיָאֵן** *citizen*; Sept. **Ἠρό**, Vulg. *Hir*), the first-named of the sons of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (<sup><13045></sup>1 Chronicles 4:15). B.C. 1618.

### Irvine, Matthew

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Cumberland Co., Pa., December 22, 1817. In early life he was a schoolteacher. On account of his piety and gifts he was made an elder in the Church. His call to the ministry then became more apparent to himself and to others, and he began the study of theology privately with his pastor, and in 1843 was licensed and ordained. He took charge of feeble and scattered German Reformed congregations in Bedford Co., Pa., where he did the work of a pioneer in a truly apostolic spirit. A number of separate charges were formed from time to time out of parts of his field. His ministry was greatly blessed, and the wilderness and solitary places all around became glad. He accomplished the work of a long life in a comparatively few years, and died in peace April 21, 1857.

### Irving, Edward

“the great London preacher, and promoter of a strange fanaticism, whose name thirty years ago was in everybody’s mouth, and whose career, so strange, grotesque, solemn, and finally so sad, was the theme of the sneers of the thoughtless and of the wonder of the thoughtful,” was born Aug. 15, 1792, at Annan, county of Dumfries, Scotland, where his father was a tanner. He was piously brought up, having been early destined by his

ambitious parents for the ministry. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and shortly after graduation (1805) was appointed to superintend the mathematical school at Haddington, whence he removed in 1812 to Kirkcaldy to assume the duties of a similar but more eligible position. About this time he also began his theological studies, and, in accordance with the usage of his *alma mater*, he entered as one of her students of theology. After a stay of about seven years, having completed the probation required by the Church of Scotland, he attained, by action of the Presbytery of Annan, to “the ambiguous position of a licensed preacher and candidate—a layman in fact, though often recognized as a clergyman by courtesy; and he only waited an opportunity to escape from his present occupation to that for which he had been formally designated.” But not finding an opening immediately, and tired of the occupation of teaching, he recommenced study at Edinburgh, devoting most of his time to the writings of Bacon, Hooker, and Jeremy Taylor. At last there came an invitation to preach in the hearing of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, who was desirous of procuring for himself an assistant in the great parish of St. John’s, Glasgow; and shortly after Irving was chosen for this position, and so enabled to begin “in earnest the great life-work for which he had been preparing, and which he had anticipated with most painful longings. A parish of 10,000 souls, mostly the families of poor artisans and laborers, composed the pastorate of St. John’s, Glasgow, and Irving at once entered on its varied duties with all his energies.” But as his association in this parish with Dr. Chalmers only afforded him an inferior place, he soon grew dissatisfied with the position; and, his preaching having secured him quite a favorable reputation, he was invited to the great English metropolis as minister of the Caledonian Church a kirk of Scotland in Cross Street, Hatton Garden. Early in July 1822, he began his labors in this little out-of-the-way church, composed of only fifty members, occasionally enlarged by some stray Scotchmen visiting the great city. In a very few weeks he began to attract large congregations; in three months the applications for seats had risen to 1500; at length it became necessary to exclude the general public, and to admit only those who were provided with tickets. Statesmen, orators, the noble, the wealthy, the fashionable, occupied the seats of the church, and their carriages thronged the adjoining streets. His ability and success as a preacher are thus stated by a writer on “Henry Drummond” in the *London Quart. Review*, October, 1860, p. 275: “The preacher’s great stature, his bushy black hair hanging down in ringlets, his deep voice, his solemn manner, the impressiveness of his action, his broad Scotch dialect,

his antiquated yet forcible style, all combined to rivet attention, and made you feel that you were in the presence of a power. Nor did his matter belie the impression which was thus created, He was bent upon accomplishing the end of the Gospel ministry in saving souls from death; and at the beginning of his course, before the disturbing influences of his position had done their full work upon him, he preached with great force and effect.” The influence which Irving exerted among all classes of society of London was really surprising. Such an amount of applause as was awarded to his pulpit discourses has never fallen to the lot of man since his day, excepting perhaps in the case of Spurgeon. In 1824, a volume containing some of his discourses was sent forth, not as sermons, but under the title of *Orations: For the Oracles of God, for Orations; For Judgments to come, an Argument in nine Parts*. The author shared the same popular favor as the preacher, and three editions of the book were sold in less than half a year. “Aimless, and without a wide or lasting interest, curiously quaint in style and manner, while the matter generally bears upon the topics of the passing hour, it contains many passages of extraordinary beauty and depth, many an outpouring of lofty devotion, and frequent bursts of the most passionate eloquence” (*Encyclop. Brita. 12:625*). But, as the production of the preacher of the little Hatton Garden chapel, everybody who wished to be up with the times had to read it, and so it soon “became the talk of the town, and was criticized by each according to his position and temper.” The book had many vulnerable points, one of which, not the least perhaps, was the thrust in his introduction against the evident lack of success of the ordinary instructions of the pulpit, charging it all as the result of the defective manner of preaching generally prevalent in England at that time. But if this arrayed a number of critics against him, an estrangement of the great body of contemporary evangelical Christians only followed his course of action in 1824. In this year he was called upon, as one of the pulpit celebrities of the great metropolis, to preach before the London Missionary Society. He had long dreamed of a revival of apostolical missions, and to advance “these sublime fancies” this opportunity afforded him scope. ‘For three mortal hours the vast assembly was held entranced by his gorgeous oratory while he depicted, not the work of that or any other body, but a grand ideal of a mission scheme after the model of apostolic times. During all this time the managers sat in painful solicitude, first for their usual collections, and ultimately for the damage that such a discourse must entail upon the cause in which they were engaged. But nobody could suspect the preacher of a design to harm the cause he was called to advocate. To his

mind the missionary work was not the same thing with that contemplated by the society, and, as he spoke from his own inflamed fancy and full heart, his utterances were foreign to the subject as they viewed it. But the discourse was more than a blunder; it was a burning protest, though undesigned, against the spirit of cowardly prudence in which the work of missions was, and, alas! that it must be said, still is prosecuted. It unluckily struck precisely upon those points which annual reports and platform orators are usually careful to leave untouched, and by holding up the bright ideal it condemned the actual" (Dr. Curry).

However candid may have been his manner and true the zeal for the Christian cause which unquestionably impelled Irving at this time, the effect was to estrange from him many of his Christian friends. But the birth of a son for a time turned his attention from the controversy which his acts had provoked and to him, so fond of home life, atoned in a measure for the loss of friends. The child, however, soon died, and this additional loss incited him to the study of prophecy. His attention had already been called in this direction by Hatley Frere, "an earnest but one-sided student of the prophecies," who was propounding about this time a new theory of interpretation, the especial object of which was to establish the idea of a personal reign of Christ on earth. The study and translation of a Spanish work on this subject, generally attributed to Ben-Ezra, but really the production of the Jesuit Lacunza (q.v.) (published by Irving under the title of *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*), aided in "turning the balance of Irving's mind the wrong way just at the crisis of his intellectual fate. These prophetic studies met an original bias in his mind, and made him a fatal prey to religious delusion." An opportunity soon occurred to lay before the public his favorite theory of the millennium by an invitation from the Continental Society to preach the annual sermon (1825). Like the missionary sermon of the previous year, it gave rise to considerable commotion, more especially among the friends of "Catholic Emancipation." England at this time was decidedly in favor of bestowing upon Roman Catholics unlimited political power, which Irving vehemently opposed. A good part of his audience left their seats before the speaker had finished his discourse, which, like the missionary sermon, occupied some "three or more hours in the delivery." To make a bad matter still worse, Irving determined to publish his discourse, enlarged and rearranged, in book form, and during the next year sent it forth under the title *Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed*, dedicating it "to my beloved friend and brother

in Christ, Hatley Frere, Esq.” “Irving now threw himself unreservedly,” says Dr. Curry, “into the current that swept him away from his moorings. By the strange fascination which often attends the study of prophecy and the expectation of a terrestrial millennium, he now came to expect the *speedy* coming of Christ to set up his kingdom on earth, and this wrought in him the usual results of excitement and speciality of religious thought and conversation. He had reached that stage of mental excitement in which almost every event becomes a proof of the cherished expectation, and the mind’s own action steadily intensifies the dominant fascination. ‘In this, too, he craved the sympathy of other minds inspired with the same sentiments, and these he readily obtained; a kind of mystic circle, among whom were Hatley Frere, now relieved of his isolation, the celebrated Rabbin, Dr. Wolff, Irving himself, and Henry Drummond, with others less distinguished, after numerous informal conversations, at length came together in a conference at Albury, the hospitable residence of Mr. Drummond, brought together, as Irving declared, by ‘a desire to compare their views with respect to the prospects of the Church at this present crisis’”(comp. art. 9. “On Drummond,” in the *London Quart. Review*, Oct. 1860). “Irving sat down with his motley associates, a giant among pigmies, the most docile of the company, and quite ready to yield his own’ views to the superficial fancies of the least distinguished of the body, and to surrender his clearest intellectual convictions to what was styled the answer to prayer. From such sessions the only probable results followed: the fanaticism in which they began was heightened and confirmed, especially in the single mind capable of being damaged by it.”

The popularity of the great preacher, however, continued unabated in the midst of all these difficulties; nay, his late meditations and yearnings rather increased his reputation, ‘and soon a new and more commodious church had to be provided for the throngs of hearers that weekly came to listen to him. The money for the building of a new edifice was easily procured, and early in 1827 he was installed pastor of the newly-built church in Regent Square, Chalmers preaching on the occasion. “The transition from the little Caledonian chapel, so long thronged by a promiscuous crowd of London fashionable life, to the commodious National Scotch Church in Regent Square, with its well-ordered and well-defined congregation, marks the culmination and the beginning of the descent of Irving’s popularity.” Shortly after his removal to the new church, he again ventured before the public as an author by the publication of three volumes (1828) selected

from his discourses preached since the commencement of his ministry at London. Up to this time many of the extravagances of Irving had more or less displeased his brother laborers in the ministry, but no one had ventured to attack him publicly until “an idle clergyman called Cole,” of whom Mr. Irving’s biographer, Mrs. Oliphant, can barely speak with civility, accused Irving of inculcating heterodox doctrines on the *Incarnation* in the first volume of his sermons, which treats chiefly of the Trinity; first of the divine character, and especially of the person and work of Christ. “The perfect humanity of Christ was Irving’s favorite theme. With the utmost intensity he clung to the idea of the brotherhood of his Master—an idea he held with perfect reverence. The first shock of the charge of heresy, and of heresy, too, in relation to his adorable Lord, utterly unmanned him. The last thought of his heart would have been to derogate from the dignity of his Master, his impassioned reverence for whom had probably stimulated the teaching which now bore the brand of heresy” (*Lond. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 193). It would hardly be worth while to follow up the controversy incited by the impertinent, if not treacherous conduct of Mr. Cole in exaggerating “an error which should have been the groundwork of a brotherly expostulation,” were it not for the fact that for these very views on the incarnation Irving was, some years later, deposed from the ministry. As we have already said, he was the last of all persons who could be led to believe that the views which he set forth on this subject had anything novel or unusual in them. All that he was possibly guilty of, says Dr. Curry, is that “*he took in a larger view which contemplated the whole work of the incarnation of the Word as redemptive in that by it the Godhead came into vital union with humanity, fallen and under the law.*” This last thought carried to his realistic mode of thinking the notion of Christ’s participation in the fallen character of humanity, which he designated by terms that implied a real sinfulness in Christ. His attempt to get rid of the odiousness of that idea by saying that this was overborne and at length wholly expelled by the indwelling Godhead helped the matter but little, and still left him open to grave censures for at least an unhappy method of statement. But under all this there is unquestionably a most precious Gospel truth, and if Irving was justly condemned for an unwarrantable misstatement of certain doctrines of Christianity, the orthodoxy of the age may be justly called to account for its partial exhibition of those doctrines. For centuries the Church has been actively occupied in setting forth and defending the doctrine of Christ’s divinity, until that of his humanity has largely fallen out of its thinkings. It is quite time to cease from this one-sidedness and to take

in a whole Gospel. Fallen humanity demands a sympathizing no less than an almighty Savior; and if indeed Jesus is to be that Savior, he must be apprehended by our faith, as ‘man with man,’ and as really and fully ‘touched with a *sense* of our infirmities.’ The Church of Rome answers to the heart’s yearning for human sympathy in the Mediator by giving that office to Mary; while our malformed practical creeds remove Jesus beyond our sympathies, and give us no other Mediator. The Church awaits the coming of a John, uprising from the Savior’s bosom, to set forth in all fullness the blessedness of the grace of Jesus, the *incarnate* God, who hath ‘borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.’” With this charge of heresy advanced against him, Irving set out on a visit to his native land “to warn, first his father’s house and kindred, and the country side which had still so great a hold upon his heart, and then universal Scotland, of that advent which he looked for with undoubting and fervent expectations;” and brilliant was the success with which he saw his labors crowned wherever he went. For once he was a prophet who received honors in his own country. Wherever he preached, not only whole congregations from neighboring towns came to swell his already large numbers of hearers, but oftentimes even the ministers would adjourn their services and go with their flocks *en masse* to hear Scotland’s noble descendant. While preaching at Edinburgh on the *Apocalypse*, the special theme of study in these later years, the services began at six o’clock A.M. Of these Chalmers writes: “He is drawing prodigious crowds. We attempted this morning to force our way into St. Andrew’s Church, but it was all in vain. He changes to the West Church, with its three hideous galleries, for the accommodation of the public,” and even then there was not room. As in Edinburgh, so was his success at Glasgow and other places that he visited, and we need not wonder that Chalmers himself exclaims “that there must have been a marvelous power of attraction that could turn a whole population out of their beds as early as five in the morning.”

As if to augment the difficulties already in his way, in his candid and straightforward manner, he further estranged his friends of the Scottish Church by extending his sympathy to a minister of his native Church, a Mr. Campbell, of Row, who was just then under the odium of teaching false notions on the Procrustian high Calvinistic doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in the Westminster Confession.

But the grand and final divergence from his mother Church further resulted, not from the communication of any doctrinal excitement from the



banks of Guirloch, but from a very strange phenomenon which about this time took its rise along the quiet banks of this river. For some time Irving had been pondering on the heritage of the *gift of tongues* (q.v.; **SEE GIFTS**), and was inclined to believe this spiritual gift to have been not only possessed by the apostolic Church, but an actual heritage of the Church of all times; indeed, a necessary condition for the healthy state of any Church of Christ. These thoughts of his became convictions when seconded at this juncture by some remarkable instances. In the locality of Row, celebrated for the piety of its inhabitants there had lived and died a young woman, Isabella Campbell by name, of rare and saintly character. A memoir which her minister had written of her attracted the attention of people far and near, and many of them came as pilgrims to visit the spot where she had lived and prayed. These visits to the earthly dwelling-place, as well as the noble reputation, if not example of a departed sister, had a wonderful influence on the surviving sister Mary — gifted with the same spiritual temperament, with powers of mind of no ordinary character, and, moreover, with the personal fascination of beauty.” For a long time she had been afflicted with the same disease which had made a prey of her sister, and while lying, as all believed, at the point of death, she professed to have received “the gift of tongues,” and, “as she lay in her weakness,” the Holy Ghost, they said, had come upon her with mighty power, and “constrained her to speak at great length, and with superhuman strength, in an unknown tongue.” Similar cases occurred in other neighboring places, and the news of the wondrous phenomena soon reached the ears of Irving. To him of course, these indicated “an approaching realization of his prophetic dreams.” Not for an instant was he to hesitate to acknowledge them as the natural answer of his aspirations and prayer; and many of his own flock, prepared by his previous teachings, seconded his leanings in favor of these long-lost spiritual gifts. Manifestations of a similar character soon appeared in his own Church at first privately, then at the weekday matins, and finally even in the public service on the Sabbath. “The die” had truly been “cast, and from that time the Regent Square church became a Babel.” His oldest and most discreet friends one by one deserted him, finding that their counsel was of no avail. Even a visit of Chalmers and Coleridge, both his friends, could not in the least stay the current that was fast hurrying him to a most frightful abyss. A collision between the pastor and his flock was inevitable, though some of his people shared his views. Against the continuation of the “new prophets” even his own brother-in-law voted, and the inevitable result was of course the ejection of the minister and his

believers in the “gift of tongues” from Regent Square Church. But it must not be supposed that a man of Irving’s great abilities, though his course was now downward, was surrounded only by a few weak followers. Among those who faithfully followed their pastor were some of London’s most distinguished characters, and when on the following Sunday he met his adherents in the hall of the great infidel Owen, no less than 800 were there to partake of the Lord’s Supper. Indeed, the place they had temporarily secured was far too small to contain all that still flocked to hear Irving, and they removed to a large gallery in Newman Street, generally designated as West’s Gallery, because it had formerly belonged to West the painter. The denouement of the play had now fairly begun, and it rapidly hastened to its close. The “gifted ones” at Newman Street had things in their own hands, and everything proceeded by “vision,” and “prophecy,” and in the “Spirit;” to all which Irving gave the most reverent and obedient attention. The Presbytery of Annan, by which body Irving had been first licensed to preach, but not ordained, “by a remarkable stretch of power” condemned him as guilty of heresy, and excommunicated him from the Church of Scotland. But as if his cup of sorrows was not yet sufficiently bitter, to add to the condemnation which he had just received at the hand of his mother Church, which he so dearly loved, he was, on his return from Annan to London, deprived even by his own adherents of the authority which by reason of his superiority had universally been granted to him, and, in accordance with a “revelation,” was interdicted “from exercising any priestly function, or administering the sacraments, or even preaching, excepting to those less sacred assemblies to which unbelievers were admitted. Astounded, he yet uttered no murmur, but sat in the lowest places of the Church which he himself had created, in silent and resigned humility.” Mr. Andrews, in an article on Irving in the *New Englander* (1863, p. 816 sq.), seeks to refute this statement, so generally accepted as made by Mrs. Oliphant in her biography of Mr. Irving. But even Mr. Andrews acknowledges that when Mr. Irving was finally reordained by these “superior” officers, who claimed to have been called by God to higher distinctions, his position “was in some respects less independent than before,” and that it could not have been otherwise than “that Mr. Irving should have met with trials and difficulties in the progress of the work under his new phase,” especially “a man. of his great strength of character, and gifts for leadership, accustomed hitherto to be foremost in whatever he engaged in” (p. 821). But for once fortune favored Irving. The great degradation which he was called upon to suffer was to be his last,

and a short one at that. In the autumn of 1834, the severe task which he had been imposing on his mind and body began to tell upon him, and while on a journey to Scotland for the recovery of his failing health, he was taken dangerously ill, and died at Glasgow Dec. 8, 1834.

Of Irving it may truly be conceded that a more devout or earnest spirit has not appeared on the stage of time in the 19th century. Destined to be a Christian minister, "he strove" (said of him a friend who knew him well), "with all the force that was in him, to *be* it. He might have been so many things; not a speaker only, but a doer—the leader of hosts of men. For his head, when the fog of Babylon had not yet obscured it, was of strong, far-reaching insight. His very enthusiasm was sanguine, not *atrabiliar*; he was so loving, full of hope, so simple-hearted, and made all that approached him his. A giant form of activity was in the man; speculation was accident, not nature. There was in him a courage dauntless, not pugnacious; hardly fierce, by no possibility ferocious; as of the generous war-horse, gentle in its strength, yet that laughs at the shaking of the spear. But, above all, be he what he might, to be a reality was indispensable for him." In another place the same friend exclaims: "But for Irving I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find." Similar was the judgment of all Irving's friends, and even of most of his opponents. "All admired the man, his many virtues, his matchless eloquence; all deplored his fall, and the gulf of separation which it created between him and his mother Church." His works have been collected by his nephew, the Rev. P. Carlyle, who has published them under the title of *Collected Writings of Edward Irving* (Lond. 1864-5, 5 vols. 8vo). See Mrs. Oliphant, *Life of Edward Irving* (Lond. 1862; N. Y. [Harpers'] 1862, 8vo); Carlyle, *Miscellaneous Essays*; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1849; 1863; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, art. oi; *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1862, art. 7; *Encyclop. Britain.* 12:s.v.; Baring Gould, *Post Mediaeval Preachers* (of England only); Littell's *Living Age* (on Irving's works), Feb. 23, 1867, art. 1; and M. V. Andrews (of the Catholic Apostolic Church, the name now assumed by the Irvingites), in the *A New Englander*, July, 1863, art. 1; Oct., art. 8. (J. H. W.)

## I'saac

(Heb. *Yitschak'*, *qj xjʾat* *laughter*, in the poet. books sometimes *qj cʾjæ* *Yischak'*, <sup><1943></sup>Psalm 105:9; <sup><2433></sup>Jeremiah 33:26; <sup><3100></sup>Amos 7:9, 16, in the last two passages spoken of the Israelitish nation; Sept. and N.T. *Ἰσαάκ*, Joseph. *Ἰσαακος*, *Ant.* 1, 10, 5), the only son of Abraham by Sarah, and the middle one of the three patriarchs who are so often named together as the progenitors of the Jewish race.

**I.** *Personal History.* — The following are the facts which the Bible supplies of the longest-lived of the three patriarchs, the least migratory, the least prolific, and the least favored with extraordinary divine revelations. A few events in this quiet life have occasioned discussion.

**1.** The promise of a son had been made to his parents when Abraham was visited by the Lord in the plains of Mamre, and appeared so unlikely to be fulfilled, seeing that both Abraham and Sarah were “well stricken in years,” that its utterance caused the latter to laugh incredulously (<sup><1810></sup>Genesis 18:1 sq.). B.C. 2064. Being reproved for her unbelief, she denied that she had laughed. The reason assigned for the special visitation thus promised was, in effect, that Abraham was pious, and would train his offspring in piety, so that he would become the founder of a great nation, and all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him. *SEE ABRAHAM.* In due time Sarah gave birth to a son, who received the name of Isaac (<sup><2101></sup>Genesis 21:1-3). B.C. 2063. This event occurred at Gerar. Isaac was thus emphatically the child of promise. Born, as he was, out of due time, when his father was a hundred years old and his mother ninety, the parents themselves laughed with a kind of incredulous joy at the thought of such a prodigy (<sup><1717></sup>Genesis 17:17; 18:12), and-referring to the marvelousness of the event when it had actually taken place, Sarah said that not only she, but all who heard of it, would be disposed to laugh (<sup><2106></sup>Genesis 21:6). The name Isaac, therefore, was fitly chosen by God for the child, in commemoration of the extraordinary, supernatural nature of the birth, and of the laughing joy which it occasioned to those more immediately interested in it. This signification of Isaac's name is thrice alluded to (<sup><1717></sup>Genesis 17:17; 18:12; 21:6). Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 12, 2) refers to the second of those passages for the origin of the name; Jerome (*Quaest. Hebr. in Genesis*) vehemently confines it to the first; Ewald (*Gesch.* 1, 425), without assigning reasons, gives it as his opinion that all three passages have been added by different writers to the original record. There need be no dispute as to which of

these passages the import of the name refers; it includes a reference to them all, besides according with and expressing the happy, cheerful disposition of the bearer, and suggesting the relation in which he stood, as the seed of Abraham, the channel of the promised blessing, and the type of him who is pre-eminently *the Seed*, whose birth has put laughter into the hearts of myriads of our race. The preternatural birth of Isaac was a sign from heaven at the outset, indicating what kind of seed God expected as the fruit of the covenant, and what powers would be required for its production—that it should be a seed at once coming in the course of nature, and yet in some sense above nature—the special gift and offspring of God. When Isaac was eight days old he received circumcision, and was thus received into the covenant made with his father; while his mother’s skeptical laughter was turned into triumphant exultation and joy in God (<sup>-0204</sup>Genesis 21:4-7). (See De Wette., *Krit.* p. 133 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch.* 1, 388; Hartmann, *Ueber d. Pentat.* p. 269; Lengerke, *Ken.* p. 290; Niemeyer, *Charact.* 2, 160.) **SEE NAME.**

2. The first noticeable circumstance in the life of Isaac took place in connection with his weaning. This precise age at the time is not given, but we may suppose him to have been (according to Eastern custom) fully two years old. In honor of the occasion Abraham made ‘a great feast, as an expression, no doubt, of his joy that the child had reached this fresh stage in his career—was no longer a suckling, but capable of self-sustenance, and a certain measure of independent action. For the parents, and those who sympathized with them, it would naturally be a feast of laughter—the laughter of mirth and joy; but there was one in the family—Ishmael—to whom it was no occasion of gladness, who saw himself supplanted in the more peculiar honors of the house by this younger brother, and who mocked while others laughed—himself, indeed, laughed (for it is the same word still, **qj** **ixm]** <sup>-0209</sup>Genesis 21:9), but with the envious and scornful air which betrayed the alien and hostile spirit that lurked in his bosom. He must have been a well-grown boy at the time; and Sarah, desecrating in the manifestations then given the sure presage of future rivalry and strife, urged Abraham to cast forth the bondmaid and her son, since the one could not be a co-heir with the other. Abraham, it would seem, hesitated for a time about the matter, feeling pained at the thought of having Ishmael separated from the household, and only complied when he received an explicit warrant and direction from above. At the same time, he got the promise, as the ground of the divine procedure, “For in Isaac shall thy seed

be called,” that is, in Isaac (as contradistinguished from Ishmael. or any other son) shall the seed of blessing that is to hold of thee as a father have its commencement. It is probable that Abraham needed to have this truth brought sharply out to him, for correction on the one side, as well as for consolation and hope on the other, as his paternal feelings may have kept him from apprehending the full scope of former revelations concerning the son of Hagar. The high purposes of God were involved in the matter, and the yearnings of natural affection must give way, that these might be established. In the transactions themselves the apostle Paul perceived a revelation of the truth for all times-especially in regard to the natural enmity of the heart to the things of God, and the certainty with which, even when wearing the badge of a religious profession, it may be expected to vent its malice and opposition towards the true children of God (<sup><807></sup>Romans 9:7, 10; <sup><808></sup>Galatians 4:28; <sup><8118></sup>Hebrews 11:18). The seed of blessing, those who are supernaturally born of God, like Isaac, and have a special interest in the riches of his goodness, are sure to be eyed with jealousy, and, in one form or another, persecuted by those who, with a name to live, still walk after the flesh (<sup><802></sup>Galatians 4:21-31). *SEE ISHMAEL.*

It has been asked, what were the persecutions sustained by Isaac from Ishmael to which Paul refers (<sup><809></sup>Galatians 4:29)? If, as is generally supposed, he refers to <sup><120></sup>Genesis 21:9, then the word  $\text{q}\eta\text{x}\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\text{]} \text{πα}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ , may be translated *mocking*, as in the A.V., or *insulting*, as in 39:14, and in that case the trial of Isaac was by means of “*cruel mockings*” ( $\text{\epsilon}\mu\text{πα}\text{\iota}\gamma\text{\upsilon}\text{\omega}\text{\nu}$ ), in the language of the Epistle to the <sup><8135></sup>Hebrews 11:36. Or the word may include the signification *paying idolatrous worship*, as in <sup><1306></sup>Exodus 32:6; or *fighting*, as in <sup><1024></sup>2 Samuel 2:14. These three significations are given by Jarchi, who relates a Jewish tradition (quoted more briefly by Wetstein on <sup><809></sup>Galatians 4:29) of Isaac suffering personal violence from Ishmael, a tradition which, as Mr. Ellicott thinks, was adopted by Paul. The English reader who is content with our own version, or the scholar who may prefer either of the other renderings of Jarchi, will be at no loss to connect Galatians 9:29 with <sup><120></sup>Genesis 21:9. But Origen (*in Genesis Hon.* 7, § 3), and Augustine (*Sereno* 3), and apparently Prof. Jowett (on <sup><809></sup>Galatians 4:29), not observing that the gloss of the Sept. and the Latin versions “*playing with her son Isaac*” forms no part of the simple statement in Genesis, and that the words  $\text{q}\eta\text{x}\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\text{]} \text{πα}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ , are not to be confined to the meaning “*playing*,” seem to doubt (as Mr. Ellicott does on

other grounds) whether the passage in Genesis bears the construction apparently put upon it by St. Paul. On the other hand, Rosenmüller (*Schol. in* <sup><1210></sup>Genesis 21:9) even goes so far as to characterize ἐδίωκε - "persecuted"-as a very excellent interpretation of **qj æm**](See Drusius on <sup><1210></sup>Genesis 21:9, in *Crit. Sacr.*, and Estius on <sup><810></sup>Galatians 4:29.)

What effect the companionship of the wild and wayward Ishmael might have had on Isaac it is not easy to say; but his expulsion was, no doubt, ordered by God for the good of the child of promise, and most probably saved him from many an annoyance and sorrow. Freed from such evil influence, the child grew up under the nurturing care of his fond parents, mild and gentle, loving and beloved.

**3.** The next recorded event in the life of Isaac is the memorable one connected with the command of God to offer him up as a sacrifice on a mountain in the land of Moriah (Genesis 22). B.C. cir. 2047. Nothing is said of his age at the time except that he is called "a lad" (**dxii**), perhaps sixteen years of age. According to Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 13, 2), he was twenty-five years old. That Isaac knew nothing of the relation in which he personally stood to the divine command, came affectingly out in the question he put to his father while they journeyed together, "Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?" Even then the secret was not disclosed to him; and only, it would appear, when the act itself was in process of being consummated, did the fearful truth burst upon his soul that he was himself to be the victim on the altar. Yet the sacred narrative tells of no remonstrant struggle on the part of this child of promise, no strivings for escape, no cries of agony or pleadings for deliverance: he seems to have surrendered himself as a willing sacrifice to the call of Heaven and to have therein showed how thoroughly in him, as in his believing parent, the mind of the flesh had become subordinate to the mind of the spirit. To act thus was to prove himself the fitting type of him who had the law of God in his heart, and came to do, not his own will, but the will of him that sent him. But the death itself, which was to prove the life of the world, it belonged to the antitype, not to the type, to accomplish. The ram provided by God in the thicket must meanwhile take the place of the seed of blessing. In the surrender by the father of his "only son," the concurrence of the son's will with the father's, the sacrificial death which virtually took place, and the resurrection from the dead, whence Abraham

received his son “in figure” (<sup>38119</sup>Hebrews 11:19), are all points of analogy which cannot be overlooked.

The offering up of Isaac by Abraham has been viewed in various lights. It is the subject of five dissertations by Frischmuth in the *Thes. Theol. Philol.* p. 197 (attached to *Crit. Sacri*; originally Jena, 1662-5, 4to). By bishop Warburton (*Div. Leg. b. 6:§ 5*) the whole transaction was regarded as “merely an information by action (comp. <sup>3827B</sup>Jeremiah 27:2; <sup>3828B</sup>Ezekiel 12:3; <sup>3800C</sup>Hosea 1:2), instead of words, of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ’s day.” This view is adopted by dean Graves (*On the Pentateuch*, pt. 3:§ 4), and has become popular. But it is pronounced to be unsatisfactory by Davidson (*Primitive Sacrifice*, pt. 4:§ 2), who, pleading for the progressive communication of the knowledge of the Christian atonement, protests against the assumption of a contemporary disclosure of the import of the sacrifice to Abraham, and points out that no expiation or atonement was joined with this emblematic oblation, which consequently symbolized only the act, not the power or virtue of the Christian sacrifice. Mr. Maurice (*Patriarchs and Lawgivers*, 4) draws attention to the offering of Isaac as the last and culminating point (compare Eald, *Geschichte*, 1, 430-4) in the divine education of Abraham, that which taught him the meaning and ground of self-sacrifice. The same line of thought is followed up in a very instructive and striking sermon on the sacrifice of Abraham in *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, 3, 33-48. Some German writers have spoken of the whole transaction as a dream (Eichhorn, *Biblioth. f. bibl. Liter.* 1, 45 sq.), or a myth (De Wette), or as the explanation of a hieroglyph (Otman, in Henke’s *Magazine*, 2, 517), and treat other events in Isaac’s life as slips of the pen of a Jewish transcriber. Even the merit of novelty cannot be claimed for such views, which appear to have been in some measure forestalled in the time of Augustine (Sermo 2, *De tentatione Abrahæ*). They are, of course, irreconcilable with the declaration of St. James, that it was *a work* by which Abraham was justified. Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* 4:16, and 1, 10) has preserved a singular and inaccurate version of the offering of Isaac in an extract from the ancient Phoenician historian Sanchoniathon; but it is absurd to suppose that the widely-spread (see Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 79, and Thomson’s *Bampton Lectures*, 1853, p. 38) heathen practice of sacrificing human beings (so Bruns, in Paulus’s *Memorab.* 6:1 sq.) received any encouragement from a sacrifice which Abraham was forbidden to



accomplish (see Waterland, *Works*, 4:203). Some writers have found for this transaction a kind of parallel-it amounts to no more-in the classical legends of Iphigenia and Phrixus (so Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 1, 95), etc. (see J. G. Michaelis, *De Abr. et Is. a Graecis in Hyrilum et Orionem conversis*, Freft. a. O. 1721; Zeibich, *Isaaci ortus in fubula Orionis vestigia*. Ger. 1776). The story of Iphigenia, which inspired the devout Athenian dramatist with sublime notions of the import of sacrifice and suffering (Aesch. *Again.* 147, et seq.), supplied the Roman infidel only with a keen taunt against religion (Lucret. 1, 102), just as the great trial which perfected the faith of Abraham and molded the character of Isaac draws from the Romanized Jew of the first century a rhetorical exhibition of his own acquaintance with the meaning of sacrifice (see Joseph. *Ant.* 1, 13, 3). The general aim of certain writers has been, as they consider it, to relieve the Bible from the odium which the narrated circumstances are in their opinion fitted to occasion. That the passage is free from every possible objection it may be too much to assert: it is, however, equally clear that many of the objections taken to it arise from viewing the facts from a wrong position, or under the discolored medium of a foregone and adverse conclusion. The only proper way is to consider it as it is represented in the sacred page. The command, then, was expressly designated to try Abraham's faith. Destined as the patriarch was to be the father of the faithful, was he worthy of his high and dignified position? If his own obedience was weak, he could not train others in faith, trust, and love: hence a trial was necessary. That he was *not* without holy dispositions was already known, and indeed recognized in the divine favors of which he had been the object; but was he prepared to do and to suffer all God's will? Religious perfection and his position alike demanded a perfect heart: hence the kind of trial. If he were willing to surrender even his only child, and act himself both as offerer and priest in the sacrifice of the required victim, if he could so far conquer his natural affections, so subdue the father in his heart, then there could be no doubt that his will was wholly reconciled to God's, and that he was worthy of every trust, confidence, and honor (comp. <sup><0121></sup>James 2:21). The trial was made, the fact was ascertained, but the victim was not slain. What is there in this to which either religion or morality can take exception? This view is both confirmed and justified by the words of God (<sup><0226></sup>Genesis 22:16 sq.), "*Because thou hast not withheld thy only son, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*" We remark, also, that not

a part, out the whole of the transaction must be taken under consideration, and especially the final result. If we dwell exclusively on the commencement of it, there appears to be some sanction given to human sacrifices; but the end, and the concluding and ever-enduring fact, has the directly opposite bearing. Viewed as a whole, the transaction is, in truth, an express prohibition of human sacrifices. Nothing but a clear command from God could have suggested such a service. "A craving to please, or propitiate, or communicate with the powers above" by surrendering "an object near and dear" to one, which canon Stanley erroneously says is the "source of all sacrifice," and to which he attributes Abraham's conduct in the present case (*History of the Jewish Church*, 1, 47), could never have led to such an act. — The idea is wholly improbable and irrational. Kurtz maintains that the basis for this trial of Abraham was laid in the state of mind produced in him by beholding the Canaanitish human sacrifices around him. His words are: "These Canaanitish sacrifices of children, and the readiness with which the heathen around him offered them, must have excited in Abraham a contest of thoughts.... and induced him to examine himself whether he also were capable of sufficient renunciation and self-denial to do, if his God demanded it, what the heathen around him were doing. *But if this question was raised in the heart of Abraham, it must also have been brought to a definite settlement through some outward fact.* Such was the *basis* for the demand of God so far as Abraham was concerned, and such the *educational motive* for his trial. The obedience of Abraham's faith must, in energy and entireness, not lag behind that which the religion of nature demanded and obtained from its professors. Abraham must be ready to do for *his* God what the nations around him were capable of doing for their false gods. In every respect Abraham, as the hero of faith, is to out-distance all others in self-denial" (*Hist. of the O. Coven.* 1, 269). *Objectively*, the transaction was intended to *recognize* the element of *truth* in human sacrifices, while condemning the sacrifices themselves (p. 269,270). **SEE SACRIFICE.**

**4.** Isaac passed his early days under the eye of his father, engaged in the care of flocks and herds up and down the plains of Canaan. At length his father wished to see him married. Abraham therefore gave a commission to his oldest and most trustworthy servant to the effect that, in order to prevent Isaac from taking a wife from among the daughters of the Canaanites, he should proceed into Mesopotamia, and, under the divine direction, choose a partner among his own relatives for his beloved son.

Rebekah, in consequence, becomes Isaac's wife, when he was forty years of age (Genesis 24). B.C. 2023. In connection with this marriage an event is recorded which displays the peculiar character of Isaac, while it is in keeping with the general tenor of the sacred record regarding him. Probably in expectation of the early return of his father's messenger, and somewhat solicitous as to the result of the embassy, he went out to meditate in the field at the eventide. While there engaged in tranquil thought, he chanced to raise his eyes, when lo! he beheld the retinue near at hand, and soon conducted his bride into his mother's tent. In unison with all this is the simple declaration of the history, that Isaac "loved her." Isaac was evidently a man of kind and gentle disposition, of a calm and reflective turn of mind, simple in his habits, having few wants, good rather than great, fitted to receive impressions and follow a guide, not to originate important influences, or perform deeds of renown. If his character did not take a bent from the events connected with his father's readiness to offer him on Mount Moriah, certainly its passiveness is in entire agreement with the whole tenor of his conduct, as set forth in that narrative. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.)

Isaac having, in conjunction with his half-brother Ishmael, buried Abraham his father, "in a good old age, in the cave of Machpelah," took up a somewhat permanent residence "by the well Lahai-roi," where, being blessed of God, he lived in prosperity and at ease' (<sup>(-0257)</sup>Genesis 25:7-11). B.C. 1988. One source of regret, however, he deeply felt. Rebekah was barren. In time, however, two sons, Jacob and Esau, were granted to his prayers (<sup>(-0251)</sup>Genesis 25:21-26). B.C. 2003. As the boys grew, Isaac gave a preference to Esau, who seems to have possessed those robust qualities of character in which his father was defective, and therefore gratified him by such dainties as the pursuits of the chase enabled the youth to offer; while Jacob, "a plain man, dwelling in tents," was an object of special regard to Rebekah — a division of feeling and a kind of partiality which became the source of much domestic unhappiness, as well as of jealousy and hatred between the two sons (<sup>(-0257)</sup>Genesis 25:27, 28). *SEE ESAU.*

**5.** The life of Isaac, moreover, was not passed wholly without trials coming in from without. , A famine compels him to seek food in some foreign land (<sup>(-0261)</sup>Genesis 26:1 sq.). B.C. cir.: 1985. At the occurrence of this famine Isaac was expressly admonished by God not to go down into Egypt, but to abide within the boundaries of the Promised Land; and occasion was taken to renew the promise to him and his seed, and to confirm in his behalf the

oath which had been made to his father. The Lord pledged his word to be with him and to bless him in the land-which he certainly did, though Isaac did not feel so secure of the promised guardianship and ‘support as to be able to avoid falling into the snare which had also caught his father Abraham. When sojourning in the neighborhood of Gerar, during the prevalence of the famine, and no doubt observing the wickedness of the place, he had the weakness to call Rebekah his sister, in fear that the people might kill him on her account, if they knew her to be his wife. It does not appear that any violence was offered to Rebekah; and the Philistine king, on discovering, as he did, from the familiar bearing of Isaac towards Rebekah, that she must be his wife, simply rebuked him for having, by his prevarication, given occasion to a misapprehension which might have led to serious consequences (<sup>OLD</sup>Genesis 26:10).

No passage of his life has produced more reproach to Isaac’s character than this. Abraham’s conduct while in Egypt (ch. 12) and in Gerar (ch. 20), where he concealed the closer connection between himself and his wife, was imitated by Isaac in Gerar. On the one hand, this has been regarded by avowed adversaries of Christianity as involving the guilt of “lying and endeavoring to betray the wife’s chastity,” and even by Christians, undoubtedly zealous for truth and right, as the conduct of “a very poor, paltry earthworm, displaying cowardice, selfishness, readiness to put his wife in a terrible hazard for his own sake.” But, on the other hand, with more reverence, more kindness, and quite as much probability, Waterland, who is no indiscriminate apologist for the errors of good men, after a minute examination of the circumstances, concludes that the patriarch did “right to evade the difficulty so long as it could lawfully be evaded, and to await and see whether divine Providence might not, some way or other, interpose before the last extremity. The event answered. God did interpose” (*Scripture Vindicated, in Works, 4:188, 190*).

There is no improbability, as has been asserted, that the same sort of event should happen in rude times at different intervals, and, therefore, no reason for maintaining that these events have the same historical basis, ‘and are, in fact, the same event differently represented. Neither is it an unfair assumption that Abimelech was the common title of the kings of Gerar, as Pharaoh was of the kings of Egypt, or that it may have been the proper name of several kings in succession, as George has been of several English kings.

In all respects except this incident, Isaac's connection with the Philistine territory was every way creditable 'to himself, and marked with tokens of the divine favor. He cultivated a portion of ground, and in the same year reaped a hundred fold—a remarkable increase, to 'encourage him to abide under God's protection in Canaan. His flocks and herds multiplied exceedingly, so that he rose to the possession of very great wealth; he even became, on account of it, an object of envy to the Philistines, who could not rest till they drove him from their territory. He reopened the wells which his father had digged, and which the Philistines had meanwhile filled up, and himself dug several new ones, but they disputed with him the right of possession, and obliged him to withdraw from them one after another. Finally, at a greater distance, he dug a well, which he was allowed to keep unmolested; and in token of his satisfaction at 'the peace he enjoyed, he called it Rehoboth (*room*) (<sup><0252></sup>Genesis 25:22). Thence he returned to Beersheba, where the Lord again appeared to him, and gave him a fresh assurance of the covenant-blessing; and Abimelech, partly ashamed of the unkind treatment Isaac had received, and partly desirous of standing well with one who was so evidently prospering in his course, sent some of his leading men to enter formally into a covenant of peace with him. Isaac showed his meek and kindly disposition in giving courteous entertainment to the messengers, and cordially agreed to their proposal

It was probably a period considerably later still than even the latest of these transactions to which the next notice in the life of Isaac must be referred. This is the marriage of Esau to two of the daughters of Canaan (Judith and Bashemath), which is assigned to the fortieth year of Esau's life, coeval with Isaac's hundredth. These alliances were far from giving satisfaction to the aged patriarch; on the contrary, they were a grief of mind to him and his wife Rebekah (<sup><0263></sup>Genesis 26:36).

**6.** The last prominent event in the life of Isaac is the blessing of his sons (<sup><0270></sup>Genesis 27:1 sq.). B.C. 1927. It has been plausibly suggested (Browne, *Ordo Saeclorum*, p. 310) that the forebodings of a speedy demise (ver. 2) on the part of Isaac, whose health always appears to have been delicate (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.), may have arisen from the fact that his brother Ishmael died at the age he had just now reached (<sup><0257></sup>Genesis 25:17), although he himself survived this point for many years (<sup><0338></sup>Genesis 35:28). When old and dim of sight (which fails much sooner in Eastern countries than with us), supposing that the time of his departure was at hand, he called for his beloved son Esau, and sent him to "take some

venison” for him, and to make his favorite “savory meat,” that he might eat and “bless” him before his death. Esau prepared to obey his father’s will, and set forth to the field; but through the deceptions stratagem of Rebekah the ‘savory meat’ was provided before Esau’s return; and Jacob, disguised so as to resemble his hairy brother, imposed on his father, and obtained the blessing. Yet, on the discovery of the cheat, when Esau brought in to his father the dish he had prepared, Isaac, remembering no doubt the prediction that “the elder should: serve the younger,” and convinced that God intended the blessing for Jacob, would not, perhaps rather could not, reverse the solemn words he had uttered, but bestowed an inferior blessing on Esau (comp. <sup><3827></sup>Hebrews 12:17). *SEE EDOM*. This paternal blessing, if full, conveyed, as was usual, the right of headship in the family, together with the chief possessions. In the blessing which the aged patriarch pronounced on Jacob, it deserves notice how entirely the wished-for good is of an earthly and temporal nature, while the imagery which is employed serves to show the extent to which the poetical element prevailed as a constituent part of the Hebrew character (<sup><4027></sup>Genesis 27:27 sq.). Most natural, too, is the extreme agitation of the poor blind old man on discovering the cheat which had been put upon him. All the parties to this nefarious transaction were signally punished by divine Providence (comp. Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed*, p. 47). The entire passage is of itself enough to vindicate the historical character and entire credibility of those sketches of the lives of the patriarchs, which Genesis presents.

Yet Isaac’s tacit acquiescence in the conduct of his sons has been brought into discussion. Fairbairn (*Typology*, 1, 334) seems scarcely justified by facts in his conclusion that the later days of Isaac did not fulfill the promise of his earlier; that, instead of reaching to high attainments in faith, he fell into general feebleness and decay moral and bodily, and made account only of the natural element in judging of his sons. The inexact translation (to modern ears) of *dyæi* prey taken in hunting, by “venison” (<sup><4258></sup>Genesis 25:28), may have contributed to form, in the minds of English readers, a low opinion of Isaac. Nor can that opinion be supported by a reference to 27:4; for Isaac’s desire at such a time for savory meat may have sprung either from a dangerous sickness under which he was laboring (Blunt, *Undesigned Coincidences*, pt. 1, ch. 6), or from the same kind of impulse preceding inspiration as prompted Elisha (<sup><4301></sup>2 Kings 3:15) to demand the soothing influence of music before he spoke the word of the Lord. For sadness and grief are enumerated in the Gemara among the impediments to

the exercise of the gift of prophecy (Smith's *Select Discourses*, 6:245). The reader who bears in mind the peculiarities of Isaac's character will scarcely infer from those passages any fresh accession of mental or moral feebleness. Such a longing in an old man was innocent enough, and indicated nothing of a spirit of self-indulgence. It was an extraordinary case, too, and Kalisch sets it in its true light: "The venison is evidently like a sacrifice offered by the recipient of the blessing, and ratifying the proceedings; and hence Jacob killed and prepared two kids of the goats (verse 9), whereas, for an ordinary meal, one would have been more than sufficient; it imparted to the ceremony, in certain respects, the character of a covenant (comp. 21:27-30; 26:30; <sup><0202></sup>Exodus 12:2; 24:5-11, etc.); the one party showed ready obedience and sincere affection, while the other accepted the gift, and granted in return the whole store of happiness he was able to bequeath. Thus the meal which Isaac required has a double meaning, both connected with the internal organism of the book" (*Comms. on* <sup><0200></sup>*Genesis 27:1-4*).

**7.** The stealing, on the part of Jacob, of his father's blessing having angered Esau, who seems to have looked forward to Isaac's death as affording an opportunity for taking vengeance on his unjust brother, the aged patriarch is induced, at his wife's entreaty, to send Jacob into Mesopotamia, that, after his own example, his son might take a wife from among his kindred and people, "of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother" (<sup><0244></sup>Genesis 27:41-46). B.C. 1927. *SEE JACOB*.

This is the last important act recorded of Isaac. Jacob having, agreeably to his father's command, married into Laban's family, returned after some time, and found the old man at Mamre, in the city of Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned (<sup><0327></sup>Genesis 35:27). B.C. cir. 1898. Here, "being old and full of days" (180), Isaac gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered unto his people, and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him" (<sup><0328></sup>Genesis 35:28). B.C. 1883.

In the N.T. reference is made to the offering of Isaac (Heb. 11:17, and James 2, 21) and to his blessing his sons (Heb. 11:20). As the child of the promise, and as the progenitor of the children of the promise, he is contrasted with Ishmael (Rom. 9:7, 10; <sup><0428></sup>Galatians 4:28; Heb. 11:18). In our Lord's remarkable argument with the Sadducees, his history is carried beyond the point at which it is left in- the O.T., into and beyond the grave. Isaac, of whom it was said (<sup><0329></sup>Genesis 35:29) that he was gathered to his



people, is represented as still living to God (<sup><0718></sup>Luke 20:38, etc.); and by the ‘same divine authority he is proclaimed as an acknowledged heir of future glory (<sup><0181></sup>Matthew 8:11, etc.).

**II. His Character.** — Isaac, the gentle and dutiful son, the faithful and constant husband (see Becker, *De Isaaco*, etc., Greifsw. 1750), became the father of a house in which order did not reign. If there were any very prominent points in his character, they were not brought out by the circumstances in which he was placed. He appears less as a man of action than as a man of suffering, from which he is generally delivered without any direct effort of his own. Thus he suffers as the object of Ishmael’s mocking, of the intended sacrifice on Moriah, of the rapacity of the Philistines, and of Jacob’s stratagem. But the thought of his sufferings is effaced by the ever-present tokens of God’s favor; and he suffers with the calmness and dignity of a conscious heir of heavenly promises, without uttering any complaint, and generally without committing any action by which he would forfeit respect. Free from violent passions, he was a man of constant, deep, and tender affections. Thus he mourned for his mother till her place was filled by his wife. ‘His sons were nurtured at home till a late period of their lives; and neither his grief for Esau’s marriage, nor the anxiety in which he was involved in consequence of Jacob’s deceit, estranged either of them from his affectionate care. His life of solitary blamelessness must have been sustained by strong habitual piety, such as showed itself at the time of Rebekah’s barrenness (<sup><0251></sup>Genesis 25:21), in his special intercourse: with God at Gerar and Beersheba (<sup><0212></sup>Genesis 26:2, 23), in the solemnity with which he bestows his blessing and refuses to change it. His life, judged by a worldly standard, might seem inactive, ignoble, and unfruitful; but the “guileless years, prayers, gracious acts, and daily thank-offerings of pastoral life” are not to be so esteemed, although they make no show in history. Isaac’s character may not have exercised any commanding influence upon either his own or succeeding generations, but it was sufficiently marked and consistent to win respect and envy from his contemporaries. By his posterity his name is always joined in equal honor with those of Abraham and Jacob, and so it was even used as part of the formula which Egyptian magicians in the time of Origen (*Contra Celsun*, 1, 22) employed as efficacious to bind the daemons whom they adjured (comp. <sup><0134></sup>Genesis 31:42, 53).

If Abraham’s enterprising, unsettled life foreshadowed the early history of his descendants; if Jacob was a type of the careful, commercial, unwarlike



character of their later days, Isaac may represent the middle period, in which they lived apart from nations, and enjoyed possession of the fertile land of promise. (See Kalisch, *Genesis* ad loc.)

**III.** The *typical view* of Isaac is barely referred to in the N.T., but it is drawn out with minute particularity by Philo and those interpreters of Scripture who were influenced by Alexandrian philosophy. Thus in Philo, Isaac (laughter the most exquisite enjoyment--the soother and cheerer of peace-loving souls) is foreshadowed in the facts that his father had attained 100 years (the perfect number) when he was born, and that he is specially designated as given to his parents by God. His birth from the mistress of Abraham's household symbolizes happiness proceeding from predominant wisdom. His attachment to one wife (Rebekah =perseverance) is contrasted with Abraham's multiplied connections, and with Jacob's toil-won wives, as showing the superiority of Isaac's heaven-born, self-sufficing wisdom to the accumulated, knowledge of Abraham and the painful experience of Jacob. In the intended sacrifice. of Isaac, Philo sees only a sign (laughter =rejoicing is, the prerogative of God, and is a fit offering to him) that God gives back to obedient man as much happiness as is good for him. Clement of Rome (ch. 31), with characteristic soberness, merely refers to Isaac as an example of faith in God. In Tertullian he is a pattern of monogamy, and a type of Christ bearing the cross. But Clement of Alexandria finds an allegorical meaning in the incidents which connect Abimelech with Isaac and Rebekah (<sup>0238</sup>Genesis 26:8), as well as in the offering of Isaac. In this latter view he is followed by Origen, and by Augustine, and by Christian expositors generally. The most minute particulars of that transaction are invested with a spiritual meaning by such writers as Rabanus Maurus, in *Genesis* § 3. Abraham is made a type of the first person in the blessed Trinity, Isaac of the second; the two servants dismissed are the Jewish sects who did not attain to a perception of Christ in his humiliation; the ass bearing the wood is the Jewish nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God which they failed to understand; the three days are the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations; the ram is Christ on the cross; the thicket they who placed him there. Modern English writers hold firmly the typical significance of the transaction, without extending it into such detail (see Pearson, *On the Creed*, 1, 243, 251, edit. 1843; Fairbairn's *Typology*, 1, 332). A recent writer (A. Jukes, *Types of Genesis*), who has shown much ingenuity in attaching a spiritual meaning to the characters and incidents in the book of Genesis, regards

Isaac as representing the spirit of sonship, in a series in which Adam represents human nature, Cain the carnal mind, Abel the spiritual, Noah regeneration, Abraham the spirit of faith, Jacob the spirit of service, Joseph suffering or glory. With this series may be compared the View of Ewald (*Gesch.* 1, 387-400), in which the whole patriarchal family is a prefigurative group, comprising twelve members with seven distinct modes of relation:

1. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, respectively personifying active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles, distinguished from the rest as Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses among the heroes of the Iliad, or as the Trojan Anchises, Aeneas, and Ascanius, and mutually related as Romulus, Remus, and Numa;
2. Sarah, with Hagar, as mother and mistress of the household,
3. Isaac as child;
4. Isaac with Rebekah as the type of wedlock (comp. his *Alterthümer.* p. 233);
5. Leah and Rachel the plurality of coequal wives;
6. Deborah as nurse (compare Anna and Caieta, E12. 4:654, and 7:1)  
—
7. Eliezer as steward, whose office is compared to that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

**IV. Traditions.** — Jewish legends represent Isaac as an angel made before the world, and descending to earth in human form (Origen, in *Johann.* 2, § 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud.* 1, 343, 864). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Shem (Jarchi, *on Genesis* 25). The ordinance of evening prayer is ascribed to him (<sup><0246></sup>Genesis 24:63), as that of morning prayer to Abraham (<sup><0197></sup>Genesis 19:27), and night prayer to Jacob (<sup><0281></sup>Genesis 28:11) (Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jsd.* 1, 483).

The Arabian traditions included in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, a righteous person inspired with grace to do good works, observe prayer, and give alms (ch. 21), endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, 'children, and- wealth (ch. 19). The promise of Isaac and the offering of

Isaac are also mentioned (~~GEN~~Genesis 11:38). Faith in a future resurrection is ascribed to Abraham: but it is connected, not, as in Heb. 11:19, with the offering of Isaac, but with a fictitious miracle (chap. 2). Stanley mentions a curious tradition of the reputed jealousy of Isaac's character that prevails among the inhabitants of Hebron respecting the grave of Rebekah (*Jewish Church*, 1, 496 sq.). (On the notices of Isaac in the Talmud, see Otho's *Lex. Talm.* p. 133; Hamburger, *Real-Encyklop. Bible u. Talmud*, p. 612 sq.; for the notices in the Koran, see Hottinger's *Hist. Orient.* p. 25, 52). See Boucher, *History of Isaac* (Lond. 1864). For older treatises, see Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* col. 190.

### Isaac, bishop of Langres

France, is supposed to have been present at the Council of Kiersy in 840, as deacon of Laon. After the death of Theutbalde, Wulfade seized the bishopric of Langres in spite of all opposing canons; but Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, declared against him, and Charles the Bald compelled him to flee. Hilduin, lay abbot of St. Denis, then proposed Isaac as bishop, and by his influence caused him to be appointed. Isaac was ordained bishop of Langres about 856. We afterwards find his name in the councils of Toul and Langres (859), of Tousy (860), of Pistes (862), of Verberie, and of Soissons (866) —an evidence that he had gained great consideration and influence. His mildness caused him to be surnamed *bonus*, and the martyrology of the Church of Dijon praises him highly. A lasting monument of his efforts to effect a reform among the monastic orders is his work on *Canons*, published by Sirmond, *Conciles*, vol. 3; Labbe, *Concil.* etc.; Baluze, *Capitdlaire*, vol. 2. See *Gallia Christ.* vol. 5, col. 533; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 5, 528; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 26:4. (J. N. P.)

### Isaac the Syrian (A),

with the surname of *Doctor* or *Magnus*, because of his ability as an ecclesiastical writer, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was, in all probability, a native of Syria. He was at first a monk in a convent not far from Gabala, in Phoenicia, and afterwards became a priest at Antioch. He died about 456. He wrote several theological pamphlets in Syriac (and perhaps also in Greek), directed chiefly against the Nestorians and Eutychians. A work on the *Contempt of the World* would be considered as his chief claim to reputation, but the authorship of this book is not at all

well established. It is by some supposed to have been written by the other *Isaac the Syrian* (see next art.). There seem to be better grounds for considering him as the author of the treatise *De Cogitationibus*, the Greek text of which, together with a Latin translation, can be found in the *Ascetica* of Petrus Possinus. The library of the Vatican contains some other MS. works of Isaac. He is honored as a saint both by the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria. See Gennadius, *De Script. Eccles.*; Cave, *Hist. Litteraria*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 11:214; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 26:3; Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1991.

### Isaac the Syrian (B),

generally with the surname of *Ninivita*, an ecclesiastical writer of the 6th century, became bishop of Nineveh, but afterwards resigned his office to enter a convent, of which he was subsequently chosen abbot. He died towards the close of the 6th, century. He is generally, and, as it seems, justly considered as the author of the treatise *De Contemptu Mundi, de' Operatione coporali et sui Abjectione Liber*, which may be found in the *Orthodoxographi* (second edition, Basle, 1569), *Bibliotheca Patrum* (of Cologne, vol. 6), *Bibliotheca Patrum* (of Paris, vol. 5), *Bibliotheca novissima* (of Lyons, vol. 11), and in Galland, *Bibliotheca Patrum* (vol. 12). All these collections contain a Greek text with a Latin translation, yet the former appears itself to be a translation from the Syriac. There are twenty-seven ascetic sermons of his in Greek (MSS in the Vienna Library) and some homilies (MSS in the Bodleian Library). See Cave, *Hist. Liter.*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 11:215; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 26:4; Jicher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1991.

### Isaac Aboab

a Spanish Jew of some distinction as a commentator and preacher, was born, according to Gratz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 8, 225), in 1433, and succeeded the celebrated Isaac of Campanton as gaon of Castile. He died in 1493. Aboab wrote, besides super commentaries to the commentaries of Rashi and Nachmani, [דברי חיים \[it/Fvæor Dissertations on a Part of the Talnjudic Tract Janm-Tob](#) (Beza), edited by Jedidja Galante (Venice, 1608; Wilmersdorf, 1716):-- [^/vyPæhi\]](#) or *Homilies, with free Use of the Hagadah*, edited by Gershom Soncini (Constantinople, 1538, 4to; Zolkiew, 1806, 4to). There are a number of other works that have frequently been attributed to the pen of this Isaac, which Dr. Zunz assigns, as Gratz

believes very properly, to another Isaac Aboab, who flourished about 1300-1320. Among these, the most important, which Furst (*Bibliotheca Judaica*, 1, 4 sq.) assigns to the present Isaac, is *r/aMhi t r/nm*] a hagadic or ethical treatise on the Talmud and Midrashim, in seven sections (published at Venice, 1544, fol., and several times later; also with a Heb. commentary by Frankfurter, Amsterd. 1701, 8vo; and by others with Spanish, Hebrew, German, and High-German translations at different times and places). (J. H.W.)

### Isaac Albalag

a Jewish philosopher of some note, flourished in Spain during the latter half of the 13th century. He was a contemporary of the celebrated Falaquera, and, like him, well versed in Arabian philosophy. Albalag possessed greater natural endowments than Falaquera, but, wanting that independence of mind which made the latter so justly celebrated, he failed to take as prominent a position. He died about 1294. About 1292 he edited and improved Alghazali's *Makasid Alphilsapha*, under the title of *t/[yhi* *WQTæ* a part of it has been published by Schorr in *Chaluz*, 4 (1859) and 6 (1861). See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7, 252 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Isaac Argyrus

a Greek monk who flourished in the latter half of the 14th century at Aeneus, in Thracia, wrote about 1373, when he is said to have been at the age of sixty, *Computus Graecorum de solemnitate pascha, tis celebrandi*, published in Greek and Latin by J. Christmann (Heidelberg, 1611, 4to), and inserted by Dionysius Petavius in his *De Doctrina temporum* (3, 359). He is also supposed to be the author of a work still in MS. form on astronomy. Of Isaac's personal history but little is clearly known. — Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2. 1984; Mosheim. *Eccl. Hist.* bk. 3, cent. 14, pt. 2, ch. 2. (J. H.W.)

### Isaac ben-Abba-Mare

a Jewish exponent of the Talmud, was born at Bourg des St. Gilles, France, in 1139. His father was an officer under the government of the count of Toulouse, and afforded Isaac every opportunity for distinction, but he early devoted himself to the study of the Talmud under the celebrated Rabbi Tam of Rameru. When only seventeen years old he prepared a compendium of certain ritualistic laws of the Jews, in which he evinced thorough familiarity with the Talmud. He also wrote a commentary

on one of the most difficult parts of the Talmud, and finally collected all his investigations on the Jewish traditions under the title of *רמב"ם* (probably in 1179). It was incompletely published by Josef ben-Saruk (Ven. 1608; and since then, Warsaw, 1801). See Gratz, *Gesch. l. Juden*, 6:244; Furst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 2, 137. (J. H.W.)

### Isaac ben-Abraham

a distinguished Jewish Rabbi of the Karaitic sect, was born at Trock, near Wilna (Lithuania) about 1533. He is especially celebrated as the author of a work against Christianity, entitled *חזקוני* (*Chizzuk Amunah* (*munimem fidei*) written in 1593. It is divided into two parts: the first, containing fifty chapters, consists of an apology for Judaism, and a general attack on the Christian faith; the second contains a critical examination of a hundred passages of the N.T., intended by the writer to refute the proofs adduced by Christians from the Old Test. It is considered, next to the productions of Duran (q.v.), the ablest work ever written by any Jew against the Christian religion. It was first published by Wagenseil, with a Latin translation, in the *Tela ignea Satance* (Altdorf, 1682, 4to), from a MS. obtained from an African Jew, which, as Gratz asserts, was imperfect. The Hebrew text was afterwards reprinted by the Jews (Amsterdam, 1705, 12mo), and by Gousset, with a Latin translation and a refutation (Amst. 1712, fol.). Wolf in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, gives a supplement and variation, said to be derived from a more perfect MS. than the one at Wagenseil's command. But the best edition is held to be that of Rabbi Deutsch (Sohrau, 1865). It was also translated into (German Hebrew (Amst. 1717, 8vo); into 'German by Gebling, and into Spanish by Is. Athia. Among the works written in answer to it. which deserve especial mention, besides those named above, are J. Miller, *Confutatio libri Chizuk Emuna* (Hamb. 1644,4to); Gebhard, *Cents loca Novi Testamenti vindicata adversus Chizuk Emuna* (Greifswald, 1699, 4to); J. P. Storr, *Evangelische Glaubenslehre gegen d. Werk Chizuk Emuna* (Tub. 1703, 8vo); K. Kidder, *Demonstrat. Of the Messiah* (Lond. 1684/1700, 3 pts. 8vo). Isaac ben-Abraham died about 1594. See Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; Bartolucci, *Magna Biblio. Rabbisn.*; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:490 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*. 26, 10; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 139. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Abraham Akrish

a Jewish writer of considerable note, was born about 1489, in Spain; the name of the place is not known to us. He was lame on both feet, but this maimed condition by no means prevented him from acquiring great learning; nay, he even traveled extensively, and enjoyed the reputation of a great scholar. When yet a boy, the persecutions of the Jews by the Spaniards obliged him to leave his native land (1492), and he removed to Naples. But also here he and his coreligionists were sorely tried by persecution, and again he fled; this time from country to country “whose languages he did not understand, and whose inhabitants spared neither the aged nor the young,” until he finally found a home in the house of a banished coreligionist in far-off Egypt. After a stay of some ten years he removed to Palestine, and finally settled in Turkey, where he was honored with the instruction of one of the princes of the realm. He died after 1577. His works are רצבמ] /q, or *on Jewish Reign during the Exile*; containing (1) the correspondence of Chasdai ben-Isaac with Jusuf, the king of the Chassars; (2) סרP;myBawD;tybhcēni or *History of the House of David during the reign of the Persians*; also the history of Bastanai, etc. (Constant. 15 , 8vo; Basle, 1589, 8vo; and with a work of Farisaolo, Offenb. 1720, 12mo). See *Gratz Gesch. d. Juclei*, 9, 10 sq., 420 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Isaac ben-Calonymos

SEE NATHAN.

## Isaac ben-Elia ben-Samuel

a Jewish commentator who flourished in the beginning of the 18th century, deserves our notice as the author of

(1.) *A Commentary on the Psalms*, published at Dyrhensfurt, under the title of μydgμ yfwql μ[ μyl ht, *the Psalms with a valuable catena* (1728), consisting of excerpts from the celebrated expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, etc., giving also an abridgment of Alsheich’s commentary, entitled l a twmmwr, and a German explanation of the difficult words.

(2.) *A Commentary on Proverbs*, entitled yl çm μydgμ yfwql μx, *Proverbs with a valuable catena* (Wandsbeck, 1730-31), composed of



excerpts from the expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, Ibn Ezra, Levi b. — Gershon, Salomon b. — Melech, giving also a German explanation of the difficult expressions, and an abridgment of Alsheich's exposition called **μνννρ bwr**; and

(3.) *A Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons from the Prophets*, entitled **qj xy ynp**, *the face of Isaac* (Wandsbeck, 1730), which consists of excerpts from nine of the most distinguished commentators, viz. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, D. Kimchi, Levi b. — Gershon, Abrabanel, Alsheich, Samuel b. — Laniado, J. Arama, and Joseph Albo. The works of Isaac b Elia are very valuable, inasmuch as they enable the Biblical student to see on one page the expositions of the best and most famous Jewish commentators on every difficult passage, without being obliged to search for them in inaccessible and costly volumes. — Kitto, *Biblical Cyclopaedia*, 2, 410.

### Isaac ben-Gikatilla

*SEE IBN-GIKATILLA.*

### Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi or Alcalai

one of the most distinguished Talmudical scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cala-Hammad near Fez, in Africa, about 1013. It had been the custom among Jewish Rabbis to follow in the interpretation of the Talmud the decisions of the Gaonim, and thus direct inquiry and independence of thought had well nigh become not only obsolete, but even impossible. But when Alfasi had become sufficiently familiar with the Talmudic writings to make his voice heard among his Jewish brethren, he evinced such an independence of thought, and a mind of such penetration, that he was soon acknowledged not only on Africa's shore, but even on the other side of the sea, by Spain's Jewish savans, as one of the ablest interpreters of their tradition. A work which he published at this time, **t/kl hñirpseor** *the Halacha's of the whole Talmud*, intended as a Talmudical compendium (published at Cracow, 1597, 8vo; Basle, 1602, 8vo), which has preserved its authority even to the present day, still farther increased his renown. During a time of persecution (1088), being obliged to flee his native country, he sought refuge in Cordova, and there he was received with great honor. But his distinction as a Talmudist, and the kind offices of his Spanish brethren. seem to have annoyed some of the more distinguished Rabbis of Spain. A controversy, into which he was unwillingly drawn, with Ibn-Gia



and Ibn-Albalda, became especially severe. After the death of Ibn-Gia, he removed to Lucena, and was there appointed the successor of his former opponent. But his controversy with Ibn-Albaida continued until the death of the latter (1094), when Alfasi adopted a son of Ibn-Albalda, and made him one of his most faithful adherents. He died in 1103. A list of the different editions of his works may be found in First, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 1, 34 sq. See Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:76 sq., 92 sq.; Munk, *Notice sur Aboulwealid*, p. 4 sq.; Pinsker, *Likute Kadnonijot*, text No. 210, and note X. (J. H. W.)

### Isaac ben-Jehudah.

*SEE IBN-GIATH.*

### Isaac ben-Joseph

called also ISAAC DE CORBEL, was born in Corbeil. a city in France, towards the beginning of the 13th century, and died in 1280 according to Rossi (Jachia-Ghedalia and Abraham Zakuth say, the one 1240, the other 1270). He is the author of the celebrated work entitled *הל' /ג ידממ' i* *Ammudey Goleh* (Constantinople, 1510, 4to; Cremona, 1557, 4to; and with glosses by Perez ben-Elia, and indications of the passages quoted from the Bible and the Talmud, Cracow, 1596, 4to). This work is taken from the *ת/xינאפסד דג* (*Sepher Mitzvoth Gadol*) of Moses of Coucy, and is known also by the name of *Semak* (from the initials of the three Hebrew words *Sepher Mitzvoth Katon*). It contains a synopsis of the precepts of the Jewish religion. It is divided into seven parts, each containing regulations for one day of the week. Isaac wrote it in 1277, at the request of the French Jews, who desired to have a clear and convenient manual to guide them in matters pertaining to their religion. It is also known under the Latin title of *Columnae captivitatis*, and still more frequently as the *Liber Preceptorum parvus*. Several other copies of it were made by French as well as German Rabbis. Jekutiel Salmon ben-Mose, of Posen, made a compendium of the work (Cracow, 1579, 4to). See Bartolocci, *Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.*; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraica*; Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; First, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 1, 186; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:131; Jost, *Gesch. l. Judenthums*, 3, 33. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Juda (Abrabanel)

SEE ABRABANEL.

## Isaac ben-Latif or Allatif

a Jewish philosopher of some note, was born about 1270, somewhere in the southern part of Spain. Of his early history scarcely anything is now known. But some of his works have been preserved, and from notices of distinguished contemporaries we learn that he was inclined to favor the Cabalists (q.v.). He is highly spoken of by the Rabbins of his day, but evidently, judging from his works, was rather two-sided on all cabalistic points, so that he may most appropriately be said to have stood "with one foot in philosophy, and with the other in the Cabala." He died some time in the first half of the 14th century. Of his works are printed **tl hq l [i** **VWlrPea** *Commentary on Kohelet* (Constantinople, 1554, 8vo): — **r/Mhi r/rx]** and **μl /[h; trWx**, a *Cosmology* (Vien. 1862, edited by S. Stem):- — **μyæW/hir [vi**, a work on Dogmatics, Religious Philosophy, and the Physical Sciences, in 4 parts:-- **μda; t/dl ]T sēa** *History of Man*; etc. See Gratz, *Geschied. d. Juden*, 7:220 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. fudenthums*, 3:80; Sachs, *Kerem Chemed*, 8:88 sq.; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2, 224. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Mose

SEE PROFIAT DURAN.

## Isaac ben-Moses

also called AVOJI, who flourished in the latter half of the 16th century, deserves our notice as the author of

(1.) a *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled **l a t/mwj nt**, or *Consolations of God* (Saloniki, 1578-9); and

(2.) a *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, entitled **tl hq l yhqm**, or *the Gatherer of the Congregation* (ibid 1597), which are both valuable contributions to the exegetical literature of the O.T. Scriptures. See Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 410; Steinschneider, *Cathol. Lib. Hebr in Biblioth. Bod.* col. 1139.

## Isaac ben-Schescheth

(*Barfat*), one of the most distinguished Rabbis of the 14th century, was born about 1310, at or near Saragossa (Spain). He presided over the congregation at Saragossa for a number of years, and when, in 1391, the persecutions instituted against the Jews made it impossible for him to remain, he removed to Algiers, where he continued to hold a like position until his death, about 1444, and appointed as his successor the celebrated Simon ben-Simach Duran (q.v.). He was especially celebrated for his thorough acquaintance with Jewish tradition. Not only from all parts of Spain, but from the different parts of Europe, he was constantly invited to express his opinion on the meaning of obscure Talmudical passages. These were collected, and form a very important source for the study of the interpretation of the Talmud, and convey at the same time a pretty accurate idea of the state of the Jews in his day, not only in Spain and Algiers, but in France and even other countries as well. His works are *t/bWvj* *¶ t/l aæ* a collection of *Halachoth* (edited by Samuel Levi in 2 parts, Constantinople, 1547, fol. and often): — *hr/Thil* [*iPæor Commentary on the Pentateuch*, with notes from the Talmud:-- *µyvWj* *æ* also a work on the Talmud. The latter two, we think, still remain in MS. form. See Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:33 sq., 109 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3, 87; Furst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 2, 145. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Suleiman

(*Salomo*) Israeli, a Jewish philosopher and philologist, was born in Egypt about 845. He was a physician by profession, and as such attained to very high distinction, serving from 904 to his death at Kairuan, as private physician to the reigning prince, and celebrated as the author of several medical works valuable even in our day.' But also as philologist and philosopher he attained great notoriety, more particularly as the author of a philosophical commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating of the Creation, of which, however, only a part is now extant. It bore the title of *Sefer Jezirah*, whence the error that he wrote a commentary on the book *Jezirah*. He died about 940. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, 282 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac Blitz

SEE JEKUTHIEL BEN-ISAAC.

## Isaac Campanton

*SEE KAMPANTON.*

## Isaac, Daniel

a prominent Methodist minister, commonly designated as the Wesleyan “Polemic Divine,” was born at Caythorpe, in the county of Lincoln, England, July 7, 1778. He was early devoted to books, and, on his conversion in his nineteenth year, he at once determined to devote his life to the work of the Christian ministry. In 1800 he joined the Conference on probation, supplying at this time a vacancy on Grimsby Circuit. He soon rose to great distinction among his brethren in the ministry, and was appointed to some of the most prominent charges at the command of his denomination. May 20, 1832, while in Manchester preaching in behalf of the Sunday-school work, he was seized with paralysis, from the effects of which he never recovered. At the session of the next Conference he was present, and believed himself sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon active work, and was appointed to York Circuit, an old and favorite circuit, to which he was now sent for the third time. But he began to fail fast, and died in the midst of his work, March 21, 1834. Speaking of the abilities of Daniel Isaac, the Rev. Samuel Dunn says: “He was an independent thinker, acute reasoner, formidable opponent, dexterous polemic, sound theologian, striking, instructive, extemporaneous preacher, perspicuous writer, generous benefactor, faithful friend, and amiable Christian. His intellect was original, subtle, analogical, penetrating, clear, strong. His manner was deliberate, grave, conversational, pointed, humorous, sarcastic, ironical. The sagacious Henry Moore remarked: ‘Daniel Isaac, like Paul; reasoned with his hearers out of the Scriptures; and he kept in them, never went out of them, and never reasoned himself out of them.’ If at any time he drew a smile from his hearers, he would maintain the utmost gravity. He displayed great power in grappling with the conscience, and in bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. Of the ludicrous he had a marvelous perception, and could present an object in such a light as to excite the indignation or the loathing of those who before admired it. He painted from life. Many hearers were disgusted with their own likeness as they saw it in the clear mirror he held before them. He was never declamatory or ornate. In debate he was remarkably cool, calm, collected, keen, argumentative, and close. There was no trembling hesitancy, quibbling, or artifice. He engaged in no sham fight; never brandished the sword at a distance, but came at once to

close quarters, grappled with his opponent, pierced his vitals, and took from him his armor." But the great strength of Daniel Isaac lay in his pen, and he wielded it with especial ability in matters of controversy. His works are, — *Universal Restoration* (N. Y. 1830, 12mo), in which he meets the objections of the Universalists to the eternity of punishment: — *Sermons on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Lond. 1815): — *Ecclesiastical Claims* (Lond. 1816), the views of which his Conference disapproved, but to which, in a reply, he steadfastly adhered.. Dr. George Smith (*History of Wesleyan Methodism*, 3, 7) says of this work and the action of the Conference: "In many important respects the work does great credit to the author's industry and research. It contains the most convincing proofs, from Scripture and history, of the groundless character and the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the ministerial order by Papists and High-Churchmen, and clearly shows the contradictions, impieties, and absurdities to which the admission of these claims must inevitably lead. But in doing this, Mr. Isaac went so far as to impugn the scriptural position of the Christian ministry as held by Wesley and the Methodist people. Nor. is this the only serious defect in the work; some passages therein are grossly indelicate and irreverent, if not, indeed, profane (from this charge, however, it should be said, others seek to free Mr. Isaac); while, as stated in the resolution of the Conference, its 'general spirit and style' are decidedly improper.... The case is greatly to be regretted. Mr. Isaac's ability, energy, and sterling worth are fully admitted, and it is equally clear to our judgment, from a careful perusal of the work, that the Conference were not only justified in adopting the course they pursued, but were compelled to pursue it by the circumstances of the case." His next work was published whilst he was stationed at Leicester, and on terms the most friendly with Robert Hall, the celebrated Baptist minister. It was entitled *Baptism Discussed*. This volume Hall would never read; but, when urged to do it by his friends, he remarked, in good temper, "If he has exposed our views of baptism as he exposed the Episcopalians in his *Ecclesiastical Claims*, the Lord have mercy upon us." Isaac also wrote pamphlets against the use of instrumental music in the house of God, and on the Leeds organ discussions. He edited the *Life* of his father, *Memoirs of the Rev. John Strawe*, and published sketches of the *Lives of Robert Bolton, John Corbett*, — and other old Divines. In 1826 he began, at the instigation of the Rev. Samuel Dunn, a work on the *Atonement*, which made its appearance a few years after.' His works were edited after his death by the venerable John Burdsall, and published at London (1828, in 3 vols. 8vo).

See Everett, *Polemic Divine, or Memoirs, etc., of Rev. Dan. Isaac* (Lond. 1839); Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 3:482 sq. (J.H.W.)

### Isaac Ibn-Albalia

a Jewish writer of great distinction, was born at Cordova. about 1035. He manifested at an early age superior talents and great thirst for learning. Besides the study of the Talmud, and of philosophy, he was eager for the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of astronomy and the mathematical sciences, and when thirty years old began a commentary on the most difficult parts of the Talmud, under the title *Kupat ha-Rochelim*. but it was so extensive a work that he did not live long enough to complete it. He also attempted an astronomical work on the principle of the Jewish mode of calculating the calendar, under the title *Ibbur* (about 1065). Becoming a favorite of the reigning prince of Spain, he was honored with the distinguished position of nasi and grand rabbi of the Jews of that domain. , He died about 1094. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:72. (J. H. W.)

### Isaac Ibn-Giat

SEE IBN-GIAT.

### Isaac Israeli ben-Josef

a very distinguished' Jewish writer who flourished at Toledo in the first half of the- 14th century (1300-1340), deserves our notice as the author of **μl / [ d/sy]** or *The Foundation of the World*, a masterly production on Jewish chronology, including also the entire field of the science of astronomy, both theoretically and practically delineated (Berlin, 1777, 4to; and a better edition, *ibid.* 1848, 4to). This work, of which a part of the MS. has been preserved, was written about 1310 at the express wish of Israeli's teacher, Asher ben-Jechiel. He also compiled tables of Jewish chronology under the title of **hl BQhiddse** (Zolkiew, 1805, 8vo, et el.). See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:290; Carmoly, *Itinéraires*, p. 224; B. Goldberg, *Isaac Israeli* (in the *Lib. d. Or.* 1845), c. 433-435; Furst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 2, 150. (J. H.W.)

### Isaac Levita, or Johann Isaac Levi

as he called himself after his change from Judaism, one of the most celebrated Jewish savans of the 16th century, was born at Wetzlar in 1515.

He was thoroughly prepared by his friends for the Rabbinical 'office, and filled it for years with great distinction but, becoming impressed with the truthfulness of the Christian interpretation of the Messianic predictions, he and his son both, after a careful and extended study of the prophecies, forsook the faith of their forefathers, and joined the Roman Catholic Church. Some Jewish writers have attributed this course to a desire for promotion in literary circles, which as a Jew were closed to him. But there is no reason to believe it other than the result of association with Christians, and the study of the writings of Christian commentators on the prophecies, especially of Isaiah (more particularly chapter 53), which is said first to have led him to a study of the Messianic predictions. After his conversion (1546) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the city of Liwen, and in 1551 was called to a like position in the University of Cologne. He became a vigorous defendant of the Hebrew text of the Bible, and replied to Lindanus, who had attacked it, (in his *De optimo Scripturas interpretandi genere*, Cologne, 1538), in a work entitled *Defensio Veritatis Hebrew sacrarum scripturarum* (Col. 1559). He published also the following works on Hebrew grammar, which rank among the best in' that language:

(1.) *An Introduction to the Hebrew Grammar, and to the Art of Writing a pure Hebrew style*, entitled רפֿך ירמא אבמ (Colon. 1553), in which he gave different specimens of Hebrew writing, dialogues, and epistles, both from the O.T. and other Hebrew writings, as well as the books of Obadiah and Jonah in Hebrew, with a Latin translation:--

(2.) A grammatical treatise entitled *Me meditationes Hebraicae in Arten Grammn. per integrum librum Ruth explicatce; adjuncta sunt quaedam contra D. 1. Forsteri lexicon* (Colon. 1558), which consists of a useful analysis and excellent translation of the entire book of Ruth:

(3.) *Notae in Clenardi Tabulam*, etc. (Colon. 1555), being annotations on Clenard's Tables of Hebrew Grammar.

(4.) An excellent introduction to the edition of Elias Levita's Chaldee Lexicon, entitled ןmgrwtm, (Colon. 1560). He likewise translated several scientific works written by Jews into Latin, and was an assistant to Pagnini on his great lexicological work. See Bartolucci, *Bibl. Rabb.*; Jocher, *Gelehkt. Lex. Addenda*, 2, 2332 sq.; Rivet, *Isagoge ad Sacr. Script.*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Cor.* 26, 10; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.*, 2, 410.

## Isaac Pulgar

*SEE PULGAR.*

## Isaac “the Blind”

a Jewish writer of the 13th century (from 1190-1210), is noted as the reputed author of the modern cabalistic system. *SEE CABALA*. Some writers, as is well known, assert that the Cabala originated with him, but this is doubted by the best authorities, and he is considered only to have been the first to give a new impulse to the study of this peculiar philosophical system, to oppose the inroads of Maimonides’s (q.v.) philosophical interpretation of the Scriptures. It ‘is certain, at least, that he had much to do with one of ‘the mystical books of the Cabala, the *Jezirah*. His theories were further developed after his death by his two disciples Ezra and Azariel of Zerona. Gratz (*Gesch. d Julden*, 7, 74 sq., 444 sq.) seems inclined to favor the assertion of Joseph Ibn-Gikatilla, that the Cabala system was the production of Isaac the Blind, and that neither the sacred Scriptures nor Jewish tradition bear any reference to prove its earlier existence. (J. H. W.)

## Isaacus

*SEE ISAAC LEVITA.*

## Isabella Of Castille

queen of Spain, one of the most celebrated characters of the 15th century, deserves our notice on account of the part she acted in the religious history of Spain, and those dominions subject to her rule. Isabella, born April 22, 1451, was the daughter of John II, king of Castile and Leon. In 1469 she married Ferdinand V, surnamed “the Catholic,” king of Aragon. She was not the heir-apparent to the throne on the death of her father in 1481, am she had an elder sister. But, assisted by the powerful armies of her husband, a man of some sterling qualities, but of very little conscience, she succeeded in ascending the throne. Mr. Piesscott and most modern historians seek to relieve her of the stigma that she was responsible for the cruelties that were inflicted on those of her subjects who chose to differ with the Church of Rome in their worship of their divine Maker. ‘It seems certain that she was deceived by the Jesuits, and consented to these outrages only because, in her fervor for the Roman Catholic cause, she



believed the very existence of the Church of Rome threatened; and, though we pity her weakness in the hour when resoluteness on her part was most needed to defend and protect her subjects, she saw that, Spain once reformed, Romanism would have passed from the world in the 16th century, instead of still lingering in our midst at this late hour. But if we excuse the conduct of queen Isabella of Castile on the ground of her piety and misled devotion to the Church of Rome, quite otherwise must we treat the conduct of her husband. He it is upon whom must fall the guilt of the outrages committed in the name of God in Spain and other lands under her dominion by the “Holy League.” It was the desire of money, the longing for power, and extension of his government to the American shore that made him the docile follower of the Jesuits, and brought ruin upon Spain. But he was well rewarded for his low and parsimonious conduct by the disturbances which followed the death of Isabella (Nov. 26, 1504) in Castile, and his expulsion from that country, over which, by the will of his departed wife, he had been appointed regent. *SEE SPAIN.* (J. H. W.)

## Isagogics

*SEE INTRODUCTION.*

## Isai’ah

(prop. Heb. *Yeshayah’*, *hy[ʹy]* saved by *Jehovah*; but this shorter form occurs, with reference to this person, only in the Rabbinic title of the book; the text always has the name in the paragogic form — *Yeshaya’hu*, *Why[ʹy]*, Sept., Josephus, and N.T. Ἡσαΐας, Vulg. *Isaias*; Auth. Vers. N.T. “Esaias:” but the Heb. name, both in the simple and prolonged forms, occurs of other persons likewise, although differently Anglicized in the Eng. Vers.; *SEE JESHAIAH*; *SEE JESAJAH*), one of the most important of “the Greater Prophets,” who gave title to one of the books of Scripture.

**I.** *Personal History of the Prophet.* — Little is known respecting the circumstances of Isaiah’s life. Kimchi (A.D. 1230) says in his commentary on <sup><2000></sup>Isaiah 1:1, “We know not his race, nor of what tribe he was.” His father’s name was Amoz (<sup><2000></sup>Isaiah 1:1), whom the fathers of the Church confound with the prophet Amos, because they were unacquainted with Hebrew, and in Greek the two names are spelled alike (so Clem. Alex.; Jerome, *Prce. in Amn.*; August. *Civ. D.* 18, 27). See-Amoz. The opinion of the Rabbins (Gemara, *Megilla*, 10:2) that Isaiah was the brother of king

Amaziah rests also on a mere etymological combination (see Carpzov, *De regis Jesuice natalibus*, Rost. 1735). Isaiah resided at Jerusalem, not far from the Temple (ch. 6). We learn from ch. 7 and 8 that he was married. Two of his sons are mentioned, Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hashbaz. These significant names, which he gave to his sons, prove how much Isaiah lived in his vocation. He did not consider his children as belonging merely to himself, but rendered them living admonitions to the people. In their names were contained the two chief points of his prophetic utterances: one recalled to mind the severe and inevitable judgment wherewith the Lord was about to visit the world, and especially his people; the other, which signifies “The remnant shall return,” pointed out the mercy with which the Lord would receive the elect, and with which, in the midst of apparent destruction, he would take care to preserve his people and his kingdom. Isaiah calls his wife a *prophetess*. This indicates that his marriage-life was not only consistent with his vocation, but that it was intimately interwoven with it. This name cannot mean the wife of a prophet, but indicates ‘that the prophetess of Isaiah had a prophetic gift, like Miriam, Deborah’ and Huldah. The appellation here given denotes the suitableness as well as genuineness of their conjugal relation.

Even the dress of the prophet was subservient to his vocation. According to 20:2, he ‘Wore a garment of haircloth or sackcloth. This seems also to have been the costume of Elijah, according to 2 Kings 1,.8; and it was the dress of John the Baptist (Matt. 3:4). Hairy sackcloth is in the Bible the symbol of repentance (compare <sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 20:11, 12, and <sup><1227></sup>1 Kings 21:27). This costume of the prophets was a *sermo propheticus realis*, a prophetic preaching by fact. Before he has opened his lips his external appearance proclaims μετανοεῖτε, *repent*.

It is held traditionally that Isaiah suffered martyrdom under the wicked Manasseh, by being sawn in two under a memorable tree long said to have stood in the vicinity of Jerusalem (Gemara, *Jeban.* 4, 13; compare *Sanhedr.* f. 103 b, and the Targumites, in Assemani, *Catalog. Bibl.* ‘Vat. 1, 452; Trypho, p. 349; Jerome, in *Jes.* 57; Origen, in *Psalm.* 27 in *Matthew* 23; Tertullian, *Patient.* 14; Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 18, 24; *Chronic. Pasch.* p. 155). The traditional spot of the martyrdom is a very old mulberry-tree which stands near the Pool of Siloam, on the slopes of Ophel, below the south-east wall of Jerusalem. A similar account of his death is contained in the *Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah*, an apocryphal work, the Greek original of which was known to the early Church (Epiphani. *licer.* 40, 2;

Jerome, in *les. 44*, 4, p. 761, etc.), and of which only recently an Ethiopic version has been found and translated by Dr. Laurence, Oxford, 1819 (see Nitzsch, in the *Studien und Krit.* 1830, 2, 209; Engelhardt, *Kirchengesch. Abhandl.* 207 sq.). The same fate of Isaiah appears to be alluded to by Josephus (*Ant. 10:3*, 1).

**II. Time of Isaiah.** — The heading of this book places the prophet under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah; and an examination of the prophecies themselves, independently of the heading, leads us to the same chronological results. Chapter 6 in which is related the definite call of Isaiah to his prophetic office, is thus headed: “In the year in which king Uzziah died I saw the Lord,” etc. The collection of prophecies is, therefore, not chronologically arranged, and the utterances in the preceding chapters (1 to 6) belong, for chronological and other reasons to the last year of the reign of Uzziah, although the utterances in chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been erroneously assigned to the reign of Jotham. As, however, the position of affairs was not materially changed under the reign of Jotham, we may say that the first chapter was uttered during that reign. The continuation of prophetic authorship, or the writing down of uttered prophecies, depended upon the commencement of new historical developments, such as took place under the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah. Several prophecies (namely, 7-10:4; 1:2-31; 17) belong to the reign of Ahaz (<sup>234B</sup> Isaiah 14:28-32, apparently to the occasion of his death); and most of the subsequent prophecies to the reign of Hezekiah. The prophetic ministry of Isaiah under Hezekiah is also described in a historical section contained in chapters 36-39. The data which are contained in this section come down to the fifteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah: consequently we are in the possession of historical documents proving that the prophetic ministry of Isaiah was in operation during about forty-five years, commencing in the year B.C. 756, and extending to the year B.C. 711. Of this period, at least one year belongs to the reign of Uzziah, sixteen to the reign of Jotham, fourteen to the reign of Ahaz, and fourteen and upwards to the reign of Hezekiah. It has been maintained, however, by Staudlin, Jahn, Bertholdt, Gesenius, and others, that Isaiah lived to a much later period, and that his life extended to the reign of Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah. For this opinion the following reasons are adduced:

(1.) According to <sup>442B</sup> 2 Chronicles 32:32, Isaiah wrote the life of king Hezekiah. It would hence appear that he survived that king; although it must be admitted that in <sup>442B</sup> 2 Chronicles 32:32, where Isaiah’s biography

of Hezekiah is mentioned, the important words “first and last” are omitted; while in <sup><234B></sup>Isaiah 26:22, we read, “Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, *first and last*, did Isaiah, the son of Amoz, write.”

(2.) We find (as above stated) a tradition current in the Talmud, in the fathers, and in Oriental literature, that Isaiah suffered martyrdom in the reign of Manasseh by being sawn asunder. It is thought that an allusion to this tradition is found in the Epistle to the <sup><5815></sup>Hebrews 11:37, in the expression *they were sawn asunder* (ἐπίρριθσαν), which seems to harmonize with <sup><1216></sup>2 Kings 21:16, “Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much.”

(3.) The authenticity of the second portion of the prophecies of Isaiah being admitted (see below), the nature of this portion would seem to confirm the idea that its author had lived under Manasseh. The style of the second portion, it is asserted, is so different from that of the first that both could not well have been composed by the same author, except under the supposition that a considerable time intervened between the composition of the first and second portion. The contents of the latter—such as the complaints respecting gross idolatry, the sacrifice of children to idols, the wickedness of rulers, etc. seem to be applicable neither to the times of the exile, into which the prophet might have transported himself in the spirit, nor to the period of the pious Hezekiah, but are quite applicable to the reign of Manasseh. This last argument, however, is too subjective in its character to be of much weight; the difference of style referred to may be more readily accounted for by the difference in the topics treated of, and it is a gratuitous supposition that the national sins rebuked in the later prophecies had ceased during the reign of Hezekiah. The other arguments may be admitted so far as to allow a survivorship on the part of the prophet beyond the sickness of Hezekiah, and sufficiently into the reign of Manasseh to have suffered: martyrdom at the order of the latter, but it does not appear that he uttered any predictions during the fifteen added years of Hezekiah; at least none are found extant that seem to belong to that period (except ch. 40 to end, which may be assigned to the year ensuing Hezekiah’s recovery); his great age and the absence of any special occasion may well account for his silence, and he may naturally be supposed to have occupied the time in writing down his former predictions. Nor will this view, which seems to meet all the requirements in the case, require to be extended a life-time; for if Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was called to the prophetic office in his youth, perhaps at twenty years of age, he would

have been but eighty years old at the accession of Manasseh (B.C. 696), an age no greater than that of Hosea, whose prophecies extend over the same period of sixty years (<sup><300></sup>Hosea 1:1).

## Picture for Isaiah

**III.** *Historical Works of Isaiah.* — Besides the collection of prophecies which has been preserved to us, Isaiah also wrote two historical works (comp. <sup><300></sup>Isaiah 36:3, 22). It was part of the vocation of the prophets to write the history of the kingdom of God, to exhibit in' this history the workings of the law of retribution, and to exhort to the true worship of the Lord (see Augusti, *Einleit.* p. 290; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* 4, 1349). Most of the historical books in the Old Testament have been written by prophets. The collectors of the canon placed most of these books under the head *prophets*; hence it appears that, even when these historical works were remodeled by later editors, these editors were themselves prophets. The Chronicles are not placed among the prophetic books so called: we may therefore conclude that they were not written by a prophet. But their author constantly indicates that he composed his work from abstracts taken verbatim from historical monographies written by the prophets; consequently the books of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther are the only historical books of the Old Testament which did not originate from prophets.

The first historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Uzziah (comp. <sup><400></sup>2 Chronicles 26:22), "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write." The second historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Hezekiah, which was subsequently inserted in the annals of Judah and Israel. These annals consisted of a series of prophetic monographies, which were received partly entire, partly in abstracts, and are the chief source from which the information contained in the Chronicles is derived. In this work of Isaiah, although its contents were chiefly historical, numerous prophecies were inserted. — Hence it is called in <sup><400></sup>2 Chronicles 32:32, **Why[ ]wzj }** *The Vision of Isaiah*. In a similar manner, the biography of Solomon by Ahijah is called in <sup><400></sup>2 Chronicles 9:29, "the prophecy of Ahijah." The two historical works of Isaiah were lost, together with the annals of Judah and Israel, into which they were embodied. Whatever these annals contained that was of importance for all ages, has been preserved to us by being received into the historical books of the Old Testament, and the predictions of the most distinguished

prophets have been formed into separate collections. After this was effected, less care was taken to preserve the more diffuse annals, which also comprehended many statements, of value only for particular times and places.

The so-called “*Ascension of Isaiah*” is a pseudepigraphal work of later times, originally written, it would seem, in Greek (*Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαίου*), of which only an old Latin translation (*Ascensio Isaiæ*) was known to scholars, until Bp. Laurence discovered and published the Ethiopic version (Oxford, 1819, 8vo). It has also been edited with notes, etc., by Dillmann (Leips. 1877. 8vo). See Carpzov, *Introduct.* 3, p. 90; Gesenins, *Comment.* at Isaiah 1, 3 sq.; Knobel, *Prophet.* 2, 176 sq.; Stickel, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* II, 15:371 sq.; Stuart’s *Comment, on the Apocalypse*, Introd.; Whiston, *Authentic Records*, 1:470; Gieseier, *Visio Jesaiæ illustrata* (Gott. 1832); Gfrorer, *Prophete veteres* (Stuttg. 1840); Jolowicz, *Himmefahrt u. Vision des Proph. Jes.* (Lpz. 1854); *De heemelvaart van den profet Jesa.ja*, in the *Godgeleerde Bijdragen* for 1862, pt. 7, p. 529-601. **SEE APOCRYPHA; SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.**

**IV. Integral Authenticity of the Prophecies of Isaiah.** — The Jewish synagogue, and the Christian Church during all ages, have considered it as an undoubted fact that the prophecies which bear the name of Isaiah really originated from that prophet. Even Spinoza did not expressly assert, in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (8, 8), that the book of Isaiah consisted of a collection originating from a variety of authors, although it is usually considered that he maintained this opinion. But in the last quarter of the 18th century this prevailing conviction appeared to some divines to be inconvenient. All those who attack the integral authenticity of Isaiah agree in considering the book to be an anthology, or gleanings of prophecies, collected after the Babylonian exile, although they differ in their opinions respecting the origin of this collection. Koppe gave gentle hints of this view which was first explicitly supported by Eichhorn in his *Introduction*. Eichhorn advances the hypothesis that a collection of Isaian prophecies (which might have been augmented, even before the Babylonian exile, by several not genuine additions) formed the basis of the present anthology, and that the collectors, after the Babylonian exile, considering that the scroll on which they were written did not form a volume proportionate to the size of the three other prophetic scrolls containing Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the minor prophets, annexed to the Isaian collection all other oracles at hand whose authors were not-known to the editors. In this supposition of

the non-identity of date and authorship, many German scholars, and lately also Hitzig and Ewald, followed Eichhorn. Gesenius, on the contrary, maintained, in his introduction to Isaiah, that all the non-Isaian prophecies extant in that book originated from one author, and were of the same date. Umbreit and Koster on the main point follow Gesenius, considering chaps. 40 to 66 to be a continuous whole, written by a pseudo-Isaiah who lived about the termination of the Babylonian exile. In reference to other portions of the book of Isaiah, the authenticity of which has been questioned, Umbreit expresses himself doubtingly, and Koster assigns them to Isaiah. Gesenius declines to answer the question how it happened that these portions were ascribed to Isaiah, but Hitzig felt that an answer to it might be expected. He accordingly attempts to explain why such additions were made to Isaiah, and not to any of the other prophetic books; by the extraordinary veneration in which Isaiah was held. He says that the great authority of Isaiah occasioned important and distinguished prophecies to be placed in connection with his name. But he himself soon after destroys the force of this assertion by observing that the great authority of Isaiah was especially owing to those prophecies which were falsely ascribed to him. A considerable degree of suspicion must, however, attach to the boasted certainty of such critical investigations, if we notice how widely these learned men differ in defining what is of Isaian origin and what is not, although they are all linked together by the same fundamental tendency and interest. There are very few portions in the whole collection whose authenticity has not been called in question by some one or other of the various impugnors. Almost every part has been attacked either by Derlein, or by Eichhorn (who, especially in a later work entitled *Die Hebraischen Propheten*, Götting. 1816 to 1819, goes farther than all the others), or by Justl (who, among the earlier adversaries of the integral authenticity of Isaiah, uses, in his *Vermischte Schriften* [vols. 1 and 2], the most comprehensive and, apparently, the best-grounded arguments), or by Paulus, Rosenmüller, Bauer, Bertholdt, De Wette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, or others.' The only portions left to Isaiah are chaps. 1, 3-9; 17, 20, 28, 31, and 33. All the other chaps. are defended by some and rejected by others; they are also referred to widely different dates. In the most modern criticism, however, we observe an inclination again to extend the sphere of Isaian authenticity as much as the dogmatic principle and system of the critics will allow. Recent critics are therefore disposed to admit the genuineness of chaps. 1 to 23 with the only exception of the two



prophecies against Babylonian chaps. 13 and 14, and in chap. 21:1-10. Chapters 28-33 are allowed to be Isaian by Ewald, Umbreit, and others.

Divines who were not linked to these critics by the same dogmatical interest undertook to defend the integrity of Isaiah, as Hensler (*Jesaias neu übersetzt* 1788), Piper (*Integritas esaiæ*. 1793), Beckhaus (*Ueber die Integrität der Prophetischen Schriften*, 1796), Jahn, in his *Einleitung*, who was the most able among the earlier advocates, Dereser, in his *Bearbeitung des Jesaias*, 4, 1, and Greve (*Vaticinia Jesaice*, Amsterdam, 1810). All these works have at present only a historical value, because they have been surpassed by two recent monographs. The first is by Jo. Ulrich Muller (*De Authentia Oernalorum Jesaiæ*, chap. 40-46, Copenhagen, 1825). Although this work professedly defends only the latter portion of the book of Isaiah, there occur in it many arguments applicable also to the first portion. The standard work on this subject is that of Kleinert (*Die Aechtheit des Jesaias*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1829). It is, however, very diffuse, and contains too many hypotheses. The comprehensive work of Schleier (*Wirdigung der Einwürfe gegen die Alttestamentlichen Weissagungen in Jesaias*, chap. 13 and 14) of course refers more especially to these chapters, but indirectly refers also to all the other portions whose authenticity has been attacked. Since the objections against the various parts of Isaiah are all of the same character, it is very inconsistent in Koster, in his work *Die Propheten des alten Testaments*, to defend, in page 102, the genuineness of chaps. 13, 14, and 21, but nevertheless, in pages 117 and 297, to ascribe chaps. 40-66 to a pseudo Isaiah.

We have space here only to indicate the following reasons as establishing the integrity of the whole book, and as vindicating the authenticity of the second part:

**1. Externally.** — *The unanimous* testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition—Ecclus. 48:24, 25, which manifestly (in the words **παρεκάλεσε τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιών** and **ὑπέδειξε-τα ὑπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά**) refers to this second part. The use apparently made of the second part by Jeremiah (<sup><2400></sup>Jeremiah 10:1-16; 5:25; 25:31; 1; 51), Ezekiel (<sup><2634></sup>Ezekiel 13:40, 41), and Zephaniah (<sup><3125></sup>Zephaniah 2:15; 3:10). The decree of Cyrus in <sup><1500></sup>Ezra 1:2-4, which plainly is founded upon <sup><2408></sup>Isaiah 44:28; 45:1, 13, accrediting Josephus's statement (*Ant. II:1, 2*) that the Jews showed Cyrus Isaiah's predictions of him. The inspired testimony of the N.T., which often (<sup><4108></sup>Matthew 3:3, and the parallel



passages; <sup><1047></sup>Luke 4:17; <sup><4088></sup>Acts 8:28; <sup><5106></sup>Romans 10:16, 20) quotes with specification of Isaiah's name prophecies found in the second part.

**2. Internally.** — *The congruity of topic and sentiment in the last twenty-seven chapters with the preceding parts of the book. The oneness of diction which pervades the whole book. The peculiar elevation and grandeur of style which, as is universally acknowledged, distinguishes the whole contents of the second part as much as of the first, and which assigns their composition to the golden age of Hebrew literature. The absence of any other name than Isaiah's claiming the authorship. At the time to which the composition is assigned, a Zechariah or a Malachi could gain a separate name and book; how was it that an author of such transcendent gifts as "the great Unnamed" who wrote 40-66 could gain none? The claims which the writer makes to the foreknowledge of the deliverance by Cyrus, which claims, on the opposing view, must be regarded as a fraudulent personation of an earlier writer. Lastly, the predictions which it contains of the character, sufferings, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ: a believer in Christ cannot fail to regard those predictions as affixing to this second part the broad seal of divine inspiration, whereby the chief ground of objection against its having been written by Isaiah is at once annihilated.*

For a full vindication of the authenticity of Isaiah, besides the above works, see professor Stuart *On the Old Testam. Canon*, p. 103 sq., and Dr. Davidson in the new edit of Horne's *Introduction*, 2, 835 sq., in which latter, especially, copious references are made to the latest literature on the subject. Other writers who have taken the same side are especially Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, vol. 2; Havernick, *Einleitung* vol. 3 (1849); Stier, in his *Jesaias nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (1850); and Keil, in his *Einleitung* (1853), in which last the reader will find a most satisfactory compendium of the controversy, and of the grounds for the generally received view.

**V. Origin, Contents, and Style of the Compilation.** — *No definite account respecting the method pursued in collecting into books the utterances of the prophets has been handed down to us. Concerning Isaiah as well as the rest, these accounts are wanting. We do not even know whether he collected his prophecies himself. But we have no decisive argument against this opinion. Those critics who reject the authenticity of the book are compelled to invent other authors, and, of course, different theories with*

respect to compilers. None of these have proved satisfactory. (See the authorities above referred to.) According to the Talmudists, the book of Isaiah was collected by the men of Hezekiah. But this assertion rests merely upon ~~200~~ Proverbs 25:1, where the men of Hezekiah are said to have compiled the Proverbs. To us it seems impossible that Isaiah left it to others to collect his prophecies into a volume, because we know that he was the author of historical works, and it is not likely that a man accustomed to literary occupation would have left to others to do what he could do much better himself.

Chaps. 1-5 contain a series of rebukes, threatenings, and expostulations with the nation, especially Jerusalem its head, on account of the prevalent sins, and particularly idolatry. Chap. 6 describes a theophany and the prophet's own call, in the last year of Uzziah (to which the preceding chapters may also be assigned, with the exception of chap. 1:2-31, which appears to belong to the first of Ahaz). What follows next, up to chap. 10:4, belongs to the reign of Ahaz, and consists of a sublime prediction of the future consolation of Israel, in the first instance by the deliverance from surrounding enemies (especially Damascus and Samaria), and eventually by the Messiah, who is prefigured by historical signs. The same subject is treated in a similar manner in the succeeding chapters (x-12), the deliverance from Assyria being there the historical type; this is the first portion appertaining to the reign of Hezekiah. Then follows a series of prophecies against foreign nations, in which the chronological arrangement has been departed from, and, instead of it, an arrangement according to contents has been adopted. In the days of Hezekiah, the nations of Western Asia, dwelling on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, more and more resembled a threatening tempest. The prophetic gift of Isaiah was more fully unfolded in sight of the Assyrian invasion under the reign of Hezekiah. Isaiah, in a series of visions, describes what Assyria would do, as a chastising rod in the hand of the Lord, and what the successors of the Assyrians, the Chaldees, would perform, according to the decree of God, in order to realize divine justice on earth, as well among Israel as among the heathen. The prophet shows that mercy is hidden behind the clouds of wrath. This portion comprises chaps. 13-35, the several prophecies of which were uttered at various times prior to the Assyrian invasion, although isolated portions appear to belong to previous reigns (e.g. chap. 17 to the occasion of the alliance of Ahaz. with Tiglath-pileser; chap. 14:28-32, to the death of Ahaz). With the termination of this war

terminated also the public life of Isaiah, who added a historical section in chaps. 36-39, in order to facilitate the right understanding of the prophecies uttered by him during the most fertile period of his prophetic ministry. Then follows the conclusion of his work on earth (chaps. 40 to the end), composed during the peaceful residue of Hezekiah's reign, and containing a closely connected series of the most spiritual disclosures touching the future history of the nation under the Messiah. This second part, which contains his prophetic legacy, is addressed to the small congregation of the faithful strictly so called; it is analogous to the last speeches of Moses in the fields of Moab, and to the last speeches of Christ in the circle of his disciples, related by John.

The proclamation of the Messiah is the inexhaustible source of consolation among the prophets. In Isaiah this consolation is so clear that some fathers of the Church were inclined to style him rather *evangelist* than *prophet*. The following are the outlines of Messianic prophecies in the book of Isaiah: A scion of David, springing from his family, after it has fallen into a very low estate, but being also of divine nature, shall, at first in lowliness, but as a prophet filled with the spirit of God, proclaim the divine doctrine, develop the law in truth, and render it the animating principle of national life; he shall, as high-priest, by his vicarious suffering and his death, remove the guilt of his nation, and that of other nations, and finally rule as a mighty king, not only over the covenant-people, but over all nations of the earth who will subject themselves to his peaceful scepter, not by violent compulsion, but induced by love and gratitude. He will make both the moral and the physical consequences of sin to cease; the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and all enmity, hatred, and destruction shall be removed even from the brute creation. This is the survey of the Messianic preaching by Isaiah, of which he constantly renders prominent those portions which were most calculated to impress the people under the then existing circumstances. The first part of Isaiah is directed to the whole people, consequently the glory of the Messiah is here dwelt upon. The fear lest the kingdom of God should be overwhelmed by the power of heathen nations is removed by pointing out the glorious king to come, who would elevate the now despised and apparently mean kingdom of God above all the kingdoms of this world. In the second part, which is more particularly addressed to the *ἐκλογή*, *the elect*, than to the whole nation, the prophet exhibits the Messiah more as a divine teacher and high priest. The prophet here preaches righteousness through the blood

of the servant of God, who will support the weakness of sinners, and take upon himself their sorrows.

Isaiah stands pre-eminent above all other prophets, as well in the contents and spirit of his predictions, as also in their form and style. Simplicity, clearness, sublimity, and freshness, are the never-failing characters 'of his prophecies. Even Eichhorn mentions, among the first merits of Isaiah, the concinnity of his expressions, the beautiful outline of his images, and the fine execution of his speeches. In reference to richness of imagery he stands between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Symbolic actions, which frequently occur in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, seldom occur in Isaiah. The same is the case with visions, strictly so called, of which there is only one, namely, that in chap. 6, and even it is distinguished by its simplicity and clearness above that of the later prophets. But one characteristic of Isaiah is, that he likes to give signs—that is, a fact then present, or near at hand—as a pledge for the more distant futurity, and that he thus supports the feebleness of man (comp. 7-20; 37:30; 38:7 sq.). The instances in chaps. 7 and 38 show how much he was convinced of his vocation, and in what intimacy he lived with the Lord, by whose assistance alone he could effect what he offers to do in the one passage, and what he grants in the other. The spiritual riches of the prophet are seen in the variety of his style, which always befits the subject. When he rebukes and threatens it is like a storm, and when he comforts his language is as tender and mild as (to use his own words) that of a mother comforting her son. With regard to style, Isaiah is comprehensive, and the other prophets divide his riches.

Isaiah enjoyed an authority proportionate to his gifts. We learn from history how great this authority was during his life, especially under the reign of Hezekiah. Several of his most definite prophecies were fulfilled while he was yet alive; for instance, the overthrow of the kingdoms of Syria and Israel; the invasion of the Assyrians, and the divine deliverance from it; the prolongation of life granted to Hezekiah; and several predictions against foreign nations. Isaiah is honorably mentioned in the historical books. The later prophets, especially Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, clearly prove that his book was diligently read, and that his prophecies were attentively studied. The authority of the prophet greatly increased after the fulfillment of his prophecies by the Babylonian exile, the victories of Cyrus, and the deliverance of the covenant-people. Even Cyrus (according to the account in Josephus, *Ant.* 11:1, 1 and 2) was induced to set the Jews at liberty by

the prophecies of Isaiah concerning himself. Jesus Sirach (48:22-25) bestows splendid praise upon Isaiah, and both Philo and Josephus speak of him with great veneration. He attained the highest degree of authority after the times of the New Testament had proved the most important part of his prophecies, namely, the Messianic, to be divine. Christ and the apostles quote no prophecies so frequently as those of Isaiah, in order to prove that he who had appeared was one and the same with him who had been promised. The fathers of the Church abound in praises of Isaiah. — Kitto; Smith. *SEE MESSIAH.*

**VI.** The following are express commentaries on the whole of the book of Isaiah, the most important being designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* 3:104); also *Homiliae* (in Jerome, *Opp.* 4:1097); Eusebius, *Commentar-2* (in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*); Ephrem Syrus, *Enarratio* (from the Syr. in *Opp.* I, 2, 535); Basil, *Enarratio* (Gr. in his *Op.* 6. I, 2, 535; tr. in Lat., Basle, 1518, 4to); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 4:1); also *Adbreviatio* (*ib.* 4:1131); Chrysostom, *Interpretatio* [on 1-8] (Gr. in *Opp.* 6:1); Cyril, *Commentarii* (Gr. in *Opp.* 2, 1 sq.); Theodoret, *Interpretation* [in Greek] (in *Opp.* II, 1); Procopius, *Epitome* (Gr. and Lat., Par. 1580, fol.); Rupertus, *In Esaianm* (in *Opp.* 1, 429); Herveus, *Commentarii* (in Pez, *Thesaur.* III, 1); S. Jarchi [i.e. "Rashi"], *Commentarius* (from the Heb. edit. Breithaupt, Goth. 1713, 1714, 3 vols. 4to); D. Kimchi, *Commentarius* (from the Heb. by Malamineus, Florence, 1774, 4to); Abrabanel, *vWrpæd.* L'Empereur, Lugd. B. 1631, 8vo); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1531, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 2); Luther, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* 3:294); Melancthon, *Argumentum* (in *Opp.* 3:398); (Ecolampadius, *Hyponematon* (Basil. 1525, 1567, 4to); Zuinglius, *Complanatio* (Tigur. 1529, fol.; also in *Opp.* 3. 163); Dieterich, *Auslegug* (Norimb. 1543,4to); Calvin, *Commentarii* (Genesis 1551, 1559, 1570, 1583, 1587, 1617, fol.; in French, *ib.* 1552, 4to; 1572, fol.; in English by Colton, Lond. 1609, fol. by Pringle, Edinb. 1850,4 vols. 8vo); Day, *Exposition* (London, 1654, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1557, 1570, 1600, 1623, fol.); Borrhasius, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1561. fol.); Draconis, *Commentarius* (Lipsiae, 1563, fol.); Strigel, *Conciones* (Lipsice, 1563, 12mo); Forerius, *Commentaria* (Venice, 1563, fol.; Antwerp, 1565, 8vo; also in the *Critici Sacri*, 4); Sasbouth, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1563, 8vo); Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1564; Genesis 1610, fol.); Pintus, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1561,1567; Antw. 1567,1572, fol.); Gualtherus, *Homiliae* (Tigur. 1567, folio); Bullinger, *Expositio* (Tigur. 1567, folio);

Selnecker, *Erklar.* (Lpz. 1569, 4to); Castri, *Commentaria* (Salam. 1570, folio); De Palacios, *Dilucidationes* (Salam. 1572, 3 vols. fol.); Schnepf, *SchoIac* (Tub. 1575, 1583, fol.); Osorius, *Paraphrasis* (Bonon. 1576, 4to; Col. Agr. 1579, 1584, 8vo); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 3); Wigand, *Adnotationes* (Erford. 1581, 8vo); Guidell, *Commentarius* (Perus. 1598-1600, 2 vols. 4to) Montanus; *Commentarii* (Antw. 1599, 2 vols. 4to); D. Alvarez, *Commentarii* (Rome, 1599-1702, 2 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1716, fol.); Arcularius, *Commentarius* (ed. Mentzer, Frankfort, 1607; Lips. 1653, 8vo); Arama, *ⲡⲓⲣⲏⲗⲁ ⲡⲓⲮⲁⲗⲁ* (Ven. 1608, 8vo; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Sancius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1615; Antwerp and Mogunt. 1616, fol.); Heshusius, *Commentarius* (Hal. 1617, fol.); Forster, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1620, 1664, 1674, 1679, 4to); Oleastre, *Commentarii* (Par. 1622, 1656, fol.); a Lapide, *In Esaiam* (Antw. 1622, folio); G. Alvarez, *Expositio* (Lugd. 1623, fol.); De Arcones, *Elucidastio* (Lugd. 1642, 2 vols. folio); Di Marino, *ⲡⲓ ⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁ* (Verona, 1652, 4to); Laisne, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1654, fol.); Lafiado, *ⲫⲓⲗⲁⲗⲁ* (Ven. 1657, fol.); Varenus, *Commentarius*. (Rost. 1673, 1708, 4to); Brentius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 4, Tub. 1675); Jackson, *Annotations* (London, 1682, 4to); S. Schmid, *Commentarius* (ed. Sandhagen, Hamb. 1693, 1695, 1702, 1723, 4to); Sibersma, *Commentarius* (Anst. 1700, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 2, Amst. 1701); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (ed. Fecht, Hamb. 1703, 4to); Hellenbroek, *Erklärung* (Rotterdam, 1704, 4 vols. 4to) Schmuck, *Praelectiones* (edit. Vlich, Dresd. 1708, 4to); White, *Commentary* (Lond. 1709, 4to); Kortum, *Untersuchung* (Lpz. 1709, 4to); \*Vitranga, *Commentarius*, Louv. 1714-20, 1724, 2 vols. fol.; in German, Herb. 1715-22, 2 vols. fol.; the last abridged by Busching, Hal 1749, 4to); Petersen, *Erklärung*. (Frckft. 1719, 4to); Leigh. *Commentar* (Brunsw. 1725-34, 6 vols. 4to); Hoheisel, *Observationes* (Gedan. 1729, 8vo); Le Clerc, *Commentarius* (an abstract, Amsterdam, 1731, fol.); Woken, *Erklärung*. (Lpz. 1732, 8vo); Duguet, *Explication* (in French, Paris, 1734, 5 vols. 121no); Rambach, *Erklärung* (Zür. 1741, 4to); Reichel, *Erlaut.* (Lpz. and Gorl. 1755-59, 16 pts. 8vo); Vogel, *Unsschreibung* (Hal. 1771, 8vo); Struensee, *Uebers.* (Halb. 1773, 8vo); Crusius, *Hypomnenezata* (Lips. 1773, 8vo); \*Lowth, *Commentary* (Lond. — 1774, 1778, 4to; and frequently since in many forms; finally in connection with the notes of Bp. Patrick and others, in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. and Philadelphia); Walther, *Anmerk.* (Hal. 1774, 4to); \*Doderlein, *Notae* (Altd. 1775, 1780, 1783, 8vo); Holden, *Paraphrase* (Chelmsf. 1776, 2

vols. 8vo); Rambach, *Anmersk.* [to tr. of Matt. Henry's] (Lpz. 1777,8vo); Sponsel, *Abhandlung* (Nurenb. 177980,2 vols. 4to); Koppe, *Anmerk.* Cto Lowth] (Lpz. 177981,4 vols. 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Anmerk.* (Quedlinb. 1780, 4to); Weise, *Redan* (Halle, 1780, 8vo); \*Seiler, *Erldut.* (Erl. 1783, 8vo); Cube, *Anmerk.* (Berlin, 1785-6, 2 vols. 8vo); Rieger, *Scholien* (Memming. 1788, 8vo); Henssler, *Anmerk.* (Hamb. and Kiel, 1788, 8vo); Berthier, *Notes* [French] (Paris, 1789, 5 vols. 12mo); Kocher, *Vindicie* (Tribing. 1790, 8vo); Dodson, *Notes* (Lond. 1790, 8vo); Krigelius, *Bearbeitung* (Brem. 1790, 8vo); Macculloch, *Lectures* (Lond. 1791-1805, 4 vols. 8vo); Paulus, *Clavis* (Jena, 1793,8vo); Fraser, *Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1800, 8vo); Bp. Stock, *Translation* (Bath, 1805, 4to); Van der Palm, *Anmerk.* [Dutch] (Amst. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Ottensosser, *rWaBæ* (Firth, 1807, 8vo); Dereser, *Erklärung* (Frckft. a. M. 1808, 8vo); \*Gesenius, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1821-9, 3 vols. 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Biblical Criticism*, 1, 229); Möller, *Anmerk.* [Danish] (Copenh. 1822, 8vo); De Liere, *Traduction* (Paris, 1823, 8vo); Knas, *Enodatio* (Upsal. 1824,8vo); Jones, *Translation* (Oxford, 1830, 8vo; 1842, 12mo); Jenour, *Notes* (London, 1830, 2 vols. 8vo); Hendewerk, *Erklärung.* (Konigsberg, 1830-44, 2 vols. 8vo); Möller, *Erklärung.* (Brem. 1831, 8vo, pt. 1); Hitzig, *Auslegung* (Heidellb. 1833, 8vo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo; abridged, N. Y. 1848, 2 vols. 12mo); \*Henderson, *Commentary* (London, 1840, 1857,. 8vo); Govett, *Notes* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); \*Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 184142, 2 vols. 8vo); Heinemann, *vrpōJarqjñæ* (Berl. 1842, 8vo); \*Knobel, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1843. 8vo); Dreschler, *Erklar.* (Stuttg. 1845-9, 3 vols. 8vo); \*Alexander, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1846-7, 1865, 2 vols: 8vo; Glasgow, 1848, 8vo; abridged, N. York, 1851,2 vols. 12mo); Stier, *Nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (Barmen, 1850, 2 pts. 8vo); Smithson, *Translation* (Lond. 1860,8vo); Keith, *Commentary* (London, 1850, 8vo); Meier, *Erklar.* (pt. 1, Pforzh. 1850, 8vo); Whish, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Williams, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklar.* (Lpz. 1859, 8vo); Renner, *Auslegung* (Stuttg. 1865, 8vo); Luzatto, *Commenti* [in Heb.] (Padova, 1865-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Second, *Commentaire* (Genev. 1866, 8vo); \*Delitzsch, *Commentar* (in Keil and Delitzsch's series, Lpz. 1866; tr. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1867,2 vols. 8vo); Cheyne, *Notes* (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Ewald, *Commentary* (chaps. 1-33, transl. from the Germ. by Glover, London, 1869, 12mo); Neteler, *Grundlage* (Munst. 1869, 8vo); Birks, *Commentary* (Lond. 1871, 8vo). **SEE PROPHET.**



## Isautes

SEE OBADIAH (ABU-ISA).

## Is'cah

(Heb. *Yiskah'*, הַכְּסַיָּאָה; Sept. Ἰσχή), the daughter of Haran, and sister of Milcah and Lot (<sup><01129></sup>Genesis 11:29; comp. 31). Jewish tradition, as in Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 6, 5), Jerome (*Qucest. in Genesin*), and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, identifies her with SARAH SEE SARAH (q.v.).

## Iscar'iot

(Ἰσκαριώτης, probably from Heb. vyaaṯ/Yraṯ *man of Kerioth*), a surname of Judas the traitor, to distinguish him from others of the same name (<sup><4004></sup>Matthew 10:4, and often). SEE KERIOTH; SEE JUDAS.

## Is'dael

(Ἰσδαήλ, *Vulg. Gaddahel*), the name of one of the heads of families of "Solomon's servants" that returned from the captivity (1 Esd. 5:33); evidently the GIDDEL SEE GIDDEL (q.v.) of the Heb. texts (<sup><4026></sup>Ezra 2:56; <sup><4028></sup>Nehemiah 7:58).

## Iselin, Isaac

a German philosopher and philanthropist, was born at Basle March 27, 1728. He was educated at the university for the law profession, but much of his time was devoted to the study of philosophy, and he deserves our notice as the author of a *Geschichte d. Menschheit* (Frkf. and Lpz. 1764, 2 vols. 8vo. and often), and *Tratime eines Menschenfreundes* (Zurich, 1758, 8vo. and often). He was a very conspicuous helper of Basedor (q.v.) in the philosophic efforts of the latter, founded a "society for the public good" at Basle aided in founding the Helvetic Society (1761), in which Hirzel, Sarasin, Pfeffel, and others took part, and was, in short, one of the most prominent leaders in the humanitarianism or philanthropism which flourished in, the second half of last century in Germany, and more especially in Switzerland. Isaac Iselin died June 15, 1782. See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent.* 1, sect. 14; professor Vischer, *Program* (Basle, 1841, 4to). (J. H. W.)



## Iselin, James Christopher

a Swiss Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Basle June 12, 1681. After he had acquired a good knowledge of the classics, and especially of Greek, he applied himself to the study of Hebrew and theology. He was ordained in 1701, and in 1705 was appointed professor of history and rhetoric at Marburg. In 1707 he returned to Basle, and became successively professor of history, of antiquities, and finally (1711) of theology, in the university of that place. In 1716 he visited France (he had previously made a journey there in 1698), and was warmly received at Paris by chancellor D'Aguesseau. In 1717 he was elected member of the Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Iselin died April 14, 1737. He had been in relation with some of the most eminent men of his day, such as cardinal Passionei, the archbishop of Canterbury, Wake, the marquis Beretti Laudi, ambassador of Spain, etc. He wrote *In Sententiam Jac. Benj. Bossuet de Babylone bestiisque et meretrice Apocalypseos* (Basle, 1701, 4to): — *Specimen observationum atque conjecturarum ad orientalem philologiam et criticen pertinentium* (Basle, 1704, 4to): — *De Magorum in Persia Dominatione* (Marb. 1707, 4to): — *issertatio quæ mundi ceteritas argumentis historicis confutatur* (1709, 4to): *De Canone Novi Testamenti* (in *Miscellanea Groningana*, vl. 3), against Dodwell: etc. He also contributed a number of articles to the *Mercure Suisse* (1-734-5), etc. See Beck, *Vita Iselini* (*Tempe Helvetica*, vol. 3): *Eloge d'Iselin* (*Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, vol. 6); Schelhorn, *Lebensbeschr. Iselin's* (*Acta Hist. Eccles.* vol. 2; 3:1156; 4:1160); Moreri, *Dict.*; Chauffepie, *Dict.*; J. R. Iselin, *Laudatio Iselini*. — *Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 26:50 (J. N. P.)

## Isenbiehl, Johann Laurenz

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born on the Eichsfeld in 1744. Of his early history we know nothing, but in 1773 we find him appointed to the position of professor of the Oriental languages and exegetical literature at Mentz. As his first theme before the students over whom he had been chosen to preside, he selected the interpretation of <sup><2374></sup>Isaiah 7:14. He advanced the opinion that it was erroneous to attribute any connection to this passage with <sup><4023></sup>Matthew 1:23, and asserted that it did not at all refer to Immanuel the Christ, or to Mary, the mother of Christ; that Matthew only alluded to this passage because of its similarity with the circumstances of the birth of Christ. Of course he was at once deposed from his position,

and as is customary among Roman Catholics, deprived of his personal liberty on account of propagating and cherishing heretical opinions. He was returned to the theological seminary for further *instruction*, and released two years after. In 1778, however, he appeared before the public, defending his original opinion under the title of *Neuer Versuch uber d. Weissungen v. Immanuel* (Coblenz). He had meanwhile been reappointed to the professional dignity, and his persistency in defending his peculiar interpretations again deprived him of his position, and he was once more imprisoned and put on trial. His book was forbidden to all good Roman Catholics by all archbishops and bishops, and in 1779 a bull was issued against it by the pope. In the interim he had made his escape from prison, but, finding the ecclesiastical authorities all opposed to him, he recalled his former opinion, and was honored with ecclesiastical dignity (1780). In 1803 his income was reduced to a small pension, and he lived in want until his death in 1818. Isenbiehl also wrote on the diacritical points under the title of *Corpus decisionum dogmaticarum*. See Walch, *Neueste Relig. Geschichte*, 8, 9 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 7, 203 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* 7, 199 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handw. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 507. (J. H. W.)

### Isham, Chester

a Congregational minister, was born in 1798, and, after a course of preparatory study at the Latin Grammar School in Hartford, Conn., entered Yale College, where he graduated in 1820. Shortly afterwards he went to Andover Seminary to prepare for the ministry, upon which he had decided soon after his conversion while at Yale College. In 1824. on the completion of his theological course of study, he accepted a call to a newly-formed church at Taunton, where he had been preaching during the latter part of the last year spent at Andover. But the great exertions which the work demanded of him were too severe upon his constitution, and the symptoms of consumption appearing shortly after, he went South in the hope of recovering his health. He continued failing, however, and returned to Boston April 19th, to die among his friends. Dr. Leonard Bacon, who was a classmate of Chester Isham at Yale, speaks very highly of his attainments and religious bearing, in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 2, 704 sq.

## Ishaneki

(*elect band*), a Russian sect which arose in 1666, under the fear that the printed Church books were tainted with error, since they differed from the old MS. copies which had been so long in use. They stoutly adhere to the letter of Scripture, deny different orders among the clergy, and any gradation of rank among the people, but under Alexander I obtained toleration, though they had previously been exposed to constant persecution. See Eckardt, *Modern Russia*, S. V.

## Ish'bah

(Hebrew *Yzshbach*, **יִשְׁבַּח** *praiser*; Sept. **Ἰεσοβά**), a descendant of Judah, and founder (“father”) of Eshtemoa (q.v.); he probably was a son of Mered by his wife Hodiah (<sup><B017></sup>1 Chronicles 4:17). B.C. post 1612. **SEE MEFRED**. He is perhaps the same as ISHI **SEE ISHI** (q.v.) in verse 20, and apparently identical with the NAHAM **SEE NAHAM** (q.v.) of ver. 19.

## Ish'bak

(Heb. *Yishbak'*, **יִשְׁבָּק** *leaner*; Sept. **Ἰεσβόκ**, **Ἰεσβόκ**), one of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (<sup><O27D></sup>Genesis 25:2; <sup><B013></sup>1 Chronicles 1:32). B.C. post 2024. We are told that Abraham “gave gifts” to the sons of Keturah, “and sent them away from Isaac his son eastward, unto the east country” (<sup><O27D></sup>Genesis 25:1-6). They settled in the region east of the Arabah, in and near Mount Seir, and southward in the peninsula of Sinai (<sup><O5728></sup>Genesis 37:28, 36; <sup><O600></sup>Exodus 3:1; <sup><O600></sup>Numbers 31:9, 10). **SEE KETURAH**.

The settlements of this people are very obscure, and Poole (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v.) suggests as possible that they may be recovered in the name of the valley called *Sabdk*, or, as it is also called, “*Sibdk*, in the Dahnk” (*Maarasid*, s.v.). The Heb. root precisely corresponds to the Arabic (*sabaq*) in etymology and signification. The Dahna, in which is situate Sabiak, is a fertile and extensive tract belonging to the Beni-Temim. in Nejd, or the highland of Arabia, on the northeast of it, and the borders of the great desert, reaching from the rugged tract (“hazn”) of Yensf'ah to the sands of Yebrin. It contains much pasturage, with comparatively few wells, and is greatly frequented by the Arabs when the vegetation is plentiful (*Mushtarak* and *Mardsid*, s.v.). There is, however, another Dahna, nearer to the Euphrates (*ib.*), and some confusion may exist regarding the true position of Sabak; but either Dahna is suitable for the settlements of

Ishbak. The first-mentioned Dahna lies in a favorable portion of the widely stretching country known to have been peopled by the Keturahites. They extended from the borders of Palestine even to the Persian Gulf, and traces of their settlements must be looked for all along the edge of the Arabian peninsula, where the desert merges into the cultivable land, or (itself a rocky undulating plateau) rises to the wild, mountainous country of Nejd. Ishbak seems from his name to have preceded or gone before his brethren: the place suggested for his dwelling is far away towards the Persian Gulf, and penetrates also into the peninsula. **SEE ARABIA.** There are many places, however, of an almost similar derivation (root *shabak*), as *Shebek*, *Shibdk*, and *Esh-Shobak*; the last of which has especially been supposed (as by Schwarz, *Palest. p.* 215; Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, I, 2, 53) to preserve a trace of Ishbak. It is a fortress in Arabia Petraea, and is near the well-known fortress of the Crusaders' times called *El-Karerk*. This great castle of *Shobek* "stands on the top of the mountain range which bounds the valley of Arabah on the east, and about twelve miles north of Petra, on the crest of a peak commanding a wide view. It was built by Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, in A.D. 1115, on the site of a much more ancient fortress and city, and it was one of the chief strongholds of the Crusaders. The name they gave it was *Mons Regalis*; but by the Arabs, both before and since, it has been uniformly called Shobek. It was finally taken from the Franks by Saladin in A.D. 1188 (*Gesta Dei Per Fancos*, p. 426, 611, 812; Bohadin, *Vita Saladini*, p. 38, 54, and *Index Geographicus*, s.v. Sjanbachum). The castle is still in tolerable preservation, and a few families of Arabs find within its walls a secure asylum for themselves and their flocks. It contains an old church, with a Latin inscription of the crusading age over its door (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 416; *Hand-book for Syr. and Pal.* p. 58; see Forster, *Geogr. of Arabia*, 1, 352; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 164)" **SEE IDUMEA.**

### Ish'bi-be'nob

(Heb. *Yishbi'-Beznob'*, **יִשְׁבִּי בְּזִנּוֹב** *his seat is at Nob*, as in the margin, for which the text has **יִשְׁבִּי בְּנִבּוֹב** *Yishbo'-Benob'*, *his seat is at Nob*; Sept. **Ἰεσβὶ ἀπὸ Νόβ**, Vulg. *Jeshi-benob*), one of the Rephaim, a gigantic warrior who bore a spear of 300 shekels' weight, and came near slaying David in a personal rencounter, but was slain by Abishai (**1216** 2 Samuel 21:16). B.C. cir. 1018. **SEE GIANT.**

## Ish-bo'sheth

[many *Ish'-bosheth,*' (Heb. *Ish-bo'sheth*, *tvBavyaæ* *man of shame*, i.e. *bashful*, otherwise *disgraceful*; Sept. Ἰσβόσθεθ v. r. Ἰεβσοθέ, Joseph. Ἰεβσοθος, Vulg. *Isboeth*), the youngest of Saul's four sons, and his legitimate successor, being the only one who survived him (2 Samuel 2-4).. His name appears (<sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 8:35; 9:39) to have been originally. ESHBAAL, I [*BĀcaæ* "the man of Baal." Whether this indicates that *Baal* was used as equivalent to *Jehovah*, or that the reverence for Baal still lingered in Israelitish families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name (Ish-bosheth, "the man of *shame*") by which he is commonly known must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandalous sound of Baal from the name of an Israelitish king see Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2, 383), and superseding it by the contemptuous word (Bosheth. — "shame") which was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (<sup><2474></sup>Jeremiah 3:24; 11:13; Hos. 9:10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (<sup><0785></sup>Judges 8:35) into Jerubbesheth (<sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 11:21); Meri-baal (<sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 4:4) into Mephibosheth (<sup><1384></sup>1 Chronicles 8:34; 9:40). The last three cases all occur in Saul's family. **SEE SAUL.** He is thought by some to be the same with ISHUI (*ywæjæd* 14:49), these two names having considerable resemblance; but this is forbidden by <sup><0812></sup>1 Samuel 31:2, comp. with <sup><1383></sup>1 Chronicles 8:33. **SEE ABINADAB.** He appears to have been forty years of age at the time of the battle of Gilboa (B.C. 1053), in which he was not himself present, but in which his father and three older brothers perished; and therefore, according to the law of Oriental, though not of European succession, he ascended the throne, as the oldest of the royal family, rather than Mephibosheth, son of his elder brother Jonathan, who was a child of five years old. Too feeble of himself to seize the scepter which had just fallen from the hands of Saul, he was immediately taken under the care of Abner, his powerful kinsman, who brought him to the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim, on the east of the Jordan, beyond the reach of the victorious Philistines, and he was there recognized as king by ten of the twelve tribes (<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 2:8, 9). There was a momentary doubt even in those remote tribes whether they should not close with the offer of David to be their king (<sup><1017></sup>2 Samuel 2:7; 3:17). But this was overruled in favor of Ish-bosheth by Abner (<sup><1017></sup>2 Samuel 3:17), who then for five years slowly but effectually restored the dominion of the house of Saul over the trans-Jordanic territory, the plain of Esdraelon, the central mountains of Ephraim, the frontier tribe of

Benjamin, and eventually “over all Israel” (except the tribe of Judah, <sup><KJB></sup>2 Samuel 3:9). In 2 Samuel 2, 10 Ish-bosheth is said to have reigned two years, which some understand as the whole amount of his reign. As David reigned seven and a half years over Judah before he became king of all Israel upon the death of Ish-bosheth, it is conceived by the Jewish chronologer (*Seder Olam Rabba*, p. 37), as well as by Kimchi and others, that there was a vacancy of five years in the throne of Israel. ‘It is not, however, agreed by those who entertain this opinion whether this vacancy took place before or after the reign of Ish-bosheth. Some think it was before, it being then a matter of dispute whether he or Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, should be made king; but others hold that after his death five years elapsed before David was generally recognized as king of all Israel. If the reign of Ish-bosheth be limited to two years, the latter is doubtless the best way of accounting for the other five, since no ground of delay in the succession of Ish-bosheth is suggested in Scripture itself; for the claim of Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, which some have produced, being that of a lame boy five years old, whose father never reigned, against a king’s son forty years-of age, would have been deemed of little weight in Israel. Besides, our notions of Abner do not allow us to suppose that under him the question of the succession could have remained five years in abeyance. But it is the more usual, and perhaps the better course, to settle this question by supposing that the reigns of David over Judah, and of Ish-bosheth over Israel, were nearly contemporaneous, namely, about seven years each; and that the two years named are only the first of this period, being mentioned as those from which to date the commencement of the ensuing events--namely, the wars between the house of Saul and that of David. This appears to be the view taken by Josephus (*Ant.* 7, 1, 3; comp. 2, 1). Ish-bosheth thus reigned seven, or, as some will have it, two years-if a power so uncertain as his can be called a reign. Even the semblance of authority which he possessed he owed to the will and influence of Abner, who kept the real control of affairs in his own hands. The wars and negotiations with David were entirely carried on by Abner (<sup><KJB></sup>2 Samuel 2:11; 3:6, 12). After various skirmishes between the forces of the rival kings, a pitched battle was fought, in which the army of David under Joab was completely victorious. After this the interest of David continually waxed stronger, while that of Ish-bosheth declined (<sup><KJB></sup>2 Samuel 3:1). At length Ish-bosheth accused Abner (whether rightly or wrongly does not appear) of an attempt on his father’s concubine, Rizpah, which, according to Oriental usage, amounted to treason (<sup><KJB></sup>2 Samuel 3:7;

comp. <sup><1021></sup>1 Kings 2:13; <sup><1062></sup>2 Samuel 16:21; 20:3). Although accustomed to tremble before Abner, even Ish-bosheth's temper was roused to resentment by the discovery that Abner had thus invaded the harem of his late father Saul, which was in a peculiar manner sacred under his care as a son and a king. By this act Abner exposed the king to 'public contempt, if it did not indeed leave himself open to the suspicion of intending to advance a claim to the crown on his own behalf Abner resented this suspicion in a burst of passion, which vented itself in a solemn vow to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul to the house of David, a purpose which from this time he appears steadily to have kept in view. Ish-bosheth was too much cowed to answer; and when, shortly afterwards, through Abner's negotiation, David demanded the restoration of his former wife, Michal, he at once tore his sister from her reluctant husband, and committed her to Abner's charge (<sup><1034></sup>2 Samuel 3:14, 15). It is, perhaps, right to attribute this act to his weakness; although, as David allows that he was a righteous man (<sup><1040></sup>2 Samuel 4:10), it may have been owing to his sense of justice. This trust seems to have given Abner a convenient opportunity to enter into negotiations with David; but in the midst of them he himself fell a victim to the resentment of Joab for the death of Abishai. The death of Abner deprived the house of Saul of their last remaining support. *See ABNER*. When Ish-bosheth heard of it, "his hands were feeble, and all the Israelites were troubled" (<sup><1041></sup>2 Samuel 4:1). In this extremity of weakness he fell a victim, probably, to a revenge for a crime of his father. The guard of Ish-bosheth, as of Saul, was taken from their own royal tribe of Benjamin (<sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 12:29). But among the sons of Benjamin were reckoned the descendants of the old Canaanitish inhabitants of Beeroth, one of the cities in league with Gibeon (<sup><1042></sup>2 Samuel 4:2, 3). Two of those Beerothites, Baana and Rechab, in remembrance, it has been conjectured, of Saul's slaughter of their kinsmen the Gibeonites, determined to take advantage of the helplessness of the royal house to destroy the only 'representative that was left, excepting the child Mephibosheth (<sup><1044></sup>2 Samuel 4:4). They were "chiefs of the marauding troops" which used from time to time to attack the territory of Judah (comp. <sup><1042></sup>2 Samuel 4:2; 3:22, where the same word **דלדג** is used; Vulg. *princim es latronum*). They knew the habits of the king and court, and acted accordingly. In the stillness of an Eastern noon they entered the palace, as if to carry off the wheat which was piled up near the entrance. The female slave, who, as usual in Eastern houses, kept the door, and was herself sifting the wheat, had, in the heat of the day, fallen asleep at her



task (<sup><1015></sup>2 Samuel 4:5, 6, in Sept. and Vulg.). They stole in, and passed into the royal bedchamber, where Ish-bosheth was asleep on his couch during his midday siesta. They stabbed him in the stomach, cut off his head, made their escape, all that afternoon, all that night, down the valley of the Jordan (Arabah, A.V. “plain;” <sup><1017></sup>2 Samuel 4:7), and presented the head to David as a welcome present. B.C. 1046. They met with a stern reception from the monarch, who-as both right feeling and good policy required-testified the utmost horror and concern. He rebuked them for the cold-blooded murder of an innocent man, and ordered them to be executed; their hands and feet were cut off, and their bodies suspended over the tank at Hebron. The head of Ish-bosheth was carefully buried in the sepulchre of his great kinsman Abner, at the same place (<sup><1019></sup>2 Samuel 4:9-12). **SEE DAVID.** I’shi (Heb. *Yishi*’, *γ[ε]σ[α]salutary*; Sept. Ἰεσεί, Ἔς, Ἰεσεί), the name of four men.

1. The son of Appaim, and father of Sheshan, the eighth in descent from Judah (<sup><1121></sup>1 Chronicles 2:31). B.C. prob. post 1612.
2. The father of Zoheth and Ben-zoheth, a descendant of Judah, but through what line does not appear (<sup><1123></sup>1 Chronicles 4:20). The name is possibly a corruption for the ISMIBAH of ver. 17. B.C. perh. cir. 1017.
3. Father (progenitor) of several (four only are named) Simeonites who invaded Mt. Seir and dispossessed the Amalekites (<sup><1142></sup>1 Chronicles 4:42). B.C. ante 726.
4. One of the chiefs of Manasseh East, of famous valor (<sup><1143></sup>1 Chronicles 5:24). B.C. cir. 720.

## I’shi

(Heb. *Ishi*’, *γ[υ]γααν my husband*; Sept. ὁ ἀνὴρ μου, Vulg. *Vir meus*), a metaphorical name prescribed for himself by Jehovah, to be used by the Jewish Church, expressive of her future fidelity and privilege of intimacy, in contrast with the spirit of legalism indicated by the title *Baali*, “my master” (<sup><1216></sup>Hosea 2:16).

## Ishi’ah

(Hebrew *Yishshiyah*’, *h[ι]γ[γ]α[α]nce why[γ]α[α]* <sup><1316></sup>1 Chronicles 12:6; *lent by Jehovah*), the name of several men, differently Anglicized.



1. (Sept. Ἰεσία, Vulg. *Jesia*, Author. Vers. “Isshiah.”) The fifth son of Uzzi (grandson of Issachar), a valiant chieftain of his tribe (<sup><1307B></sup>1 Chronicles 7:3). B.C. cir. 1618; but in ver. 2 he is apparently made nearly contemporary with David. See Uzzi.
2. (Sept. Ἰεσσιά v.r. Ἰσιά, Ἰσία; Vulg. *Jesia*; Auth. Vers. “Jesiah,” “Isshiah.”) The second son of Uzziel (grandson of Levi), and father of Zechariah (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 23:20; 24:25). B.C. cir. 1618; although the context seems to place this one also in the time of David.
3. (Sept. Ἰεσία, Vulg. *Jesias*, Auth. Vers. “Isshiah.”) The first of the sons of Rehabiah, and great-grandson of Moses (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 24:21; compare 23:17; 26:25, where he is called JESHIAH). B.C. post 1618.  
*SEE REHABTAH.*
4. (Sept. Ἰεσσία, Vulg. *Jesia*, Author. Vers. “Jesiah.”) A Korhite, and one of the braves that joined David at Ziklag (<sup><1312B></sup>1 Chronicles 12:6). B.C. 1055.
5. (Sept. Ἰεσσία, Vulg. *Josute*, Auth. Vers. “Ishijah.”) One of the “sons” of Harim, who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (<sup><1508B></sup>Ezra 10:31). B.C. 459.

### Ishi'jah

(<sup><1508B></sup>Ezra 10:31). *SEE ISHIAH*, 5. Ish'ma (Heb. *Yishmna'*, ἀμνῆ, *desolation*, otherwise *high*; Sept. Ἰεσμά), a descendant of Judah, apparently named (with two brothers and a sister) as a son of the founder (“father”) of Etam (<sup><1304B></sup>1 Chronicles 4:3). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

### Ish'mael

(Heb. *Yishmael'*, Ἰα[~~μ~~ν]μαῆλ *heard by God*; Sept. Ἰσμοῆλ, Joseph. Ἰσμάηλος), the name of several men.

1. Abraham's eldest son, born to him by the concubine Hagar (<sup><0165></sup>Genesis 16:15; 17:23). *SEE ABRAHAM*; *SEE HAGAR*. It may here be remarked that the age attributed to him in <sup><01214></sup>Genesis 21:14 is not inconsistent with <sup><01725></sup>Genesis 17:25 (see Tuch, *Comm.* p. 382). The story of his birth, as recorded in Genesis 16, is in every respect characteristic of Eastern life and morals in the present age. The intense desire of both Abraham and Sarah 'for children; Sarah's gift of Hagar to Abraham as wife; the insolence of

the slave when suddenly raised to a place of importance; the jealousy and consequent tyranny of her high-spirited mistress; Hagar's flight, return, and submission to Sarah—for all these incidents we could easily find parallels in the modern history of every tribe in the desert of Arabia. The origin of the name *Ishmael* is thus explained. When Hagar fled from Sarah, the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness in the way of Shur... and he said, "Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name *Ishmael* ('God hears'), because the Lord *hath heard* thy affliction" (<sup>(-0161)</sup>Genesis 16:11). Hagar had evidently intended, when she fled, to return to her native country. But when the angel told her of the dignity in store for her as a mother, and the power to which her child, as the son of the great patriarch, would attain, she resolved to obey his voice, and to submit herself to Sarah (<sup>(-0160)</sup>Genesis 16:10-13).

**1.** Ishmael was born at Mamre, in the eighty-sixth year of Abraham's age, eleven years after his arrival in Canaan, and fourteen before the birth of Isaac (<sup>(-0163)</sup>Genesis 16:3, 16; 21:5). B.C. 2078. No particulars of his early life are recorded, except his circumcision when thirteen years of age (17, 25). B.C. 2065. His father was evidently strongly attached to him; for when an heir was promised through Sarah, he said, "Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!" (17, 18). Then were renewed to Abraham in more definite terms the promises made to Hagar regarding Ishmael: "As for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great nation" (ver. 20). Before this time Abraham seems to have regarded his first-born child as the heir of the promise, his belief in which was counted unto him for righteousness (<sup>(-0156)</sup>Genesis 15:6); and although that faith shone yet more brightly after his passing weakness when Isaac was first promised, his love for Ishmael is recorded in the narrative of Sarah's expulsion of the latter: "And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son" (<sup>(-0211)</sup>Genesis 21:11).

Ishmael seems to have remained in a great measure under the charge of his mother, who, knowing his destiny, would doubtless have him trained in such exercises as would fit him for successfully acting the part of a desert prince. Indulged in every whim and wish by a fond father, encouraged to daring and adventure by the hardy nomads who fed and defended his father's flocks, and having a fitting field on that southern border-land for the play of his natural propensities, Ishmael grew up a true child of the desert—a wild and wayward boy. The perfect freedom of desert life, and his

constant intercourse with those who looked up to him with mingled feelings of pride and affection as the son and heir-apparent of their great chief, tended to make him impatient of restraint, and overbearing in his temper. The excitement of the chase — speeding across the plains of Beersheba after the gazelles, and through the rugged mountains of Engedi after wild goats, and bears, and leopards, inured him to danger, and trained him for war. Ishmael must also have been accustomed from childhood to those feuds which raged almost incessantly between the “trained servants” of Abraham and their warlike neighbors of Philistia, as well as to the more serious incursions of roving bands of freebooters from the distant East. Such was the school in which the great desert chief was trained. Subsequent events served to fill up and fashion the remaining features of Ishmael’s character. He had evidently been treated by Abraham’s dependents as their master’s heir, and Abraham himself had apparently encouraged the belief. The unexpected birth of Isaac, therefore, must have been to him a sad and bitter disappointment. And when he was afterwards driven forth, with his poor mother, a homeless wanderer in a pathless wilderness; when, in consequence of such unnatural harshness, he was brought to the very brink of the grave, and was only saved from a painful death by a miracle; when, after having been reared in luxury, and taught to look forward to the possession of wealth and power, he was suddenly left to whi a scanty and uncertain subsistence by his sword and bow--we need scarcely wonder that his proud spirit, revolting against injustice and cruelty, should make him what the angel had predicted, “a wild-ass man; his hand against every man, and every man’s hand against him” (<sup>-016B</sup>Genesis 16:32).

**2.** The first recorded outbreak of Ishmael’s rude and wayward spirit occurred at the weaning of Isaac. B.C. 2061. On that occasion Abraham made a great feast after the custom of the country. In the excitement of the moment, heightened probably by the painful consciousness of his own blighted hopes, Ishmael could not restrain his temper, but gave way to some insulting expressions or gestures of mockery. Perhaps the very name of the child, Isaac (“*laughter*”), and the exuberant joy of his aged mother, may have furnished subjects for his untimely satire. *SEE ISAAC*. Be this as it may, Sarah’s jealous eye and quick ear speedily detected him; and she said to Abraham, “Expel this slave and her son; for the son of this slave shall not be heir with my son, with Isaac” (<sup>-021D</sup>Genesis 21:10). Now Abraham loved the boy who first, lisping the name “father,” opened in his

heart the gushing fountain of paternal affection. The bare mention of such an unnatural act made him angry even with Sarah, and it was only when influenced by a divine admonition that he yielded. The brief account of the departure of Hagar, and her journey through the desert, is one of the most beautiful and touching pictures of patriarchal life which has come down to us: “And Abraham rose early in the morning, and took bread, and a skin of water, and gave it to Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the lad (dl yh), and sent- her away;. and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And when the water was spent in the skin, she placed the lad under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat down opposite, at the distance of a bowshot; for she said, I will not see the death of the lad. And she sat opposite, and lifted up her voice and wept” (<0214>Genesis 21:14-16).

Isaac was born when Abraham was a hundred years old (<0205>Genesis 21:5), and as the weaning, according to Eastern usage, probably took place when the child was about three years old, Ishmael himself must have been then about sixteen years old. The age of the latter at the period of his circumcision, and at that of his expulsion, has given occasion for some literary speculation. A careful consideration of the passages referring to it fails, however, to show any discrepancy between them. In <0175>Genesis 17:25, it is stated that he was thirteen years old when he was circumcised; and in 21. 14 (probably two or three years later) “Abraham took bread, and a bottle- of water, and gave [it] unto Hagar, putting [it] on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away.” Here it is at least unnecessary to assume that the child was put on her shoulder the construction of the Hebrew (mistranslated by the Sept., with whom seems to rest the origin of the question) not requiring it; and the sense of the passage renders it highly improbable: Hagar certainly carried the bottle on her shoulder, and perhaps the bread: she could hardly have also thus carried a child. Again, these passages are quite irreconcilable with ver. 20 of the last quoted chapter, where Ishmael is termed r [Nh; A.. “lad” (comp., for use of this word, <0349>Genesis 34:19; 37:2; 41:12). It may seem strange to some that the hardy, active boy, inured to fatigue, should have been sooner overcome by thirst than his mother; but those advanced in life can bear abstinence longer than the young, and, besides, Ishmael had probably exhausted his strength in vain attempts to gain a supply of food by his bow. Again Hagar is saved by a miracle: “God heard the voice of the lad .. and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well

of water” (ver. 17, 19). And again the cheering promise is renewed to her son, “I will make of him a great nation” (ver. 18).

**3.** The wilderness of Paran, lying along the western side of the Arabah, between Canaan and the mountains of Sinai, now became the home of Ishmael (see Baumgarten, *Comm.* I, 1, 22): “And God was with him, and he became a great archer” (ver. 20). Some of the border tribes with which the shepherds of Abraham were wont to meet and strive at the wells of Gerar, Beersheba, and En-Mishpat probably received and welcomed the out cast to their tents. A youth of his warlike training and daring spirit would soon acquire a name and a high position among nomads. (See Prokesch, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 46.) His relationship to Abraham also would add to his personal claims. It would seem to have been the original intention of his mother to return to Egypt, to which country she belonged; but this being prevented, she was content to obtain for her son wives from thence (<sup>0209</sup>Genesis 21:9-21; on which latter verse the *Targum* of Jonathan adds traditionally that he divorced his first wife Adisha, and then married an Egyptian Phatima). His mother, accordingly, as soon as she saw him settled, took for him an Egyptian wife—one of her own people, and thus completely separated him from his Shemitic connections. This wife of Ishmael is not elsewhere mentioned; she was, we must infer, an Egyptian; and this second infusion of Hamitic blood into the progenitors of the Arab nation, Ishmael’s sons, is a fact that has generally been overlooked. No record is made of any other wife of Ishmael, and failing such record, the Egyptian was the mother of his twelve sons and daughter. This daughter, however, is called the “sister of Nebajoth” (<sup>0209</sup>Genesis 28:9), and this limitation of the parent-age of the brother- and sister certainly seems to point to a different mother for Ishmael’s other sons. The Arabs, probably borrowing from the above Rabbinical tradition, assert that he twice married; the first wife being an Amalekite, by whom he had no issue; and the second a Joktanite, of the tribe of Jurhum (*Mir-dt et-Zemdn*, MS, quoting a tradition of Mohammed Ibn-Is-hak). Though Ishmael joined the native tribes of Arabia, his posterity did not amalgamate with them. The Joktanites have left traces of their names and settlements chiefly in the southern and southeastern parts of the peninsula, while the Ishmaelites kept closer to the borders of Canaan (see Forster’s *Geography of Arabia*, 1, 77. sq.).

**4.** Although their lots were cast apart, it does not appear that any serious alienation existed between Ishmael and Isaac; for when Abraham died, we

read that “his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah.” The rival brothers then met, in the vale of Mamre, at their father’s tomb (<sup>0239</sup>Genesis 25:9). B.C. 1989. (The Talmud states [*Baba Bathra*, 16] that prior to Abraham’s death Ishmael had forsaken the nomadic mode of life.) That must have been a strange and deeply interesting scene at the burial of the great patriarch. All his own old “trained servants.” with Isaac, the peaceful shepherd chief, at their head, were assembled there; while Ishmael, surrounded by the whole body of his wild retainers and allies, as was and still is the custom of Bedawy sheiks, stood there too. As funerals in the East take place almost immediately after death, it is evident that Ishmael must have been called from the desert to the death-bed of his father, which implies that relations of kindness and respect had been kept up, although the brevity. of the sacred narrative prevents any special notice of this circumstance. Ishmael had, probably, long before received an endowment from his father’s property similar to that which had been bestowed upon the sons of Keturah (<sup>0236</sup>Genesis 25:6).

**5.** Of Ishmael’s personal history after this event we know nothing. The sacred historian gives us a list of his twelve sons, tells us that Esau married his daughter Mahalath, the sister of Nebajoth (<sup>0239</sup>Genesis 28:9), and sums up the brief simple sketch in these words: “These are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirtyseven years; and he died, and was gathered to his people” (Genesis 25, 17). B.C. 1941. Where he died, or where he was buried, we know not.

**6.** It has been shown, in the article ARABIA, that Ishmael had no claim to the honor, which is usually assigned to him, of being the founder of the Arabian nation. That nation existed before he was born. He merely joined it, and adopted its habits of life and character; and the tribes which sprung from him formed eventually an important section of the tribes of which it was composed. (See also Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 210.) At this period the Arabian desert appears to have been thinly peopled by descendants of Joktan, the son of Eber, “whose dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east” (<sup>0105</sup>Genesis 10:25-30). The Joktanites, or *Bene-Kahtan*, are regarded by Arab historians as the first and most honorable progenitors of the Arab tribes (D’Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s.v. Arabes). **SEE JOKTAN.**

Ishmael had twelve sons: Nebajoth, Kedar, Abdeel, Mibsam, Mishma, Dumah, Massa, Hadar, Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. To the list of

them, the sacred historian appends (<sup><02516></sup>Genesis 25:16) an important piece of information: “These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, *by their cities* (**μϕyρxj** , “fortified towns”), *and their camps* (**μtryf**); twelve *princes according to their nations*” (**μtmal** ). Every one of the twelve sons of Ishmael, therefore, like the children of Jacob, was the head of a tribe, and the founder of a distinct colony or camp. In this respect the statements in the Bible exactly accord with the ancient traditions and histories of the Arabs themselves. Native historians divide the Arabs into two races: 1. *Pure Arabs*, descendants of Joktan; and, 2. *Mixed Arabs*, descendants of Ishmael. Abulfeda gives a brief account of the several tribes and nations which descended from both these original stocks (*Historia Anteislamica*, ed. Fleischer, p. 180, 191 sq.). Some of the tribes founded by sons of Ishmael retained the names of their founders, and were well known in history. The *Nabathceans*, who took possession of Idumaea in the 4th century B.C., and constructed the wonderful monuments of Petra, were the posterity of *Nebajoth*, Ishmael’s eldest son. **SEE NABATHIEANS**. The descendants of *Jetur* and *Naphish* disputed with the Israelites possession of the country east of the Jordan, and the former, described by Strabo as **κακοῦργοι πάντες** (16:2), gave their name to a small province south of Damascus, which it bears to this day. **SEE ITUREA**. The black tents of *Kedar* were pitched in the heart of the Arabian desert, and from their abundant flocks they supplied the marts of Tyre (<sup><3120></sup>Jeremiah 2:10; <sup><3117></sup>Isaiah 60:7; <sup><3221></sup>Ezekiel 27:21). The district of *Tema* lay south of Edom, and is referred to by both Job and Isaiah (<sup><1619></sup>Job 6:19; <sup><3214></sup>Isaiah 21:14; Forster’s *Geogr. of Arabia*, 1, 292; Heeren’s *Historical Researches*, 2, 107). *Dumah* has left his name to a small province of Arabia. Since the days of Abraham the tents of the Ishmaelites have been studded along the whole eastern confines of Palestine, and they have been scattered over Arabia from the borders of Egypt to the banks of the Euphrates. As friends and foes, as oppressors and oppressed-but ever as freemen-the seed of Ishmael have “dwelt in the presence of their brethren.”

Of this last expression various explanations have been given, but the plainest is the most probable; which is, that Ishmael and the tribes springing from him should always be located near the kindred tribes descended from Abraham. This was a promise of benefit in that age of migration, when Abraham himself had come from beyond the Euphrates, and was a stranger and sojourner in the land of Canaan. There was thus, in fact, a relation of some importance between this promise and the promise of the heritage of



Canaan to another branch of Abraham's offspring. It had seemingly some such force as this-The heritage of Canaan is, indeed destined for another son of Abraham; but still the lot of Ishmael, and of those that spring from him, shall never be cast far apart from that of his brethren. This view is confirmed by the circumstance that the Israelites did, in fact, occupy the country bordering on that in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled-the Ishmaelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. Most interpreters find in this passage a promise that the descendants of Ishmael should never be subdued. But we are unable to discover this in the text; and, moreover, such has not been the fact, whether we regard the Ishmaelites apart from the other Arabians, or consider the promise made to Ishmael as applicable to the whole Arabian family. The Arabian tribes are in a state of subjection at this moment; and the great Wahaby confederacy among them, which not many years ago filled Western Asia with alarm, is now no longer heard of.

The prophecy which drew their character has been fulfilled with equal minuteness of detail. "He shall be *a wild ass of a man* ( $\mu\delta\alpha;arP$ ); his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him." This means, in short, that he and his descendants should lead the life of the Bedouins of the Arabian deserts; and how graphically this description portrays their habits may be seen in notes on these verses in the *Pictorial Bible*, and in the works of Niebuhr, Burckhardt, Lane, etc.; and, more particularly, in the Arabian romance of *Antar*, which presents the most perfect picture- of real Bedouin manners now in existence. A recent commentator on the passage has illustrated the prophecy with equal force and beauty. "The character of the Ishmaelites, or the Bedouins, could not be described more aptly or more powerfully. Against them alone time seems to have no sickle, and the conqueror's sword no edge. They have defied the softening influence of civilization, and mocked the attacks of the invader. Ungovernable and roaming, obeying no law but their spirit of adventure, regarding all mankind as their enemies, whom they must either attack with their spears or elude with their faithful steeds, and cherishing their deserts as heartily as they despise the constraint of towns and communities, the Bedouins are the outlaws among the nations. Plunder is legitimate gain, a daring robbery is praised as valor" (Kalisch, ad loc.). *SEE ISHMAELITE.*

**7.** The notions of the Arabs respecting Ishmael (*Ismail*) are partly derived from the Bible, partly from the Jewish Rabbins. and partly from native traditions. The origin of many of these traditions is obscure, but a great



number may be ascribed to the fact of Mohammed's having, for political reasons, claimed Ishmael for his ancestor, and striven to make out an impossible pedigree; while both he and his followers have, as a consequence of accepting this assumed descent, sought to exalt that ancestor. Another reason may be safely found in Ishmael's acknowledged headship of the naturalized Arabs, and this cause existed from the very period of his settlement. *SEE ARABIA*. Yet the rivalry of the Joktanite kingdom of Southern Arabia, and its intercourse with classical and medieval Europe, the wandering and unsettled habits of the Ishmaelites, their having no literature, and, as far as we know, only a meager oral tradition, all contributed, till the importance it acquired with the promulgation of El-Islam, to render our knowledge of the Ishmaelitic portion of the people of Arabia, before Mohammed, lamentably defective. That they maintained, and still maintain, a patriarchal and primitive form of life, is known to us. Their religion, at least in the period immediately preceding Mohammed, was in Central Arabia chiefly the grossest fetishism, probably learnt from aboriginal inhabitants of the land; southwards it diverged to the cosmic worship of the Joktanite Himyerites (though these were far from being exempt from fetishism), and northwards (so at least in ancient times) to an approach to that true faith which Ishmael carried with him, and his descendants thus gradually lost. This last point is curiously illustrated by the numbers who, in Arabia, became either Jews (Karaites) or Christians (though of a very corrupt form of Christianity), and by the movement in search of the faith of the patriarchs which had been put forward, not long before the birth of Mohammed, by men not satisfied with Judaism or the corrupt form of Christianity with which alone they were acquainted. This movement first aroused Mohammed, and was afterwards the main cause of his success.

The Arabs believe that Ishmael was the first-born of Abraham, and the majority of their doctors (but the point is in dispute) assert that this son, and not Isaac, was offered by Abraham in sacrifice. The scene of this sacrifice is Mount 'Armafah, near' Mecca, the last holy place visited by pilgrims, it being necessary to the completion of pilgrimage to be present at a sermon delivered there on the 9th of the Mohammedan month Zu-l-Hejjeh, in commemoration of the offering, and to sacrifice a victim on the following evening after sunset, in the valley of Mini. The sacrifice last mentioned is observed throughout the Muslim world, and the day on which it is made is called "The Great Festival" (Lane's *Mod. Egypt*. Ch. 3).

Ishmael, say the Arabs, dwelt with his mother at Mekkeh, and both are buried in the place called the “Hejr,” on the north-west (termed by the Arabs the north) side of the Kaabeh, and enclosed by a curved wall called tIJ, “Hatim.” Ishmael was visited at Mekkeh by Abraham, and they together rebuilt the temple, which had been destroyed by a flood. At Mekkeh, Ishmael married a daughter of Mudad or El-Mudad, chief of the Jokanite tribe Jurhum, and had thirteen children (*Mir-at ez-Zemdn*, MS.), thus agreeing with the Biblical number, including the daughter.

Mohammed’s descent from Ishmael is totally lost, for an unknown number of generations, to ‘Adnan, of the twenty-first generation before the prophet: from him downwards the latter’s descent is, if we may believe the genealogists, fairly proved. But we have evidence far more trustworthy than that of the genealogists; for, while most of the natives of Arabia are unable to trace up their *pedigrees*, it is scarcely possible to find one who is ignorant of his *race*, seeing that his very life often depends upon it. The law of blood-revenge necessitates his knowing the names of his ancestors for four generations, but no more; and this law, extending from time immemorial, has made any confusion of race almost impossible. This law, it should be remembered, is not a law of Mohammed, but an old pagan law that he endeavored to suppress, but could not. In casting doubt on the prophet’s pedigree, we must add that this cannot affect the proofs of the chief element of the Arab nation being Ishmaelitish (and so, too, the tribe of Kureysh, of whom was Mohammed). Although partly mixed with Joktanites, they are more mixed with Keturahites, etc.; the characteristics of the Joktanites, as before remarked, are widely different from those of the Ishmaelites; and, whatever theories may be adduced to the contrary, we believe that the Arabs, from physical characteristics, language, the concurrence of native traditions (*before* Mohammedanism made them untrustworthy), and the testimony of the Bible, are mainly and essentially Ishmaelitish.

**2.** The father (or ancestor) of Zebadiah, which latter was “ruler of the house of Judah” under Jehoshaphat (<sup><1491></sup>2 Chronicles 19:11).. B.C. cir. 900.

**3.** Son of Jehohanan, and captain of a “hundred” under the regency of Jehoiada (<sup><1421></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. 877.

**4.** One of the six sons of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin (<sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 8:38; 9:44). B.C. ante 588.

5. The son of Nethaniah, whose treachery forms one of the chief episodes of the history of the period immediately succeeding the first fall of Jerusalem (<sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 40:7 41:15, with a short summary, in <sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 25:23-25). B.C. 587. His full description is “Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, of the seed royal” of Judah (<sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 41:1; <sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 25:25). Whether by this is intended that he was actually a son of Zedekiah, or of one of the later kings, or, more generally, that he had royal blood in his veins—perhaps a descendant of Elishama, the son of David (<sup><1156></sup>2 Samuel 5:16) —we cannot tell. Jerome (*Qu. Hebr.* on <sup><1807></sup>2 Chronicles 28:7) interprets this expression as meaning “of the seed of Molech.” He gives the same meaning to the words “the king’s son” applied to Maaseiah in the above passage. The question is an interesting one, and has recently been revived by Geiger (*Urschiff*, etc., p. 307), who extends it to other passages and-persons. — **SEE MOLECH.** Jerome (as above) further says—perhaps on the strength of a tradition that Ishmael was the son of an Egyptian slave, Gera: as a reason why the “seed royal” should bear the meaning he gives it. During the siege of the city he had, like many others of his countrymen (<sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 40:11), fled across the Jordan, where he found a refuge at the court of Baalis, then king of the Bene-Ammon (Josephus, *Ant.* 10:9, 2). Ammonitish women were sometimes found in the harems of the kings of Jerusalem (<sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 11:1), and Ishmael may have been thus related to the Ammonitish court on his mother’s side. At any rate, he was instigated by Baalis to the designs which he accomplished but too successfully (<sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 40:14; Josephus, *Ant.* 10:9, 3). Several bodies of Jews appear to have been lying under arms in the plains on the southeast of the Jordan, during the last days of Jerusalem, watching the progress of affairs in Western Palestine, commanded by “princes” (μῆραι), the chief of whom were Ishmael, and two brothers, Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah. Immediately after the departure of the Chaldean army these men moved across the Jordan to pay their respects to Gedaliah, whom the king of Babylon had left as superintendent (dyqp) of the province. Gedaliah had taken up his residence at Mizpah, a few miles north of Jerusalem, on the main road where Jeremiah the prophet resided with him (40:6). The house would appear to have been isolated from the rest of the town. We can discern a high-enclosed courtyard and a deep well within its precincts. The well was certainly (<sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 41:9; comp. <sup><1152></sup>1 Kings 15:22), and the whole residence was probably, a relic of the military works of Asa, king of Judah. Ishmael made no secret of his intention to kill the superintendent and usurp his position. Of this Gedaliah

was warned in express terms by Johanan and his companions; and Johanan, in a secret interview, foreseeing how irreparable a misfortune Gedaliah's death would be at this juncture (40:15), offered to remove the danger by killing Ishmael. This, however, Gedaliah, a man evidently of a high and unsuspecting nature, would not hear of (40:16; and see the amplification in Josephus, *Ant. 10:9, 3*). They all accordingly took leave. Thirty days after (Josephus, *Ant. 10:9, 4*), in the seventh month (<sup>2400</sup>Jeremiah 41:1), on the third day of the month-so says the tradition-Ishmael again appeared at Mizpah, this time accompanied by ten men, who were, according to the Hebrew text, "princes of the king" (Ēl MhiyBe), though this is omitted by the Sept. and by Josephus. Gedaliah entertained them at a feast (41:1). According to the statement of Josephus, this was a very lavish entertainment, and Gedaliah became much intoxicated. It must have been a private one, for before its close Ishmael and his followers had murdered Gedaliah and all his attend-ants with such secrecy that no alarm was given outside the room. The same night he killed all Gedaliah's establishment, including some Chaldean soldiers who were there. Jeremiah appears fortunately to have been, absent, and, incredible as it seems, so well had Ishmael' taken his precautions, that for two days the massacre remained perfectly unknown to the people of the town. On the second day Ishmael perceived from his elevated position a large party coming southwards along the main road from Shechem and Samaria. He went out to meet them. They proved to be eighty devotees, who, with rent clothes, and with shaven beards, mutilated bodies, and other marks of heathen devotion, and weeping (Sept.) as they went, were bringing incense and offerings to the ruins of the Temple. At his invitation they turned aside to the residence of the superintendent. Here Ishmael put into practice the same strata-gem which, on a larger scale, was employed by Mehemet Ali in the massacre of the Mamelukes at Cairo in: 1806. As the unsuspecting pilgrims passed within the outer gates (Sept. *court-yard*) he closed the entrances behind them and there he and his band butchered the whole number ten only escaped by the offer of heavy ransom for their lives. The seventy corpses were then thrown into the well, which (as in the Sepoy massacre at Cawnpore) was within the precincts of the house, and which was completely filled with the bodies. It was the same thing that had been done by Jehu-a man in some respects a prototype of Ishmael, with the bodies of the-forty-two relatives of Ahaziah (<sup>2104</sup>2 Kings 10:14). This done, he descended to the town, surprised and carried off the daughters of king Zedekiah, who had been sent there by Nebuchadnezzar for safety, with

their eunuchs and their Chaldean guard (<sup><24114></sup>Jeremiah 41:14, 16), and all the people of the town, and made off with his prisoners to the country of the Ammonites Which road he took is not quite clear; the Hebrew text and Sept. say by Gibeon, that is north; but Josephus, by Hebron; round the southern end of the Dead Sea. The news of the massacre had by this time got abroad; and Ishmael was quickly pursued by Johanan and his companions. Whether north or south, they soon tracked him and his unwieldy booty, and found them reposing by some copious waters (**μyBæi μyæ**). He was attacked, two of his bravoes slain, the whole of the prey recovered, and Ishmael himself, with the remaining eight of his people, escaped to the Ammonites, and thenceforward passes into the obscurity from which it would have been well if he had never emerged. Johanan's foreboding was fulfilled. The result of this tragedy was an immediate panic. The small remnants of the Jewish commonwealth-the captains of the forces, the king's daughters, the two prophets Jeremiah and Baruch, and all the men, women, and children-at once took flight into Egypt (<sup><24117></sup>Jeremiah 41:17; 43:5-7), and all hopes of a settlement were for the time at an end. The remembrance of the calamity was perpetuated by a fast the fast of the seventh month (<sup><3005></sup>Zechariah 7:5; 8:19), which is to this day strictly kept by the Jews on the third of Tisri. (See Reland, *Antiq.* 4:10: Kimchi on <sup><3005></sup>Zechariah 7:5). The part taken by Baalis in this transaction apparently brought upon his nation the denunciations both of Jeremiah (<sup><24118></sup>Jeremiah 49:1-6) and the more distant Ezekiel (<sup><2521></sup>Ezekiel 25:1-7), but we have no record to-show him these predictions were accomplished. **SEE GEDALIAH.**

**6.** One of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (<sup><2502></sup>Ezra 10:22). B.C. 459.

## Ishmael

(as a later name). **SEE ISMAEL.**

## Ish'maelite

(Heb. *Yishmeeli'*, **yl æ[æ]y**, <sup><1207></sup>1 Chronicles 2:17; 28:3, etc., plur. **μl y[æ]yæ** usually Anglicized "Ishmeelites." q.v.), a descendant of Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar. Ishmaelites carried on a traffic with Egypt (<sup><13725></sup>Genesis 37:25, 27; 39:1), and lived a wandering life as nomades at the eastward of the Hebrews and of Egypt as far as to the Persian Gulf

and Assyria, i.e. Babylonia (<sup><012518></sup>Genesis 25:18), which same limits are elsewhere assigned to the Amalekites (<sup><09157></sup>1 Samuel 15:7); so also the names “Ishmaelites” and “Midianites” appear to be sometimes applied to the same people (<sup><013725></sup>Genesis 37:25, 27, 28; <sup><07082></sup>Judges 8:22, 24). In <sup><012518></sup>Genesis 25:18, it is said, “And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria: and he died in the presence of all his brethren.” As Ishmael’s death had already been mentioned, and as the Hebrew term **נָפַח**; *naphal*-rendered “*he died*,” properly *he fell* — is seldom used in the Scriptures in reference to “dying,” except in cases of sudden and violent death, as when one “falls” in battle, the probability is that *naphal* here signifies that his territory or possession *fell* to him in the presence of all his brethren, or immediately contiguous to the borders of the territories in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled the Israelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. This interpretation is countenanced by the Sept. and Targums which have *dwelt*, and by the promise in <sup><01612></sup>Genesis 16:12 (comp. the similar phraseology in <sup><012304></sup>Joshua 23:4; <sup><01916></sup>Psalms 16:6). “The twelve sons of Ishmael, somewhat like the twelve sons of Jacob, then came so many heads of tribes (<sup><012513></sup>Genesis 25:13-15), which implies that in the next generation they spread themselves pretty widely abroad. It appears (<sup><012518></sup>Genesis 25:18) that the head-quarters of the race lay in the northern parts of the Arabian peninsula; but in process of time they would naturally stretch more inland, eastward and southward. That they also extended their journeying northwards is evident from the fact that the brethren of Joseph espied “a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, to carry it down to Egypt” (<sup><013725></sup>Genesis 37:25). The company has afterwards the name of Midianites applied to it (ver. 28), probably on account of its consisting of more than one class of people, Midianites also in part; but being first called Ishmaelites, we can have no reasonable doubt that these formed a considerable portion of the caravan party. The trade of inland carriers between the countries in the north of Africa on the one side, and those in southern and western Asia (India, Persia, Babylonia, etc.) on the other, is one in which sections of the Ishmaelitic race have been known from the remotest times to take a part. It suited their migratory and unsettled habits; and they became so noted for it, that others, who did not belong to the same race, were not infrequently called Ishmaelites, merely because they followed the Ishmaelitic traffic and manners. It is impossible to say how far the descendants of Ishmael penetrated into Arabia, or acquired settlements

in its southern and more productive regions. As it is certain the Ishmaelitish mode of life has been always less practiced there, and a modified civilization is of old standing, the probability is that the population in those regions has little in it of Ishmaelitish blood. But, with all their regard to genealogies, the Arabic races have for thousands of years been so transfused into each other, that all distinct landmarks are well-nigh lost. The circumstance of Mohammed having, for prudential reasons, claimed to be a descendant of the son of Abraham, has led to an extension of the Ishmaelitish circle far beyond what the probable facts will bear out” *SEE ISHIMAL*, 1.

### Ishmai’ aah

(Heb. *Yishmmzayah*, *hy[ ]ivjæ* and in <sup><1379></sup>1 Chronicles 27:19 in the paragogic form *Yishlnaya’hu*, *Why[ ]ivjæ* heard by Jehovah), the name of two of David’s officers.. See *DA TI*.

**1.** (Sept. *Σαμαΐας*, ulg. *Samarjcs*, Auth. Vers. “Ismaiah.”) — A Gibeonite, one of the chiefs of those warriors who relinquished the cause of Saul, the head (of their tribe, and joined themselves to David-when he was at Ziklag (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 12:4). B.C. 1046. he is described as “a hero (*gibbor*) among the thirty and over the thirty” — i.e. David’s body-guard; but his name does not appear in the lists of the guard in 2 Samuel 23 and 1 Chronicles 11. Possibly he was killed in some encounter before David reached the throne.

**2.** (Sept. *Σαμαΐας*, Vulg. *Jesnmujas*, Auth. Vers. “Ismaiah.”) Son of Obadiah, and viceroy of Zebulon under David and Solomon (<sup><1379></sup>1 Chronicles 27:19). B.C. 1014.

### Ish’maelite

occurs in the A.V. at <sup><1375></sup>Genesis 37:25, 27, 28; 29:1, as a general name of the Abrahamic peoples of the “east country” or *BENE-KEDEL* *SEE BENE-KEDEL* (q.v.); but elsewhere (<sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 2:17) in the strict sense of the proper *ISHMAELITES* (as Anglicized in <sup><1784></sup>Judges 8:24: <sup><1816></sup>Psalms 83:6), with which the Heb. name corresponds.



## Ish'merai

(Heb. *Yishmmeray'*, *yrmyjæ* for *hyrMvjæ* *preserved by Jehovah*; Septuag. *Ἰεσσαμάρυ*), one of the sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (<sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 8:18). B.C. ante 588.

## I'shod

(Heb. *Jshhod'*, *d/hvjææ* *man of splendor*, i.e. in countenance or in fame; Sept. simply *Σούδ*, Vulg. translates *vir decorus*), a son of Hammoleketh, the sister of Machir of Gilead (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 7:18). B.C. cir. 1658.

## Ish'pan

(Heb. *Yishpan'*, *^Pvjææ* prob. *hid*, but Gesenius *bald*, Ftrst *strong*; Sept. *Ἰεσφάν*, Vulg. *Jespham* one of the "sons" of Shashak, a Benjamite chief resident at Jerusalem (<sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 8:22). B.C. ante 588. Ish'-tob (*Heb.* *Ish-Tob'*, *b/fAvyææ* *man of Tüb [i.e. good]*; Sept. *Ἰστώβ*; Josephus *Ἰστωβος*; Vulg. *Ishtob*), apparently one of the small kingdoms or states which formed part of the general country of Aram, named with Zobah, Rehob, and Maacah (<sup><1016></sup>2 Samuel 10:6, 8). In the parallel account of 1 Chronicles 19 Ishtob is omitted. By Josephus (*Ant.* 7:6, 1) the name is given as that of a king. But though in the ancient versions the name is given as one word, it is probable that the real signification is "the men of Tob" (q.v.), a district mentioned also in connection with Ammon in the records of Jephthah (<sup><7113></sup>Judges 11:3 5), and again, perhaps, under the shape of TOBIE or TUBIENI, in the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 5:13; 2 Macc. 12:17).

## Ish'uah

(Heb. *Yishvah'*, *hwvjææ* *uniform*; Septuag. *Ἰεσοῦα*, but *Ἰεσσοῦα* in Genesis; Vulg. *esua*), the second named of the sons of Asher (<sup><1467></sup>Genesis 46:17; <sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30, in which latter passage it is Anglicized "Isuah"). B.C. 1856. He appears to have left no issue (compare Numb. 26:44).

## Ishtuai

(<sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30). *SEE ISHUI*, 1.



## Ish'ui

(Heb. *Yishvi'*, *γῶσῆζα* *uniform*), the name of two men.

**1.** (Sept. in <sup><0437></sup>Genesis 46:17, **Ἰεὺλ**; Vulg. *Jessui*, Auth. Vers. "Isui;" in <sup><0834></sup>Numbers 26:44, **Ἰεσοὺ**, *Jessui*, "Jesui;" in <sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30, **Ἰησουί**, *Jessui*, "shuai"). The third named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family that bore his name ("Jesuites," <sup><0834></sup>Numbers 26:44). B.C. 1856.

**2.** (Septuag. **Ἰεσσοῦί**, Josephus **Ἰεσοῦς**, *Ant.* 6. 6, 6; Vulg. *Jessui*, Auth. Vers. "Ishui"). The second named of the three oldest sons of king Saul (<sup><0144></sup>1 Samuel 14:49); probably the same with ABINADAB (<sup><0812></sup>1 Samuel 31:2; comp. <sup><1333></sup>1 Chronicles 8:33). *SEE ISH-BOSHETIT.*

## Isidore of Alexandria, St.

was born in Egypt about the year 318, and led for a time the life of a hermit in the wilderness of the Thebaid and in the desert of Nitria. St. Athanasius ordained him priest, and give him the charge of a hospital, whence Isidore is also called *the Hospitaller*. After the death of Athanasius, Isidore courageously defended his works and his memory against the attacks of the Arians. Having got into difficulties with Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, Isidore was obliged to flee to Constantinople, where he died in 403. The Greek Church commemorates him on the 15th of January. See Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 16, 56. (J. N. P.)

## Isidore, St.

bishop OF CORDOVA, and an eminent Spanish theologian and historian, who flourished in the 4th century, is supposed to have died about 380. The chronicle of Flav. Dexter mentions him as having continued St. Jerome's *Chronicon* to the year 380; Sigebert de Gembloux attributes to him also a *Commentarius in Orosii Libros Regum*; but Florez and Antonio show good grounds for discrediting this assertion. Antonio even gives very strong reasons for considering this Isidore an imaginary individual, as well as another Isidore, likewise supposed to have been bishop of Cordova in 400-430, whom Dexter considers to be the author of a *Liber Alleyoriarsum* and a *Commentarius in Lucam*. See Bivarius, *Note ad Dextrum*; Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*, 1, 249; Fabricius, *Bibl.*

*Med. et Infimae Latinitatis*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 26:56. (J. N. P.)

## Isidore Mercator

(or *Peccator*), the supposed ( name of a compiler who, towards the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, published the famous collection of canons known as the Pseudo-Isidorian. *SEE CANONS*; *SEE DECRETALS*. It is pretty generally conceded that this writer lived in the dominions of Charles the Bald, but his real name is a matter of doubt. As for his collection, it is evidently based on that of Isidore of Seville, numerous copies of which. were at the time circulating in France; but it contains besides a vast number of apocryphal additions. Some of these pieces had already been in circulation for years, and they were not all made up by the Pseudo-Isidore. The collection of capitularies of Benedict Levita, a deacon of Mayence (who has by some been considered as the author of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection), which was written about 840, contains already numerous extracts of the fictitious documents of the work of Mercator. They circulated at first only in Southern France. They remained unknown in Spain until the 16th century, and in Germany and Italy but few copies of them are to be found. They are compiled from the histories of Rufinus and Cassiodorus, the *Liber Pontificalis*, the works of the fathers, decisions of the councils, regular decretals, the Bible (which, according to Richter, he quotes from the Vulgate, revised by Rhabanus Maurus), and, finally, the Roman law, of which he possessed a compendium in the Visigoth language. These two latter circumstances go far to prove that the writer must have been either a native, or at least, at the time, a resident of France. Mayence has sometimes been considered as the place where the pseudo-decretals were written, and Riculf or Otgar, archbishops of that city, or even Benedict Levita, above alluded to, as their author; but this seems unlikely, the more since Rhabanus Maurus, who succeeded Otgar in 847, appears entirely unacquainted with their existence. It must have been written about the middle of the 9th century, for it contains the decrees of the council held at Paris in 829, shows a knowledge of Rhabanus Maurus's work against the chor-bishops written in 847-849, and was first made public at the Synod of Chiersy in 857. The history of this collection has never been fully traced out; much may perhaps be done for it by a careful comparison of the numerous MS. copies of it which are still extant. Among these copies, one of the most important is the — *Codex Vaticanus*, No. 630, written in 858-867. It is thought that the *Capitula Angilrami*, another apocryphal

document of canon law, must also be considered as the work of the so-called Isidore Mercator. See, besides the works already referred to under **DECRETALS** *SEE DECRETALS*, Centuriatores, *Ecclesiastica historia*, vol. 6, cap. 7, and vol. 3, cap. 7; Blondel, *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; Van Espen, *De Collectione Isidori, Opera*, vol. 3; Zaccaria, *Antifebronio*, vol. 1, diss. 3; Spittler, *Gesch. des canonischen Rechts*, p. 243; Kunstmann, *Fragmente über Pseudo-Isidor* (Neue Sion, 1855); Gfrorer, *Untersuchung. über Alter. Ursprung und Zweck d. Dekretalen d. falschen Isidorus* (Friburg, 1848); Same, *Gesch. d. Carolinger*, 1, 71; Rosshirt, *Zu den Kirchenrechtlichen Quellen u. z. den Pseudo-Isidorischen Decretalen* (Heidelberg, 1849); Hoefler, *Nowv. Biog. Généralé*, 16, 71; Mlilman. *Latin Christianity*, 2, 370 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 12, 337; Hefele, in *Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* 8. 859. (J. H. W.)

### Isidore Of Moscow

a distinguished Russian bishop, was born at Thessalonica towards the close of the 14th century. He became successively archimandrite of the convent of St. Demitri at Constantinople, coadjutor of the archbishop of Illyria, and, finally (in 1437, metropolitan bishop of Russia. In this capacity he attended, at the head of a hundred Russian bishops and priests, the Council of Florence, at which the union of the Latin and Greek churches was effected. *SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF*. Isidore and Bessarion played the most important part in that council. In June 1439, having fulfilled his task, he returned to Moscow to proclaim the news. But the grand duke Vasili, who was displeased with the results of the council, had him thrown into prison, and condemned to be burned alive; but on the day appointed for the execution he made his escape, and fled to Rome, where Eugene IV welcomed him as a martyr. As the union effected by the Council of Florence in 1439 was of very short duration, Isidore was selected by the Roman pontiff, Nicholas V, as messenger to Constantinople, to attempt again a union of the churches, but in this mission he failed. Isidore died at Rome April 27, 1463. Having witnessed the establishment of Islamism at Constantinople, he gave an account of it in two letters, one of which was published in the *lettres Turques* of Reisner, vol. 4; the second, which is dated Candia, July 7, 1453, was never printed, and is probably contained in the Riccardini Library at Florence. Some Russian annalists, especially Nikon, give extracts of some of his sermons and commandments. — See *Nanamnukre skoba Opcoba; Drevnaia Rosjejskaia Bibliotheca*, vol. 11; Strahl, *Der Russische Metropolit Isidor u. sein Versuch d. russisch-*

*griechische Kirche zit d. Romisch-Katolischen zuvereinen* (Tibinlgen, 1823); *Claconii et Oldoini Vitae et Res gestae Pontificum et Carlinalium* (Romae, 1677), 2, 903; *Statuta Concilii Florentini* (Florence, 1518); Maimbourg, *Histoire du Schism des Grecs*; Theiner, *Vicissitudes de l'Eglise en Pologne et en Russie*, 1, 33; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 26, 73; Neale's *History of the Council of Florence*, p. 59; Covell, *Account of the Greek Church*, p. 117.

### Isidore of Pelusium

(or *Pelusiota*), ST., an ecclesiastical writer, was born at Alexandria about the year 370. He spent his life in the neighborhood of Pelusium, in a monastery of which he was abbot, and where he practiced strict asceticism. He was a great admirer of St. Chrysostom, of whom, according to some, he was a pupil, and whom he defended against the attacks of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Theophilus and Cyril. In the controversy waged by Cyril against Nestorius, Isidorus Pelusiota favored the Cyrillian party, his counsels of moderation contrasting greatly with the passion and ambition of Cyril. He was a firm adherent to the doctrines of the Greek Church, and vigorously opposed all heretical inroads. Of his writings, which "discuss, with learning, piety, judgment, and moderation, nearly all the theological and practical questions of his age," there remain to us yet a collection of his letters, forming five volumes, though they are probably not all (there are more than 2000 of them) his own. These letters treat almost all on the interpretation of Scripture. The first three volumes were published, with a Latin translation and notes, by J. de Billy (Paris, 1585, fol.), and reprinted, together with the fourth volume, by Conrad Rittershausen (Heidelb. 1605, fol.), and the fifth by the Jesuit Schott (Antw. 1623, 8vo). A complete, though rather faulty edition was finally published at Paris in 1638, folio, and in Migne's edition of the fathers, vol. 58 (Paris, 1860). See Photius, *Bibliotheca* (cod. 228, 232); Schröckh, *Christlichen Kirchengesch.* 17:520, 529; Heumann, *Dissertatio de Isidoro Pelusiota ejusque epistolis* (Göttingen, 1737, 4to); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 10:480, 494; H. A. Niemeyer, *De Isid. Pel. vita, scriptis et doctrina* (Halle, 1825); Tillemont, *Mem. Ecclesiastiques*, vol. 15; Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl. des aut. eccles.* 4, 5 sq.; Ceillier, *Fist. des aut. sac.* 13, 600 sq.; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* 2, 2, 361 sq.; Schaff; *Ch. Hist.* 3, 941; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 85; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 26, 57.

## Isidore of Seville, or Isidorus Hispaliensis

surnamed also "*the young*" to distinguish him from Isidore of Cordova, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the 7th century, was born at Carthagenia about the year 560 or 570. He was a son of Severianus and Theodora, and brother of St. Leander, his predecessor in the bishopric of Seville, and of St. Fulgentius, bishop of Carthage. He was brought up by his brother Leander, and it was therefore natural that he should have been favored in the selection of a successor for the bishopric of Seville, but it was not principally owing to his relationship to Leander that he was honored with this distinguished position. His abilities fully entitled him to this distinction. When he ascended to the bishopric the Goths had been masters of Spain for a century and a half. The north and west of Europe were shrouded in moral darkness. Germany, occupied by a number of adverse tribes, was yet given to idolatry; Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Scotland, were almost unknown; England and Ireland had just received the first faint glimpse of Christianity; France was torn by the dissensions of petty monarchs, and the East itself was on the eve of the inroads of Mohammedanism. To counteract these influences, and to build up the Christian faith among his countrymen, was his first care. To this end he established schools to properly train the young, entered into closer relations with the bishop of Rome (Gregory the Great), and made every effort. to bring the doctrinal and moral system of Christianity into harmony with the habits and institutions of those various races and nationalities which at that time composed the Hispano-Gothic kingdom; and so successful was he in his efforts that he is considered one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of Spain. His abilities were further recognized by his contemporaries in permitting him to preside over the two Councils-half ecclesiastical, half civil of Seville (619) and Toledo (Dec., 633). On both occasions he showed great zeal for the orthodox side, and strict opposition to all heretical manifestations; especially, however, was he opposed to Arianism. So able was the conduct of Isidore at these councils that the canons of them may be said to have served as a basis even for the constitutional law of the Spanish kingdom, both in Church and State, down to the time of the great constitutional changes of the 15th century. Isidore of Seville died at Seville April 4, 636, and was canonized by the Church soon after his death. We have but few particulars of his life from his writings, except that in a letter, about the authenticity of which there is much doubt, he invites some bishop to join him in a synod to depose the

bishop of Cordova for luxuriousness and worldliness. The great reputation which Isidore enjoyed among his colleagues may be best inferred from the fathers of the 8th Council of Toledo, who call him *Doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimum, decus, praecedentibus cetate postremus, doctriuae comparatione non infimus, atque, et quod majus est, jan saeculorum finiforum doctissimus, cum reverentia nominandus, Isidorus*. According to the testimony of his disciple, St. Ildefonse, he was a man of wonderful eloquence. The same authority names him as the author of *De Genere Oficiorum* (generally called *De Officiis ecclesiasticis*), *Liber Proemiorum*: — *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum* (sanctorum): — *Liber Synonymorum* (sive lamentationis): — *De Natura rerum*: — *Liber Sententiarum Liber Etymologiarum (Origines)*, probably the last work of Isidore. The first edition of his works, which display very extensive learning, and cover the various departments of literature-theological, ascetical, liturgical, scriptural, historical, philosophical, and even philological-and thus amply account for the admiration of his contemporaries, was published by Michael Somnius (Paris, 1580, folio); another, very complete, was taken principally from the MSS. of Alvar. Gomez, and augmented by notes by J. B. Perez and Grial (Madrid, 1599, 2 vols. fol.). The edition of James Dubreuil (Paris, 1601, folio) and that of Cologne (1667) are taken from that of Madrid. The latest, which is also considered the best, is due to Arevoli (Rome, 1797-1803, 7 vols. 4to). See St. Ildefonse, *De Viris Illustribus*; Sigebert de Gembloux, *De Script. Ecclesiast.* (c. 55); Trithem, *De Script. Eccles.*; M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 52; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gezer.* 26:57 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:89 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biography*, 2, 627 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Isidorus Hispaliensis

*SEE ISIDORE OF SEVILLE.*

## Isis

(**Ισις**), an Egyptian deity, sister and wife of Osiris (q.v.), is called by the Egyptians *His*, and is by them said to have been born on the 4th day of the Epagomena. or five days added to the Egyptian year of 360 days. The history of the worship of Isis is very obscure, all the information we possess on the subject being derived from Greek writers. Tradition said that her brother Osiris having married her, they together undertook the

task of civilizing men, and taught them agriculture; their marriage produced Horus. Their other brother, Typhon, being at enmity with them, succeeded once in surprising Osiris, murdered him, and deposited the body in a box, which he threw into the sea (Nile). Isis, while wandering about in mourning, seeking Osiris, heard that Osiris, before his departure, had been enamored with her sister Nephthys, who had had a son, now abandoned by the mother for fear of Typhon. By the aid of some dogs Isis succeeded in discovering that son, Anubis by name; she at once adopted him, and brought him up, and he became her faithful follower. In the mean time, the box containing Osiris drifted in the sea towards Byblos, Phoenicia, and was arrested by a bush, which soon grew into a tree, the box remaining enclosed in the wood. The king of Byblos caused a column to be made of this tree for his palace. Isis hastened thither to investigate the rumor, and, to avoid recognition, offered her services to 'the queen as nurse. At nightfall she put one of the children placed under her care in the fire, to divest it of all that was mortal, while she herself, in the form of a swallow, flew around the column which contained Osiris. The queen, seeing her child in the fire, cried out loudly, and thus deprived him of immortality. The goddess now revealed herself amidst thunder and lightning, and at one blow broke down the column, out of which the box containing Osiris fell. This she carried to her son Horus, who had been brought up in Butos, and he hid it. Typhon, however, discovered it, recognized the body, and tore it into 14 pieces (according to others, into 26 or 28 pieces). By means of magic, Isis succeeded in gathering all these pieces with the exception of the genitals, to replace which she made artificial ones. This is the reason why the Egyptians considered the Phallus as sacred. The body was now interred at Philae, which became the principal burial-place of the Egyptians. Osiris, however, returned from Hades to educate his son, and Isis bore him again another son, Harpocrates. As, however, she allowed Typhon, who had been captured by Horus, and whom she was to have killed to escape, Horns took the crown from her, and in its place Hermes placed bulls' horns on her head, since which Isis has generally been represented under the form of a woman with the horns of a cow. Isis was originally for the Egyptian a personification of the valley of the Nile, fecundated by Osiris, the god of the Nile. In after times, when, under the influence of foreign notions, Osiris came to be considered as the god of the sun, Isis was transformed into the goddess of the moon, and consequently as a friendly and life-imparting deity. She was also considered as the goddess of the lower world, of which she was said to hold the keys, and to be the ruler and judge. She

subsequently came to be regarded as the ruler of the sea, the law-giver and protector of marriage, the support of the state, the foundress of religion and the mysteries; and she finally obtained such importance that she was considered by the philosophers as the fundamental principle of the world, the divine power which is the cause of all the phenomenon of nature, and the source of divine and human life.

In the monuments Isis is called the goddess-mother, the mistress of heaven, sister and wife of Osiris, and nurse of Horus, the mourner of her brother, the eye of the sun, and regent of the gods. In her terrestrial character she wears upon her head the throne which represented her name; in her celestial, the disc and horns, or tall plumes. She is often seen nursing Horus (q.v.); sometimes also with the head of a cow (indicating her identity with the cow Athor, the mother of the sun), having a ball between her horns, the lotus on the top of her head, and the sistrum in her hand. She mostly wore a cloak fastened on her bosom by a knot; other images represent her with a spear, or, again, with the head of a hawk and wings, a spear in her right hand and a snake in the left, or with a flowing mantle and spreading a sail. Isis was worshipped throughout Egypt, and especially at Memphis. There was an image of her at Sais with the inscription, "I am the all, that has been, is, and shall be, and my cloak has no mortal lifted yet." All annual festival of ten days' duration commemorated the victory of Isis over Typhon by means of the sistrum: on this occasion a solemn fast was succeeded by processions, in which sheaves of wheat were carried about in honor of Isis, etc. After Alexander the Great, the worship of Isis was propagated throughout all the countries inhabited by the Greeks; in Greece temples were erected to her at Phlius, Megara, Tithorea, and Phocis. The worship of Isis was also introduced into Rome in the time of Sulla (B.C. 86), but her temples were often closed on account of the licentiousness of her priests. (Josephus tells a story about the demolition of her temple at Rome by order of the emperor on account of an intrigue by one Mundus to secure the gratification of his passion for a Roman matron, *Ant.* 18, 3, 4). Yet, under the emperors, it found credit, and Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla were themselves among her priests. Writers of those times say that it was in their day still the custom of the Greeks and Romans to carry a boat in solemn procession in honor of Isis on the opening of spring (March 5th). Hence, in the Roman calendar, the 5th of March is designated as *Isidis navilium*. As similar processions were also made by some of the German nations in honor of their deities, Tacitus claims that they also



worshipped Isis; yet her name nowhere appears among them, neither is it exactly known what goddess he thus designated.

“The myth of Isis, as given by Plutarch (*De Iside*), appears to be a fusion of Egyptian and Phoenician traditions, and the esoterical explanations offered ‘by that writer and others show the high antiquity and unintelligibility of her name. She was thought to mean the cause or seat of the earth, to be the same as the Egyptian Neith or Minerva, and Athor or Venus; to be the Greek Demeter or Ceres, Hecate, or even Io. Many monuments have been found of this goddess, and a tern. pie at Pompeii, and a hymn in her honor at Antioch. The representations of her under the Roman empire are most numerous, Isis having, in the pantheistic spirit of the age, been compared with and figured as all the principal goddesses of the Pantheon” (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.).

The fable was adopted and incorporated in the mysticism of the Gnostics. Accordingly, among other representations, we find a gem containing a beetle, with Isis on the opposite side, holding two children, the emblem of maternal fecundity. *SEE MADONNA*. On another gem the beetle is not cut on the stone, but the stone is formed into the shape of the insect, and on the convex back is represented Isis, or the Egyptian Ceres, reclining beside the Nile, with two vases of Egyptian corn, the emblem of vegetable prolificness, naturally expressed by the emblem of the sun’s rays and the Nile: from the head issues the lotus, and in one hand is held a nilometer, or perhaps a spade. It is the exact form of the same agricultural instrument as used at this day in the East. An amulet of Isis was held in great sanctity. *SEE EGYPT*.

See Herod. 2, c. 59; Ovid, *Metam.* 9, 776; Bunsen, *Egypt’s Place*, 1, 413; Wilkinson, *Manners and Cust.* 3, 276; 4:366; Birch, *Gall. Ant.* p. 31; Reichel, *De Isis apud Romanos cultu* (Berlin, 1849); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 9, 82; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Mythol.* s.v.

## Picture for Isis

### Isites

the name of a Mohammedan sect, who derive their name from their founder. Isa-Alerdad. They hold that the Koran was created, notwithstanding the opposition of Mohammed himself against such a statement, for he held that it was eternal, and in his day anathematized he

who dared to dissent from his assertion. The Isites, however, really avow the same belief, ‘though they clothe it in very different language. They say that the copy of the Koran delivered by the Almighty to his Prophet was only a transcription of the original, and that the reference of eternal could not therefore be to any copy possessed by man. But their real heresy consists in their declaration that the Koran does not contain that matchless eloquence which Mohammedans generally claim as evidence of the inspiration of the book. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Histor. Sac.* 1, 547.

## Islam or Eslam

(Arab.), the proper name of the religion known as Mohammedanism, designates complete and entire submission of body and soul to God, his will and his service, as well as to all those articles of faith, commands and ordinances revealed to and ordained by Mohammed his prophet. Islam, the Mohammedans say, was once the religion of all men; but wickedness and idolatry came into the world either after the murder of Abel, or at the time which resulted in the flood, or only after Amru Ibn-Lohai, one of the first and greatest Arabian idolaters. Every child, they believe, is born in Islam, or the true faith, and would continue faithful to the end were it not influenced by the wickedness of its parents, “who misguide it early, and lead it astray to Magismi, *SEE PIAKSEISS*, Judaism, or Christianity.” *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.*

## Island or Isle

is the invariable rendering in the ‘Auth. Vers. of the Heb. word *yaa* (Sept. *νησος*, Vulg. *izsula*), which occurs in the following senses, chiefly in poetry: First, that of dry or habitable *land* in opposition to water: as. “I will make the rivers islands” (<sup><2305></sup>Isaiah 42:15: comp. 43:19; 52:2). Especially is it a maritime region or *sea-coast*, like the East-Indian *Dsib*, which means both shore and island. In <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 20:6, the isle of Ashdod means the country, and is so rendered in the margin, particularly as this was a sea-shore. In <sup><2320></sup>Isaiah 23:2, 6, ‘the isle’? means the country of Tyre and in <sup><2716></sup>Ezekiel 27:6, 7, that of Chittim and Elisha, both being maritime regions. (In <sup><2220></sup>Job 22:30’, *yqaayam* means the non-guilty.) In this sense it is more particularly restricted to the shores of the Mediterranean, sometimes in the fuller expression “islands of the sea” (<sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 11:11), or “isles of the Gentiles” (<sup><0105></sup>Genesis 10:5; comp. <sup><2321></sup>Zephaniah 2:11), and sometimes simply as “: isles” (<sup><2720></sup>Psalms 72:10; <sup><2325></sup>Ezekiel 26:15, 18; 27:3,35; 39:6;

<sup><27118></sup>Daniel 11:18): an exception to this, however, occurs in <sup><26715></sup>Ezekiel 27:15, where the shores of the Persian Gulf are intended. Secondly, it is used both in Hebrew and English, according to its geographical meaning, for an *island* proper, i.e. a country surrounded by water, as in <sup><24704></sup>Jeremiah 47:4, “the isle (margin) of Caphtor,” which is probably that of Cyprus. “The isles of the sea” (<sup><17001></sup>Esther 10:1) are evidently put in opposition to “the land” or continent. Thirdly, the word is used by the Hebrews to designate all those countries divided from Palestine by water, as fully described in <sup><25272></sup>Jeremiah 25:22, “the isles which are beyond the sea,” which were hence regarded as the most remote regions of the earth (<sup><22445></sup>Isaiah 24:15; 42:10; 59:18; compare the expression in <sup><27609></sup>Isaiah 66:19, “the isles afar off”), and also as large and numerous (<sup><23015></sup>Isaiah 40:15; <sup><19701></sup>Psalms 97:1). (See J. D. Michaelis, *Spicilegium*, 1, 131-142.) In <sup><23111></sup>Isaiah 11:11, after an enumeration of countries lying on their own continent, the words “and the islands of the sea” are added in order to comprehend those situated beyond the ocean. It is observed by Sir I. Newton (*on Daniel*, p. 276), “By the earth the Jews understood the great continent of all Asia and Africa, to which they had access by land; and by the isles of the sea they understood the places to which they sailed- by sea, particularly all Europe. (See Gestenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 38.) —Kitto; Smith. **SEE WILD BEAST.** Islands of the Blessed were, according to a very old Greek myth, certain happy isles situated towards the edge of the Western Ocean, where the favorites of the gods, rescued from death, dwelt in joy, and possessed everything in abundance that could contribute to it.

## Islebiens

is the name by which the followers of John Agricola (q.v.) are designated, in distinction from all other Antinomians (q.v.). The name is derived from their master, who was also known as the *meagister Islebius*, because a native of Eisleben, also the birthplace of Luther, with whom he was a contemporary, Sometimes the Islebiens are called *Nomomachi* (q.v.).

## Islip, Simon

an English prelate, flourished in the 14th century. But little is known of his early history. He became archbishop in 1349, having previously been canon of St. Paul's, dean of the Arches, and a member of the privy council of the king. He is especially celebrated as the founder of the college of Canterbury (now a part of Christ Church, Oxford). “He built it,” says

bishop Godwin, in his account of Islip, “and endowed it with good possessions, appropriating unto the same the parsonages of Pagham and Mayfield.” Perhaps more noteworthy still is his conduct towards Wickliffe, related by Neander (*Ch. Hist.* 5, 135-6, where the name is by mistake spelled Islep, and so even in the English translation by Torrey). Islip, says Neander, was a firm friend of the reformer, and in 1363 showed his predilections for Wickliffe by appointing him overseer over the Canterbury college, characterizing him “as a man in whose circumspection, fidelity, and activity he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he gave this post on account of his honorable deportment and his learning.” Of course, after Islip’s death in 1366 (Apr. 26), Wickliffe was deprived of his place (comp. Levis, *Life of Wickliffe*, 1820, p. 9 sq.). See Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 6, 265. (J. H. W.)

### Ismachi’ah

(Heb. *Yismakyah*’, but only in the prolonged form *Yisnzachya’hu*, **Whykimsyah** supported by *Jehovah*; Sept. **Σαμαχία**), one of the Levites charged by Hezekiah with the superintendence of the sacred offerings under the general direction of the high-priest and others (<sup><481B></sup>2 Chronicles 31:13). B.C. 726.

### Is’mael

a Graecized form of the name ISHMAEL *SEE ISHMAEL* (q.v.), found in the A.V. of the Apocrypha.

1. (Ἰσμαήλ) The son of Abraham (Judith 2:23). 2. (Ἰσμαήλος) One of the priests who relinquished their Gentile wives after the Captivity (1 Esdr. 9:22).

### Ismael

the elder son of Jaafer Saduk, the sixth imaum, in a direct line, from Ali Ben-Ali Taleb (who married Mohammed’s daughter Fatima, and founded the Ali sect, also known as *Fatimites*, and more generally as the *Shiites*. q.v.), was to have been the seventh imaum of the Shiites, but, as he died during his father’s lifetime. Jaafer appointed as his successor his younger son Kauzim. This many of the Shiites opposed, holding that, as the imaum is an incarnate emanation of the Deity, only a descendant of the direct line could assume the responsibilities of this high office, and claimed the

distinction for the sons of Ismael, who alone, of the descendants of Jaafer, were entitled to be imaum. This contention caused a schism among the Shiites about the 2nd century of the Hegira (8th century of our sera), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAETES, or ISMAETANS. The Abbassidae (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the powerful Shiites, in order to assume the government themselves, sided with the Ismaelites. But the Persians, among whom the Ismaelites at first mainly prospered (generally known as Talimis, from *talimi*, “learning,” because they afterwards held, contrary to the orthodox Mussulmans, that man can arrive at the truth of anything only by continued study), soon comprehended the designs of the Abbassidae, and they warred alike against the Abbassidae caliphs and the other Mussulmans. Missionaries were sent through all the territories settled by the followers of Mohammed, at this time torn in pieces by scores of sects, to advocate the claims of the house of Ismael. They flourished in the 9th and 10th centuries under the name of *Karmatians* (q.v.), and constituted a secret band, governed by laws very much like the freemasons, admitting, however, some very dangerous tenets, and advocating the extirpation of their enemies by the sword. They received additional strength in the 11th century of our era, when a family of chiefs, through the means of superstition, established an influence over the minds of the Ismaelians that enabled them for two centuries to control the affairs of Persia. The first of these chiefs was Hussun Subah (from whose name the Ismaelites of this period are often called *Hussuni* or *Hossoni*--a title, however, having no connection [as has been erroneously supposed by some] with the English word assassin, which is really equivalent to “hashish-eaters;” *SEE ASSASSINS* ), who, after many years of persecution, succeeded in obtaining a stronghold, and, there fortifying himself, founded upon the Ismaelitic model a sect of his own. Besides maintaining the principles of the Ismatelites so far as regarded their rights of succession to the office of imaum, he also “introduced many new tenets more conformable to the opinions of the Suffis, or philosophical deists, than to those of orthodox Mohammedans. The Koran, he admitted, was a holy volume; but he insisted that its spirit, and not its literal meaning, was to be observed. He rejected the usual modes of worship, as true devotion, he said, was seated in the soul, and prescribed forms might disturb, though they could never aid, that secret and fervent adoration which it must always offer to its Creator (Malcolm, from a Persian MS.). But the principal tenet which Hussun Subah inculcated was a complete and

absolute devotion to himself and to his descendants. His disciples were instructed to consider him more as their spiritual than their worldly leader. The means he took to instill this feeling into their minds must have been powerful, from the effect which: was produced. “When an envoy from Malik Shah came to Allahamout, Hussun commanded one of his subjects to stab himself, and another to cast himself headlong from a precipice. Both mandates were- instantly’ obeyed! ‘Go,’ said he to the astonished envoy, ‘and explain to your master the character of my followers’ (Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, 1, 399). One reason which may be assigned for this control of Hussun over his adherents is that he formed them into a secret order and, besides, promised them advancement from one degree to another, in the highest of which a foretaste of the life that is to come was given them. This extraordinary mode of procuring the devotion of his disciples he is said to have produced by drugs. “A youth who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand prior; he was then intoxicated with *hashish* (the hemp-plant), and carried into the garden-a true Eastern Paradise where the music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonized with the murmurs of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality, and this, on awakening, he believed to be Paradise; everything around him, the hour is in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of Paradise, which the Prophet had promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit-after quaffing enervating delight from the eyes of the hour is, and intoxicating wine from glittering goblets, he sank into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavored to convince him that corporeally he had not left his side, but that spiritually he had been rapt into Paradise, and had there enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youths blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly seek an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a Paradise of sensual pleasure. What Mohammed had promised in the Koran to the Moslem, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell (Madden, *Turkish Empire*. 2, 185, based on a Hammer’s *Gesch. ider Assassinen*). Malcolm

thinks this an improbable tale, invented by the orthodox Mohammedans, who hold the Assassins in great abhorrence, because “the use of wine was strictly forbidden them, and they were enjoined the most temperate and abstemious habits.” But this seems to us only an additional reason why we should believe it to be true; for if Hussun used the *hashish* to intoxicate his followers when their nerves needed strengthening for some atrocious deed, we could not expect him to advocate the free use of intoxicating beverages. Nay, its truth is further confirmed by the revelations which the fourth successor of Hussun as grand master made of the imposture. The use also to this day at Constantinople and at Cairo of opium with henbane shows what an incredible ‘charm they exert on the drowsy indolence of the Turk and the fiery imagination of the Arab.

Hussun, on account of several hill forts which he had seized, “was styled ‘Sheik el-Jebel,’ an Arabic title which signifies ‘the chief of the mountains,’ and which has been literally, but erroneously, translated ‘the old man of the mountain’” (Malcolm, 1 401). The Ismaelites in his time spread extensively. They flourished not only in Persia, but also in Syria and Arabia, until A.D. 1253 when their atrocities became unbearable, and a general massacre against them was inaugurated. A command was issued by the reigning prince, Mangu Khan, in the 651st year of the Hegira, “to exterminate all the Ismaelites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother’s breast... Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatal sentence without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismaelites they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of-Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated.... Twelve thousand of these wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age... The ‘devoted to murder’ were not now the victims of the order’s vengeance, but that of outraged humanity. The sword was against the dagger [the weapon the Assassins most generally used to murder their opponents], the executioner destroyed the murderer. The seed sowed for two centuries was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin’s dagger was reaped by the sword of the mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment” (Madden, 2, 187; comp. Milman’s Gibbon [Harper’s edition], *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 6, 215). But, with all these persecutions, they still struggled on for many years, and even in our own day “remains of the Ismaelites still exist both in Persia and Syria, hut merely as one of the many sects and heresies of

Islamism, *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM*, without any claims to power, without the means of retaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state-subverting doctrine which animated the followers of Hussun,' and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to them. Their writings are a shapeless mixture of Ismaelitic and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of a mystical theology. Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Iraq, and at the foot of the anti Lebanon" (Madden, 2, 190, 191). At present many students of Eastern history incline to the opinion that "the Druses" (q.v.), generally supposed to be the descendants of the Hivites, to whom they bear some characteristic resemblances (comp. Chasseaud [a native of Syria, and a very able scholar], *Druses of the Lebanon*. p. 361 sq.), "must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ismaelian sect of the followers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived" (Madden, 2, 196). Some also hold to a connection of the *Ansarians* with the Assassins, especially Mr. Walpole (*Travels in the further East in 1850-51* [London, 2 vols. 8vo]; compare also his *Travels in the East*, 3, 3 sq.). Even in India the Ismaelites are believed to have followers, and as such "the *Borahs*, an industrious race of men, whose pursuits are commercial, and who are well known in the British settlements of India, who still maintain that part of the creed of Hussun Subah which enjoins a complete devotion to the mandate of the highpriest" (Malcolm, 1, 407, 408), are mentioned. See, besides the works already cited, J. F. Rousseau, *Memoire sur les Ismaelis et les Nosairis*, with notes by De Sacy; the Rev. Samuel Lyde, *The Ansireeh and Ishmaleeh, a Visit to the secret Sects of Northern Syria* (Lond. 1858, 8vo); *Asiatic Researches*, 11 43 sq. *SEE MOHAMMEDANS; SEE SHIITES*. (J.H.W.)

### Ismael, Haji

a Mussulman reformer, was born on the 28th of Shawal, 1196 of the Hegira (Sept. 11, 1781), in the village of Pholah, district of Delhi. His family had furnished quite a number of distinguished theologians, and Ismael began early to preach and write against the superstitious practices which had been introduced into the Mohammedan worship in Hindustan. In 1819 he became connected with Ahmed Shah, a Mohammedan of a family of Syeds of Bareilly, in Upper India, who was at this time attracting a great deal of attention at Delhi by superior sanctity, and by his denunciations of the corrupt forms of worship then prevalent. In 1822, he and another



Miussulman of some learning set out with Ahmed Shah on a visit to Arabia and Turkey. In all the great cities large congregations gathered about these new reformers, who sought to enforce attention to the precepts of the Koran independent of the opinions Of the high dignitaries of the Moslem Church. After traveling about for more than four years they returned to Delhi, determined to establish a theocratic form of government in India, and to restore Islamism to its original simplicity. The reformers inaugurated a general war against the unbelieving, and laying particular stress on the doctrine of the unity of God, they soon succeeded in gaining considerable power by the great number of their adherents. The Sikhs (q.v.) became their chief opponents, and with them a protracted struggle ensued. Driven from Delhi by the civil authorities, they retired in 1827 to Punjtar (situated in the Eusofzai hills, between Peshawur and the Indus), where they found an ally in Omar, khan Afghan of Punjtar. At first these united forces were successful in their wars against the Sikhs, but the Afghans soon grew weary of these conquests for strange allies, and Ahmed and Ismael being left alone, removed to the left bank of the Ildus, and there, amid rugged mountains, continued for a time the desultory warfare. Early in May 1831, however, they were surprised at a place called Balakot, in the mountains of Pahkli, and slain.

The followers of Ahmed and Ismael are called *Tharicati Mohammediyat*, and bear some resemblance in their doctrines to the *Sunnites* (q.v.). Ismael composed for the benefit of the sect, and at the instigation of Ahmed, the *Tukvia ul-Inzmi*, or "Basis of the Faith," in the Urdu, or vernacular language of Upper India, and it was printed at Calcutta. "It is divided into two portions, of which the first only is understood to be the work of Ismael, the second part (the *Sirat Almostakim*, published in Persian at Calcutta, and translated in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*) being inferior, and the production of another person. In the preface Ismael 'deprecates the opinion' that the wise and learned alone can comprehend God's Word. God himself had said a prophet had been raised up among the rude and ignorant for their instruction, and that he, the Lord, had rendered obedience easy. There were two things essential: a belief in the unity of God, which was to know no other, and a knowledge of the Prophet, which was obedience to the law. Many held the sayings of the saints to be their guide, but the Word of God was alone to be attended to, although the writings of the pious which agreed with the Scriptures might be read for edification.' The first chapter treats of the unity of God, and in it the writer

deprecates the supplication of saints, angels, etc., as impious. He declares the reasons given for such worship to be futile, and to show an utter ignorance of God's Word. The ancient idolaters had likewise said that they merely venerated powers and divinities, and did not regard them as the equal of the Almighty; but God himself had answered these heathens. Likewise the Christians had been admonished for giving to dead monks and friars the honor due to the Lord. God is alone, and companion he has none; prostration and adoration are due to him, and to no other.' Ismael proceeds in a similar strain, but assumes some doubtful positions, as that Mohammed says God is one, and man learns from his parents that he was born; he believes his mother, and yet he distrusts the apostle; or that an evil-doer who has faith is a better man than the most pious idolater" (Cunningham, *History of the Sikhs*, p. 190, foot-note t). The work was translated in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain* (1852), 13:317-367. See Garcin de Tassv, *Hist. de la Litt. hindoustane*, 1, 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 26:81. (J.H. W.)

### Ismail ben-Elisa, Ha-Cohen

one of the most celebrated Jewish Rabbis and theologians, was born about A.D. 60 in Upper' Galilee, and when yet a child was carried as a captive to Rome on the destruction of Jerusalem. While he was confined in prison in the Eternal City, the Rabbis Joshua, Azzariah. and Gamaliel II had come to Rome to implore mercy and pardon for the captive Jews of the then reigning emperor Diocdetian (about A.D. 83), and by accident-passing the prison door of this young boy, Rabbi Joshua exclaimed at his door, "Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?" (<sup>2312</sup>Isaiah 42:24) to which Ismael ben-Elisa gave this manly reply: "The Lord, against whom we have sinned, and would not walk in his ways, nor be obedient unto his law" (ibid.). This remarkable reply from the mouth of Ismael so interested the celebrated Rabbis in his behalf that they vowed to secure his liberation before they should quit the city. Ismael ben-Elisa, when liberated, placed himself under the instruction of Rabbi Joshua, and also studied under the celebrated Simon ben-Jochai. At a later period we find Ismael ben-Elisa in Southern Judcea, not far from the Idumsean boundaries, at Kephaz-Aziz (zyzaArpk), occupied in the cultivation and sale of the grape. But while thus employed he was also engaged in the noble effort of maintaining young Jewish maidens, who, by the desolations of the war, had been impoverished, and were suffering terribly from; destitution. Ismael ben-

Elisa is supposed to have suffered martyrdom during the persecutions so frequent at that period (about A.D. 121). His especial service to Judaism was the system of interpretation which he inaugurated in opposition to the system of Rabbi Akiba. The latter held that “every repetition, figure, parallelism, synonym, word, letter, particle, pleonasm, nay, the very shape, and every ornament of a letter or title, had a recondite meaning in the Scripture, ‘just as every fiber of a fly’s wing or an ant’s foot has its peculiar significance.’ Hence he maintained that the particles **ta**, **μg**, **h**, and **qr**, as well as the construction of the finite verb with the infinitive, e.g. **wmfyb [ t, fb [ h, byçt bçh**, have a dogmatic significance, and he therefore deduced points of law from them. Philo was of the same opinion (comp. **σαφῶς εἰδῶς, ὅτι περιττὸν ὄνομα οὐδὲν τίθησιν, ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ παραματολογεῖν ἀμυθήτου φορᾶς**, *De profugis*, ed. Mangey, p. 458), and he even deduced from them ethical and philosophical maxims; and this was also the opinion of the Greek translator of Ecclesiastes in the Septuagint, as may be seen from his anxiety to indicate the Hebrew particle **ta** by the Greek **σύν**, which has greatly perplexed the commentators who, being unacquainted with this fact, have been unable to account for this barbarism and violation of grammatical propriety” (comp. Ginsburg, *Comment. on Ecclesiastes*, p. 496). On the other hand, Rabbi Ismael ben-Elisa held that the Scriptures (of course only the O. T.), being a composition intended for human eyes and comprehension, “used expressions in their common acceptation, and that many of the repetitions and parallelisms are simply designed to render the style more rhetorical and powerful, and cannot, therefore, without violation of the laws of language, be adduced in support of legal deductions.” In accordance with this theory, he established thirteen exegetical rules, which are called **twdm hrç [ çl ç l a [ mçy ybrd**, *The thirteen Rules of R. Ismael*, by which alone, as he maintained, the Scriptures are to be interpreted (**μhb tçrdn hrwthç**). Comp. the very valuable work of Dr. E. M. Pinner, *Talmusd Babli (tractat Berachoth) mit deutscher Uebersetzung*, etc. (Berlin, 1842, fol.), 1, 17-20, where Ismael’s rules are given with lengthy annotations. See also the article MIDRASH **SEE MIDRASH**. Rabbi Ismael is also the reputed author of a number of other works. The most important of these are, an allegorical commentary on Exodus 12-23:20, called **atl km**, treating of the ceremonies prescribed by the Torah. ‘Numerous editions of it have been printed; the first at Constantinople, 1515, folio; the last, to our

knowledge, at Wilna, 1844, folio. It has been augmented by notes from several other Jewish writers, and was translated into Latin by Ugolino (*Thesaurus Antiquitatum*, vol. 14):-- **twl kyteyqepæ r E/nj }sæ**, a work on mystic theology, of which extracts have been published in **^/nbl }wzæþi** (Venice, 1601, 4to; Cracow, 1648, 4to), and in other works. It was printed separately under the title **t/l kyteyqepæ r rD** (Venice, 1677, 8vo; Zolkiew, 1833, 8vo). It was also inserted in parts in the edition of the Zohar. Ismael also wrote a cabalistic, allegorical treatise on the nature and attributes of God, under the title **hm/q rW [væ** also called **hm/Ohis**] A part of it was published in the **l awæ }sæ** of Eleazar ben-Jehudah of Worms (Amsterd. 1701, 4to, and often). Another small cabalistic treatise on the shape and mystic value of letters, under the title of **hnWmThisæ** was published with a long commentary (Konz, 1774. 4to), etc. See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2, 75 sq.; Rossi, *Diion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrdge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 47 sq.; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 4, 68 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, col. 1160, etc.; *Ben Chananja* (Szegedin, 1858), 1, 122 sq.

## Ismaelites

*SEE ISHMAEL.*

## Ismai'ah

(<sup><13124></sup>1 Chronicles 12:4). *SEE ISHMAIAH*, 1.

## Is'pah

(Heb. *Yishpulh'*, **hPvÿap** prob. *bald*; Septuag. **Ἐσφάχ** v.r. **Ἰεσφά**), one of the "sons" of Beriah, a chief Benjamite (originally from the neighborhood of Aijalon) resident at Jerusalem (<sup><13186></sup>1 Chronicles 8:16). B.C. ante 588.

## Is'rael

[not *izrcel*] (Heb. *Yisrael'*, **l aecÿas** Sept. and N.T. **Ἰσραήλ**), the name of the founder of the Jewish nation, and of the nation itself, specially of the kingdom comprising the ten northern tribes after the schism.

The name was originally conferred by the angel-Jehovah upon Jacob after the memorable prayer-struggle at Peniel (<sup><13128></sup>Genesis 32:28); and the

reason there assigned is that the patriarch “as a prince had power (**tyræ**) With God and man, and prevailed” (comp. <sup><0250></sup>Genesis 25:10; <sup><3104></sup>Hosea 12:4). The etymology is therefore clearly from the root **hrc**; with the frequent adjunct **l aę***God*. The verb itself occurs nowhere else than in the above passages, where it evidently means to *strive* or contend as in battle; but derivatives are found, e.g. **hrc**; a *princess*, and hence applied to Abraham’s wife in exchange for her former name Sarai. The signification thus appears to be that of a “successful *wrestler with God*,” a sense with which all the lexicographers substantially coincide; e.g. Gesenius (*Heb. Lex. s.v.*, and *Thesaur.* p. 1338), *pugmator*, i.e. *miles Dei*; Winer (*Heb. Lex.* p. 1026), *luctator*, i.e. *pugnator Dei*; Furst (*Heb. Worterb. s. r.*), *Gott-Beherrscher*.

**1.** JACOB, whose history will be found under that name. Although, as applied to Jacob personally, Israel is an honorable or poetical appellation, it is the common prose name of his descendants, while, on the contrary, the title Jacob is given to them only in poetry in the latter division of Isaiah (after the 39th chapter), many instances occur of the two names used side by side, to subserve the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, as in <sup><0402></sup>Genesis 40:27; 41:8, 14, 20, 21; 42:24; 43:1, 22, 28, etc.; so, indeed, in <sup><0402></sup>Genesis 14:1. The modern Jews, at least in the East, are fond of being named *Israeli* in preference to *Yahudi*, as more honorable. *SEE JACOB*.

**2.** The ISRAELITES, i.e. the whole people of Israel, the twelve tribes; often called the *children of Israel* (<sup><0887></sup>Joshua 3:17; 7:25; <sup><0027></sup>Judges 8:27; <sup><3021></sup>Jeremiah 3:21); and *the house of Israel* (<sup><0261></sup>Exodus 16:31; 40:38); so also *in Israel* (<sup><0009></sup>1 Samuel 9:9); and *land of Israel*, i.e. Palestine (<sup><0039></sup>1 Samuel 13:19; <sup><0263></sup>2 Kings 6:23). Sometimes the whole people is represented as one person: “Israel is my son” (<sup><0022></sup>Exodus 4:22; <sup><0014></sup>Numbers 20:14; <sup><3408></sup>Isaiah 41:8; 42:24; 43:1, 15; 44:1, 5). *Israel* is sometimes put emphatically for *the true* Israelites, the faithful, those distinguished for piety and virtue, and worthy of the name (<sup><0731></sup>Psalms 73:1; <sup><3517></sup>Isaiah 45:17; 49:3; <sup><0147></sup>John 1:47; <sup><5016></sup>Romans 9:6; 11:26). *Israelites* was the usual name of the twelve tribes, from their leaving Egypt until after the death of Saul. But in consequence of the dissensions between the ten tribes and Judah from the death of Saul onward, these ten tribes, among whom Ephraim took the lead, arrogated to themselves this honorable name of the whole nation (2 Samuel 2, 9, 10, 17, 28; 3:10, 17; 19:40-43; <sup><1121></sup>1 Kings 12:1); and on their separation, after the death of

Solomon, into an independent kingdom, founded by Jeroboam, this name was adopted for the kingdom, so that thenceforth the kings of the ten tribes were called *kings of Israel*, and the descendants of David, who ruled over Judah and Benjamin, were called *kings of Judah*. So in the prophets of that period *Judah* and *Israel* are put in opposition (<sup><23045></sup>Hosea 4:15; 5:3, 5; 6:10; 7:1; 8:2, 3,6,8; 9:1,7; <sup><3000></sup>Amos 1:1; 2:6; 3:14; <sup><3000></sup>Micah 1:5; <sup><23007></sup>Isaiah 5:7). Yet the kingdom of Judah could still be reckoned as a part of *Israel*, as in <sup><23084></sup>Isaiah 8:14, the two kingdoms are called *the two houses of Israel*; and hence, after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel at Samaria, the name *Israel* began again to be applied to the whole surviving people. **SEE HEBREW:** Israelite, etc.

**3.** It is used in a narrower sense, excluding Judah, in <sup><0108></sup>1 Samuel 11:8. It is so used in the famous cry of the rebels against David (<sup><3000></sup>2 Samuel 20:1) and against his grandson (<sup><11216></sup>1 Kings 12:16). Thenceforth it was assumed and accepted as the name of the northern kingdom, in which the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, Dan, and Simeon had no share. **SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.**

**4.** After the Babylonian captivity, the returned exiles although they were mainly of the kingdom of Judah, resumed the name Israel as the designation of their nation, but as individuals they are almost always described as Jews in the Apocrypha and N.T. Instances occur in the books of Chronicles of the application of the name Israel to Judah (e.g. <sup><4108></sup>2 Chronicles 11:3; 12:6), and in Esther of the name Jews to the whole people. The name Israel is also used to denote laymen as distinguished from priests, Levites, and other ministers (<sup><15766></sup>Ezra 6:16; 9:1; 10:25; <sup><6108></sup>Nehemiah 11:3, etc.). — Smith. The twelve tribes of Israel ever formed the ideal representation of the whole stock (<sup><11830></sup>1 Kings 18:30, 31; Ezra 6. 17; <sup><4800></sup>Jeremiah 31:1, etc.). Hence also in the New Test. "Israel" is applied (as in No. 2 above) to the true people of God, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin (Rom. 9:6; <sup><8166></sup>Galatians 6:16. etc.), being, in fact, comprehensive of the entire Church of the redeemed. **SEE JEWS SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.** The name *Israel* (q.v.), which at first had been the national designation of the twelve tribes collectively (<sup><01816></sup>Exodus 3:16, etc.), was, on the division of the monarchy, applied to the northern kingdom (a usage, however, not strictly observed, as in <sup><41216></sup>2 Chronicles 12:6) in contradistinction to the other portion, which was termed the kingdom of Judah. This limitation of the name Israel to certain tribes, at the head of which was that of Ephraim, which, accordingly, in some of the prophetic

writings, as e.g. <sup><3173></sup>Isaiah 17:13; <sup><3017></sup>Hosea 4:17, gives its own name to the northern kingdom, is discernible even at so early a period as the commencement of the reign of Saul, and affords evidence of the existence of some of the causes which eventually led to the schism of the nation. It indicated the existence of a rivalry, which needed only time and favorable circumstances to ripen into the revolt witnessed after the death of Solomon.

**I. Causes of the Division.** — The prophet Abijah, who had been commissioned to announce to Jeroboam, the Ephraimite, the transference to him of the greater part of the kingdom of Solomon, declared it to be the punishment of disobedience to the divine law, and particularly of the idolatry so largely promoted by Solomon (<sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 11:31-35). But while this revolt from the house of David is to be thus viewed in its directly penal character, or as a divine retribution, this does not preclude an inquiry into those sacred causes, political and otherwise, to which this very important revolution in Israelitish history is clearly referable. Such an inquiry, indeed, will make it evident how human passions and jealousies were made subservient to the divine purpose.

Prophecy had early assigned a pre-eminent place to two of the sons of Jacob-Judah and Joseph—as the founders of tribes. In the blessing pronounced upon his sons by the dying patriarch, Joseph had the birthright conferred upon him, and was promised in his son Ephraim a numerous progeny; while to Judah promise was made, among other blessings, of rule or dominion over his brethren—"thy father's children shall bow-down before thee" (<sup><0489></sup>Genesis 48:19, 22; 49:8, 26; comp. <sup><1301></sup>1 Chronicles 5:1, 2). These blessings were repeated and enlarged in the blessing of Moses (<sup><1330></sup>Deuteronomy 33:7, 17). The pre-eminence thus prophetically assigned to these two tribes received a partial verification in the fact that at the exodus their numbers were nearly equal, and far in excess of those of the other tribes; and further, as became their position, they were the first who obtained their territories, which were also assigned them in the very center of the land. It is unnecessary to advert to the various other circumstances which contributed to the growth and aggrandizement of these two tribes, and which, from the position these were thus enabled to acquire above the rest, naturally led to their becoming heads of parties, and, as such, the objects of mutual rivalry and contention. The Ephraimites, indeed, from the very first, gave unmistakable tokens of an exceedingly haughty temper, and preferred most arrogant claims over the other tribes as regards questions of



peace and war. This may be seen in their representation to Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh (<sup><0708E></sup>Judges 8:1), and in their conduct towards Jephthah (<sup><0712E></sup>Judges 12:1). Now if this overbearing people resented in the case of tribes so inconsiderable as that of Manasseh what they regarded as a slight, it is easy to conceive how they must have eyed the proceedings of the tribe of Judah, which was more especially their rival. Hence it was, that while on the first establishment of the monarchy in the person of Saul, of the tribe of Benjamin, the Ephraimites, with the other northern tribes with whom they were associated, silently acquiesced, they refused for seven years to submit to his successor of the tribe of Judah (<sup><1019E></sup>2 Samuel 2:9-11), and even after their submission they showed a disposition on any favorable opportunity to raise the cry of revolt: "To your tents, O Israel" (<sup><1020E></sup>2 Samuel 20:1). It was this early, long-continued, and deep-rooted feeling, strengthened and embittered by the schism, though not concurring with it, that gave point to the language in which Isaiah predicted the blessed times of Messiah: The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (<sup><2113E></sup>Isaiah 11:13). Indeed, for more than 400 years, from the time that Joshua was the leader of the Israelitish hosts, Ephraim, with the dependent tribes of Manasseh and Benjamin, may be said to have exercised undisputed pre-eminence till the accession of David. Accordingly it is not surprising that such a people would not readily submit to an arrangement which, though declared to be of divine appointment, should place them in a subordinate condition, as when God "refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim, but chose the tribe of Judah, even the Mount Zion which he loved" (<sup><0785E></sup>Psalms 78:67, 68). *SEE EPHRAIM.*

There were thus, indeed, two powerful elements tending to break up the national unity. In addition to the long-continued and growing jealousy on the part of the Ephraimites to the tribe of Judah, another cause of dissatisfaction to the dynasty of David in particular was the arrangement just referred to, which consisted in the removal of the civil, and more particularly the ecclesiastical government, to Jerusalem. The Mosaic ordinances were in themselves exceedingly onerous, and this must have been more especially felt by such as were resident at a distance from the sanctuary, as it entailed upon them long journeys, not only when attending the stated festivals, but also on numerous other occasions prescribed in the law. This must have been felt as a special grievance by the Ephraimites, owing to the fact that the national sanctuary had been for a very long



period at Shiloh, within their own territory and therefore its transference elsewhere, it is easy to discern, would not be readily acquiesced in by a people who had proved themselves in other respects so jealous of their rights, and not easily persuaded that this was not rather a political expedient on the part of the rival tribe, than as a matter of divine choice (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 14:21). Nor is it to be overlooked, in connection with this subject, that other provisions of the theocratic economy relative to the annual festivals would be taken advantage of by those in whom there existed already a spirit of dissatisfaction. Even within of limited a locality as Palestine, there must have been inequalities of climate, which must have considerably affected the seasons, more particularly the vintage and harvest, with which the feasts may in some measure have interfered, and in so far may have been productive of discontent between the northern and southern residents. That there were inconveniences in both the respects now mentioned would indeed appear from the appeal made by Jeroboam to his new subjects, when, for reasons of state policy, and in order to perpetuate the schism by making it religious as well as political, he would dissuade them from attendance on the feasts in Judah: ‘It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem’ (<sup><1128></sup>1 Kings 12:28); and from the fact that he postponed for a whole month the celebration of the feast of tabernacles (ver. 32), a change to which it is believed he was induced, or in the adoption of which he was at least greatly aided, by the circumstance of the harvest being considerably later in the northern than in the southern districts (*Pict. Bible*, note on <sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:32).

Again, the burdensome exactions in the form of service and tribute imposed on his subjects by Solomon for his extensive buildings, and the maintenance of his splendid and luxurious court, must have still further deepened this disaffection, which originated in one or other of the causes already referred to. It may indeed be assumed that this grievance was of a character which appealed to the malcontents more directly than any other; and that these burdens, required especially for the beautifying of the capital, must have been exceedingly disagreeable to the inhabitants of the provinces, who did not in any way participate in the glories in support of which such onerous charges were required. The burdens thus imposed were indeed expressly stated to be the chief ground of complaint by the representatives of Israel headed by Jeroboam, who, on the occasion of the coronation at Shechem, waited on the son of Solomon with a view to obtain redress (<sup><1124></sup>1 Kings 12:4). The long smoldering dissatisfaction could

no longer be repressed, and a mitigation of their burdens was imperiously demanded by the people. For this end Jeroboam had been summoned, at the death of Solomon, from Egypt, whose presence must have had a marked influence on the issue, although it may be a question whether Jeroboam should not be regarded rather as an instrument called forth by the occasion than as himself the instigator of the revolt. With this agrees the intimation made to him from the Lord many years before by Ahijah the Shilonite. The very choice of Shechem, within the territories of Ephraim, as the coronation place of Rehoboam, may have had for its object the repression of the rebellious spirit in the northern tribes by means of so grand and imposing a ceremony.

However this may have been, or in whatever degree the causes specified may have severally operated in producing the revolt, the breach now made was never healed, God himself expressly forbidding all attempts on the part of Rehoboam and his counselors to subjugate the revolted provinces with the intimation, "This thing is from me" (<sup><1122></sup>1 Kings 12:24). The subsequent history of the two kingdoms was productive, with but slight exceptions, of further estrangement.

**II.** *Extent and Resources of the Kingdom of Israel.* The area of Palestine, even at its utmost extent under Solomon, was very circumscribed. In its geographical relations it certainly bore no comparison whatever to the other great empires of antiquity, nor indeed was there any proportion between its size and the mighty influences which have emanated from its soil. Making allowance for the territories on the shore of the Mediterranean in the possession of the Phoenicians, the area of Palestine did not much exceed 13,000 square miles. This limited extent, it might be shown, however, did the present subject call for it, rendered that land more suitable for the purposes of the theocracy than if it were of a far larger area. What precise extent of territories was embraced in the kingdom of Israel cannot be very easily determined, but it may be safely estimated as more than double that of the southern kingdom, or, according to a more exact ratio, as 9 to 4. Nor is it easy to specify with exactness the several tribes which composed the respective kingdoms. In the announcement made by Ahijah to Jeroboam, he is assured of ten tribes, while only one is reserved for the house of David; but this must be taken only in a general sense, and is to be interpreted by <sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:23 (compare ver. 21); for it would appear that Simeon, part of Dan, and the greater part of Benjamin, owing doubtless to the fact that Jerusalem itself was situated within that

tribe, formed portion of the kingdom of Judah (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 3:409). It is to be noticed, however, that Judah was the only independent tribe, and therefore it might be spoken of as the *one* which constituted the kingdom of the house of David. The ten tribes nominally assigned to Israel were probably Joseph (=Ephraim and Manasseh), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, Gad, and Reuben, Levi being intentionally omitted; the ten actually embraced in it seem to have been Ephraim, Manasseh (East and West), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Gad, Reuben, and (in part) Dan. With respect to the conquests of David, Moab appears to have been attached to the kingdom of Israel (~~1300~~ 2 Kings 3:4); as much of Syria as remained subject to Solomon (see ~~1112~~ 1 Kings 11:24) would probably be claimed by his successor in the northern kingdom; and Ammon, though connected with Rehoboam as his mother's native land (~~1423~~ 2 Chronicles 12:13), and though afterwards tributary to Judah (~~1275~~ 2 Chronicles 27:5), was at one time allied (~~1430~~ 2 Chronicles 20:1), we know not how closely or how early, with Moab. The seacoast between Accho and Japho remained in the possession of Israel.

With regard to population, again, the data are even more defective than with respect to territorial extent. According to the uncompleted census taken in the reign of David, about forty years previous to the schism of the kingdom, the fighting men in Israel numbered 800,000, and in Judah 500,000 (~~1249~~ 2 Samuel 24:9); but in ~~1320~~ 1 Chronicles 21:5, 6, the numbers are differently stated at 1,100,000 and 470,000 respectively, with the intimation that Levi and Benjamin were not included (comp. 27:24). As bearing more directly on this point, Rehoboam raised an army of 180,000 men out of Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam (~~1122~~ 1 Kings 12:21); and again, Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, with 400,000 men, made war on Jeroboam at the head of an army of 800,000 (~~1438~~ 2 Chronicles 13:3). According to the general laws observable in such cases, these numbers may be said to represent an aggregate population of from five *and a half* to six millions, of which about *one third*, or two millions, may be fairly assigned to the kingdom of Judah at the time of the separation.

Shechem was the first capital of the new kingdom (~~1125~~ 1 Kings 12:25), venerable for its traditions, and beautiful in its situation. Subsequently Tirzah, whose loveliness had fixed the wandering gaze of Solomon (~~2104~~ Song of Solomon 6:4), became the royal residence, if not the capital of Jeroboam (~~1147~~ 1 Kings 14:17) and of his successors (15:33; 16:8, 17, 23). — After the murder of Jeroboam's son, indeed, Baasha seems to have

intended to fix his capital at Ramah, as a convenient place for annoying the king of Judah, whom he looked on as his only dangerous enemy; but he was forced to renounce this plan (<sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 4:17, 21). Samaria, uniting in itself the qualities of beauty and fertility, and a commanding position, was chosen by Omri (<sup><1163></sup>1 Kings 16:24), and remained the capital of the kingdom until it had given the last proof of its strength by sustaining for three years the onset of the hosts of Assyria. Jezreel was probably only a royal residence of some of the Israelitish kings. It may have been in awe of the ancient holiness of Shiloh that Jeroboam forbore to pollute the secluded site of the tabernacle with the golden calves. He chose for the religious capitals of his kingdom Dan, the old home of northern schism, and Bethel, a Benjamite city not far from Shiloh, and marked out by history and situation as the rival of Jerusalem.

**III.** *Political and Religious Relations of the Kingdom of Israel.* — But whilst, in extent of territory and of population, and it might be shown also in various other respects, the resources of the northern kingdom were at the very least double those of its southern rival, the latter embraced elements of strength which were entirely lacking in the other. There was first the geographical position of the kingdom of Israel, which exposed its northern frontier to invasions on the part of Syria and the Assyrian hosts. But more than this, or any exposure to attack from without, were the dangers to be apprehended from the polity on which the kingdom was founded. Jeroboam's public sanction of idolatry, and his other interferences with fundamental principles of the Mosaic law, more especially in the matter of the priesthood, at once alienated from his government all who were well affected to that economy, and who were not ready to subordinate their religion to any political considerations. Of such there were not a few within the territories of the new kingdom. The Levites in particular fled the kingdom, abandoning their property and possessions: and so did many others besides; "such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah" (<sup><4113></sup>2 Chronicles 11:13- 7). Not only was one great source of strength thus at once dried up, but the strongly conservating principles of the law were violently shocked, and the kingdom more than ever exposed to the encroachments of the heathenism which extended along its frontier.

One element of weakness in the kingdom of Israel was the number of tribes of which it was composed, more especially after they had renounced those

principles of the Mosaic law which, while preserving the individuality of the tribes, served to bind them together as one people. Among other circumstances unfavorable to unity was the want of a capital in which all had a common interest, and with which they were connected by some common tie. This want was by no means compensated by the religious establishments at Bethel and Dan. But it is in respect to theocratic and religious relations that the weakness of the kingdom of Israel specially appears. Any sanction which the usurpation of Jeroboam may have derived at first from the announcement made to him by the prophet Ahijah, and afterwards from the charge given to Rehoboam and the men of Judah not to fight against Israel, because the thing was from the Lord (<sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:23), must have been completely taken away by the denunciations of the prophet out of Judah against the altar at Bethel (<sup><1130></sup>1 Kings 13:1-10), and the subsequent announcements of Ahijah himself to Jeroboam, who failed to fulfill the conditions on which the kingdom was given him (<sup><1147></sup>1 Kings 14:7-16). The setting up of the worship of the calves, in which may be traced the influence of Jeroboam's residence in Egypt, and the consecrating of priests who could have no moral weight with their fellow-subjects, and were chosen only for their subservience to the royal will, were measures by no means calculated to consolidate a power from which the divine sanction had been expressly withdrawn. On the contrary, they led, and very speedily, to the alienation of many who might at the outset have silently acquiesced in the revolution, even if they had not fully approved of it. The large migration which ensued into Judah of all who were favorable to the former institutions must still further have aggravated the evil, as all vigorous opposition would thenceforth cease to the downward and destructive tendency of the anti-theocratic policy. The natural result of the course appears in the fact that the step taken by Jeroboam was never retraced by any of his successors, one after another following the example thus set to them, so that Jeroboam is emphatically and frequently characterized in Scripture as the man "who made Israel to sin," while his successors are described as following in "the sin of Jeroboam."

Further, as the calves of Jeroboam are referable to Egypt, so the worship of Baal, which was introduced by Ahab, the seventh of the Israelitish kings, had its origin in the Tyrian alliance formed by that monarch through his marriage with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon. Hitherto the national religion was ostensibly the worship of Jehovah under the representation of the calves; but under this new reign every attempt was

made to extirpate this worship entirely by the destruction of God's prophets and the subversion of his altars. It was to meet this new phase of things that the strenuous agency of Elijah, Elisha, and their associates was directed, and assumed a quite peculiar form of prophetic ministrations, though still the success was but partial and temporary. *SEE ELIJAH* and *SEE ELISHA*.

**IV.** *Decay and Dissolution of the Kingdom of Israel.* — The kingdom of Israel developed no new power. It was but a portion of David's kingdom deprived of many elements of strength. Its frontier was as open and as widely extended as before, but it wanted a capital for the seat of organized power. Its territory was as fertile and as tempting to the spoiler, but its people were less united and patriotic. A corrupt religion poisoned the source of national life. While less reverence attended on a new and unconsecrated king, and less respect was felt for an aristocracy reduced by the retirement of the Levites, the army which David found hard to control rose up unchecked in the exercise of its willful strength; and thus eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in quick succession, Tyre ceased to be an ally when the alliance was no longer profitable to the merchant city. Moab and Ammon yielded tribute only while under compulsion. A powerful neighbor, Damascus, sat armed at the gate of Israel; and beyond Damascus might be discerned the rising strength of the first great monarchy of the world.

The history of the kingdom of Israel is therefore the history of its decay and dissolution. In no true sense did it manifest a principle of progress, save only in swerving more and more completely from the 'course marked out by Providence and revelation for the seed of Abraham; and yet the history is interesting as showing how, notwithstanding the ever-widening breach between the two great branches of the one community, the divine purposes concerning them were accomplished. That a polity constituted as was that of the northern kingdom contained in it potent elements of decay must be self-evident, even were the fact less clearly marked on every page of its history.

There is reason to believe that Jeroboam carried back with him into Israel the good will, if not the substantial assistance of Shishak, and this will account for his escaping the storm from Egypt which swept over Rehoboam in his fifth year (<sup><4112></sup>2 Chronicles 12:2-9). During that first period Israel was far from quiet within. Although the ten tribes collectively

had decided in favor of Jeroboam, great numbers of individuals remained attached to the family of David and to the worship at Jerusalem, and in the three first years of Rehoboam migrated into Judah (<sup><4116></sup>2 Chronicles 11:16, 17). Perhaps it was not until this process commenced that Jeroboam was worked up to the desperate measure of erecting rival sanctuaries with visible idols (<sup><1127></sup>1 Kings 12:27); a measure which met the usual ill-success of profane state-craft, and aggravated the evil which he feared. Jeroboam had not sufficient force of character in himself to make a lasting impression on his people. A king, but not a founder of a dynasty, he aimed at nothing beyond securing his present elevation. Without any ambition to share in the commerce of Tyre, or to compete with the growing power of Damascus, or even to complete the humiliation of the helpless monarch whom he had deprived of half a kingdom, Jeroboam acted entirely on a defensive policy. He attempted to give his subjects a center which they wanted for their political allegiance, in Shechem or in Tirzah. He sought to change merely so much of their ritual as was inconsistent with his authority over them. But, as soon as the golden calves were set up, the priests, and Levites, and many religious Israelites (<sup><4116></sup>2 Chronicles 11:16) left their country, and the disastrous emigration was not effectually checked even by the attempt of Baasha to build a fortress (<sup><4416></sup>2 Chronicles 16:6) at Ramah. A new priesthood was introduced (<sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:31) absolutely dependent on the king (<sup><3173></sup>Amos 7:13); not forming, asunder the Mosaic law, a landed aristocracy, not respected by the people, and unable either to withstand the oppression or to strengthen the weakness of a king. A priesthood created and a ritual devised for secular purposes had no hold whatever on the conscience of the people. To meet their spiritual cravings a succession of prophets was raised up, great in their poverty, their purity, their austerity, their self-dependence, their moral influence, but imperfectly organized—a rod to correct and check the civil government, not, as they might have been under happier circumstances, a staff to support it. The army soon learned its power to dictate to the isolated monarch and disunited people. Although Jeroboam, the founder of the kingdom, himself reigned nearly twenty-two years, yet his son and successor Nadab was violently cut off after a brief reign of less than two years, and with him the whole house of Jeroboam.

Thus speedily closed the first dynasty, and it was but a type of those which followed. Eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in rapid succession, the army being frequently the prime movers in these transactions. Thus Baasha, in the midst of the army at Gibbethon,



slew Nadab, the son of Jeroboam; and, again, Zimri, a captain of chariots, slew Elah, the son and successor of Baasha, and reigned only *seven days*, during which time, however, he smote ail the posterity and kindred of his predecessor, and ended his own days by suicide (<sup><1168></sup>1 Kings 16:18). Omri, the captain of the host, was chosen to punish the usurper Zimri, and after a civil war of four years he prevailed over his other rival Tibni, the choice of half the people. Omri, the sixth in order of the Israelitish-kings, founded a more lasting dynasty, for it endured for forty-five years, he having been succeeded by his son Ahab, of whom it is recorded that he “did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him” (<sup><1163></sup>1 Kings 16:33); and he, again, by his son Ahaziah, who, after a reign of less than two years, died from the effects of a fall, and, leaving no son, was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who reigned twelve years, until slain by Jehu, the captain of the army at Ramoth-Gilead, who also executed the total destruction of the family of Ahab, which perished like those of Jeroboam and of Baasha (<sup><1209></sup>2 Kings 9:9).

Meanwhile the relations between the rival kingdoms were, as might be expected, ‘of a very unfriendly character. “There was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days” (<sup><1140></sup>1 Kings 14:30); so also between Asa and Baasha (<sup><1154></sup>1 Kings 15:14, 32). The first mention of peace was that made by Jehoshaphat with Ahab (<sup><1234></sup>1 Kings 22:44), and which was continued between their two successors. The princes of Omri’s house cultivated an alliance with the contemporary kings of Judah. which was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah, and marked by the community of names among the royal children. Ahab’s Tyrian alliance strengthened him with the counsels of the masculine mind of Jezebel, but brought him no further support.

The kingdom of Israel suffered also from foreign enemies. In the reign of Omri the Syrians had made themselves masters of a portion of the land of Israel (<sup><1235></sup>1 Kings 20:33), and had proceeded so far as to erect streets for themselves in Samaria, which had just been made the capital. Further-incursions were checked by Ahab, who concluded a peace with the Syrians which lasted three years (<sup><1221></sup>1 Kings 22:1), until that king, in league with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. attempted to wrest Ramoth-Gilead out of their hands, an act which cost him his life. The death of Ahab was followed by the revolt of the Moabites (<sup><1204></sup>2 Kings 1:4), who were again, however, subjugated by Jehoram, in league with Jehoshaphat. Again the Syrians renewed their inroads on the kingdom of Israel, and even besieged



Samaria, but fled through panic. In the reign of Jehu “the Lord began to cut Israel short: and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel” (<sup><1218></sup>2 Kings 10:32). Their troubles from that quarter increased still further during the following reign, when the Syrians reduced them to the utmost extremities (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:7). To this more prosperous days succeeded, with a reverse to Judah, whose king presumptuously declared war against Israel.

Under Jeroboam II, who reigned forty-two years, the affairs of the northern kingdom revived. “He restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain; he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, which belonged to Judah, for Israel” (<sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:25, 28). Damascus was by this time probably weakened by the advance of the power of Assyria. This period of prosperity was followed by another of a totally different character. Jeroboam’s son and successor Zachariah, the last of the dynasty of Jehu, was assassinated, after a reign of six months, by Shallum, who, after a reign of only one month, was slain by Menahem, whose own son and successor Pekahiah was’ in turn murdered by Pekah, one of his captains, who was himself smitten by Hoshea. In the days of Menahem, and afterwards of Pekah, the Assyrians are seen extending their power over Israel; first under Pul, to whom Menahem paid a tribute of threescore talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom hi his hand (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:19). Now the Assyrians are found pushing their conquests in every direction; at one time, in the reign of Pekah, leading away into captivity a’ part of the inhabitants of Israel (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:29), and again coming to the assistance of Ahaz, king of Judah, then besieged in Jerusalem by the Israelites, in conjunction with the Syrians, who had somehow recovered their former ascendancy. *SEE SYRIA*. This interposition led to the destruction of Damascus, and in the succeeding weak reign of Hoshea, who had formed some secret alliance with Egypt which was offensive to the Assyrian monarch, to the destruction of Samaria, after a three-years’ siege, by Shalmaneser, and the removal of its inhabitants to Assyria; and thus terminated the kingdom of Israel, after an existence of 253 years. Some gleanings of the ten tribes yet remained in the land after so many years of religious decline, moral debasement, national degradation, anarchy, bloodshed, and deportation. Even these were gathered up by the conqueror and carried to Assyria, never again, as a distinct people, to occupy their portion of that goodly and pleasant land which their forefathers won under Joshua from the heathen.

(See Ewald, *Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, Götting. 1851; also Witsii, *Δεκάφυλον*, *de decent tribubus Israel*, in his *AEgyptica*, p. 303 sq.; J. G. Klaiber, *Hist. regni Ephraim.*, Stuttg. 1833.)

## Picture for Israel

**V.** *Chronological Difficulties of the Reigns as compared with those of Judah.* — These will mostly appear by a similar inspection of the annexed table, where the numbers given in the columns headed “nominal” are those contained in the express words of Scripture. These and other less obvious discrepancies will be found explained under the titles of the respective kings in this *Cyclopaedia*, but it may be well here to recapitulate the most prominent of them together.

**1.** The length of Jeroboam’s reign is stated in <sup><1140></sup>1 Kings 14:20 to have been twenty-two years, which appear to have been reckoned from the same point as Rehoboam’s (i.e. in Nisan); whereas they were only current, since Rehoboam’s accession took place somewhat prior to that of Jeroboam. This is confirmed by the fact that the reigns of Rehoboam (seventeen years, <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:21), and Abijah (three years, <sup><1152></sup>1 Kings 15:2) were but twenty years; and Nadab succeeded Jeroboam ‘in Asa’s second year (ver. 25). In like manner Nadab’s two nominal years (ver. 25) are current, or, in reality, little over one year; for Baasha succeeded him in Asa’s third year (verse 28, 33). So, again, Baasha’s twenty-four years of reign (verse 33) must be reduced, for purposes of continuous reckoning, to twenty-three; for Elah succeeded him in Asa’s twenty-sixth year (<sup><1168></sup>1 Kings 16:8). Once more, Elah’s two years (ver. 8) must be computed as but one full year, for Zimri slew and succeeded him in Asa’s twenty-seventh year (ver. 10, 15). The cause of this surplusage in these reigns appears to be that at some point during the reign of Jeroboam the beginning of the calendar for the regnal years of the Israelitish reign was changed (see <sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:32, 33) from the spring (the Hebrew sacred year) to the fall (their older and secular year), so that they overlap those of the kings of Judah by more than half a year. The reigns of the line of Judah must therefore be taken as the standard, and the parallel line of Israel adjusted by it. (The numbers thirty-five and thirty-six in <sup><4459></sup>2 Chronicles 15:19; 16:1, are evidently a transcriber’s error for twenty-five and twenty-six; see <sup><1168></sup>1 Kings 16:3).

2. Omri's reign is stated in <sup><1163></sup>1 Kings 16:23 to have lasted twelve years, beginning, not, as the text seems to indicate, in Asa's thirty-first year, but in his twenty-seventh (for Zimri reigned but seven days), since Ahab succeeded him in Asa's thirty-eighth (ver. 29), making these really but eleven full years, computed as above. The thirty-first of Asa is meant as the date of Omri's *sole* or undisputed reign on the death of his rival Tibni, after four years of contest. His six years of reign in Tirzah (same verse) are dated from this latter point, and are mentioned in opposition to his removal of his capital at the end of this last time to Samaria (ver. 24), where, accordingly, he reigned one full or two current years, still computed as above. This last-named fact is again the key to the discrepancy in the length of his successor Ahab's reign, which is set down in ver. 29 as twenty-two years "in Samaria;" for they date from the change of capital to that place (Ahab having probably been at that time appointed viceroy), being in reality only a small fraction more than twenty years. This appears from the combination of the residue of Asa's reign (41 38-3; comp. also <sup><1124></sup>1 Kings 22:41) and the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat, when Ahaziah succeeded Ahab (<sup><1125></sup>1 Kings 22:51). Ahaziah's two years (same verse) are to be computed as current, or 'one full year, on the same principle as above.

The other difficulties relate to minute textual discrepancies, not important to the chronology; some of them involve the supposition of interregna. They will all be found fully discussed under the names of the respective kings to whose reigns they belong. For a complete vindication and adjustment of all the textual numbers (save two or three universally admitted to be corrupt) by means of actual tabular construction, see the *Meth. Quart. Review*, Oct. 1856. **SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.**

The chronology of the kings has been minutely investigated by Usher, *Chronologia Sacra* (in his *Works*, 12:95-144); by Lightfoot, *Order of the Texts of the O.T.* (in *Works*, 1, 77-130); by Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology*, 2, 372-447; by Clinton. *Fasti Hellenici*, 3, Append. § 5; by H. Browne, *Ordo Saeculorum*, chap. 4; and by Wolff, in the *Studien u. Krit.* (1858, 4.) **SEE CHRONOLOGY.**

### Israel ben-Samuel Maghrebi

a Jewish writer of the Karaitic sect, flourished at the opening of the 14th century, at Kahira. He deserves our notice as the author of works on the Jewish laws and traditions, in which he advanced the peculiar theories of

the Karaites. Thus, in his work *hfyj æt/kl h* (written about 1306), he asserts that the animal, if killed according to law, and eaten according to prescription, develops itself in man to a higher state of being. The “shochet” (the person killing the animal) must, however be a believer of the migration of the souls of animals into the souls of men, else it can ‘not only not take effect, but makes the meat unfit for food. But it is also as the interpreter of the matrimonial laws that he ranks high among the Karaites. See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 7:322. (J.H.W.)

## Is’raelite

(*Heb. Yisreeli*’, *yl ætʃjæ*<sup><1075></sup> 2 Samuel 17:25; once [<sup><1054></sup> Numbers 25:14-] *l æcʃjæyæ*<sup><1075></sup> *man of Israel*, i.e. male Israelite; fem. *tyl ætʃjæ*<sup><1075></sup> “Israelitish woman,”<sup><1240></sup> Leviticus 24:10; Sept. and New Test. Ἰσραηλίτης), a descendant of Jacob, and therefore a member of the chosen nation, for which, however, the simple name ISRAEL *SEE ISRAEL* (q.v.) is oftener employed in a collective sense, but with various degrees of extension at different times:

- (1.) The twelve tribes descended from Jacob’s sons, called “Israel” already in Egypt (<sup><1216></sup> Exodus 3:16), and so throughout the Pentateuch and in the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, often with the explicit addition “*all*” Israel.
- (2.) The larger portion, or ten northern tribes, after the death of Saul (2 Samuel 2, 9, 10, 17, 28), a distinction that prevailed even under David (<sup><1094></sup> 2 Samuel 19:40).
- (3.) More definitely the schismatical portion of the nation (consisting of all the tribes but Judah [including Simeon] and Benjamin), which established a separate monarchy at Samaria after the death of Solomon (<sup><1129></sup> 1 Kings 12:19). Seldom does the legitimate kingdom of Judah appear in the sacred narrative under this appellation (<sup><1121></sup> 2 Chronicles 12:1; 15:17).
- (4.) After the Exile, the two branches of the nation became again blended, both having been carried away to the same or neighboring regions, and are therefore designated by the ancient title without distinction in Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Maccabees. Gradually, however, the name “Jews” (q.v.) supplanted this appellation, especially among foreigners.

(5.) In the New Test. the term “Israel” or “Israelite” is used of the true theocracy or spiritual people (<sup><47122></sup>2 Corinthians 11:22). *SEE HEBREW.*

### Israeli'tish

(<sup><1340></sup>Leviticus 24:10 sq.). *SEE ISRAELITE.*

### Is'sachar

the name of two men in the Bible, and of the descendants of one of them, and the region inhabited by them.

**1.** The ninth son of Jacob and the fifth of Leah; the first born to Leah after the interval which occurred in the births of her children (<sup><0307></sup>Genesis 30:17; comp. 29:35). He was born in Padan-Aram early in B.C. 1914. In Genesis he is not mentioned after his birth, and the few verses in Chronicles devoted to the tribe contain merely a brief list of its chief men and heroes in the reign of David (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1-5). At the descent into Egypt four sons are ascribed to him, who founded the four chief families of the tribe (<sup><0453></sup>Genesis 46:13; <sup><0423></sup>Numbers 20:23, 25; <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1).

*Form and Signification of the Name.* — Both are peculiar. The form is **rkççy** [i.e. *Yissaskar'*; if pointed as would be regular, **rkççy**: such is the invariable spelling of the name in the Hebrew, the Samaritan Codex and Version, the Targums of Onkelos and PseudoJonathan, but the Masoretes have pointed it so as to supersede the second S, **rkççyæ** *Yissa[s]kar'*; Sept. **Ἰσσαχάρ**, N.T. **Ἰσααχάρ**, Josephus **Ἰσσαχαρις** (*Ant.* 5, 1, 22), referring to the tribal territory; Vulg. *Isachar*. (See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1331.)

As is the case with each of the sons of Jacob, the name is recorded as bestowed on account of a circumstance connected with the birth. But, as may be also noticed in more than one of the others, two explanations seem to be combined in the narrative, which even then is not in exact accordance with the requirements of the name. “God hath given me my hire (**rkç**; *sakbr*). and she called his name Issachar,” is the record; but in verse 18 that “hire” is for the surrender of her maid to her husband, while in verse 14-17 it is for the discovery and bestowal of the mandrakes. Besides, as indicated above, the name in its original form—Isaskar—rebels against this interpretation, an interpretation which, to be consistent, requires the form subsequently imposed on the word, Is-sachar. The verbal allusion is not

again brought forward, as it is with Dan, Asher, etc., in the blessings of Jacob and Moses. In the former only it is perhaps allowable to discern a faint echo of the sound of “Issachar” in the word *shikmo* “his shoulder” (<sup><0495></sup>Genesis 49:15). The words occur again almost identically in <sup><0417></sup>2 Chronicles 15:7, and <sup><2616></sup>Jeremiah 31:16: *rkç;vye* “there is a reward for;” A.V. “shall be rewarded.” An expansion of the story of the mandrakes, with curious details, will be found in the *Testamentum suachar* (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr.* p. 620-623). They were ultimately deposited “in the house of the Lord” (according to the same legend), whatever that may mean. *Tribe of Issachar.* *Issachar’s* place during the journey to Canaan was on the east of the tabernacle, with his brothers Judah and Zebulun (<sup><0415></sup>Numbers 2:5), the group moving foremost in the march (<sup><0405></sup>Numbers 10:15), and having a common standard, which, according to the Rabbinical tradition, was of the three colors of sardine, topaz, and carbuncle, inscribed with the names of the three tribes, and bearing the figure of a lion’s whelp (see Targum Pseudo-Jon. on <sup><0415></sup>Numbers 2:3). At this time the captain of the tribe was Nethaneel ben-Zuar (<sup><0408></sup>Numbers 1:8; 2:5; 7:18; 10:15). He was succeeded by Igal ben-Joseph, who went as representative of his tribe among the spies (<sup><0437></sup>Numbers 13:7), and he again by Paltiel ben-Azzan, who assisted Joshua in apportioning the land of Canaan (<sup><0635></sup>Numbers 34:26). Issachar was one of the six tribes who were to stand on Mount Gerizim during the ceremony of blessing and cursing (<sup><0672></sup>Deuteronomy 27:12). He was still in company with Judah, Zebulun being opposite on Ebal. The number of the fighting men of Issachar when taken in the census at Sinai was 54,400. During the journey they seem to have steadily increased, and after the mortality at Peor they amounted to 64,300, being inferior to none but Judah and Dan-to the latter by 100 souls only. The numbers given in <sup><0302></sup>1 Chronicles 7:2, 4, 5, probably the census of Joab, amount in all to 145,600.

The Promised Land once reached, the connection between Issachar and Judah seems to have closed, to be renewed only on two brief occasions, which will be noticed in their turn. The intimate relation with Zebulun was, however, maintained. The two brother-tribes had their portions close together, and more than once they are mentioned in company. The allotment of Issachar lay above that of Manasseh. The specification of its boundaries and contents is contained in <sup><0697></sup>Joshua 19:17-23. But to the towns there named must be added Daberath (a Levitical city, 21:28: Jarmuth here is probably the Remeth of 19:21) and Ibleam (<sup><0671></sup>Joshua

17:11). The boundary, in the words of Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 22), “extended in length from Carmel to the Jordan, in breadth to Mount Tabor.” In fact, it almost exactly consisted of the plain of Esdraelon or Jezreel. The southern boundary we can trace by En-gannim, the modern Jenin, on the heights which form the southern enclosure to the plain; and then further westward by Taanach and Megiddo, the authentic fragments of which still stand on the same heights as they trend away to the hump of Carmel. On the north the territory nearly ceased with the plain, which is there bounded by Tabor, the outpost of the hills of Zebulun. East of Tabor, the hill-country continued so as to screen the tribe from the Sea of Galilee, while a detour on the S.E. included a part of the plain within the territory of Manasseh, near Bethshean and the upper part of the Jordan valley. In a central recess of the plain stood Jezreel, on a low swell, attended, just across the border, on the one hand by the eminence of Mount Gilboa. and on the other by that now called Ed-Duhy, or “Little Hermon,” the latter having Shunem, Nain, and Endor on its slopes-names which recall some of the most interesting and important events in the history of Israel. *SEE TRIBE.*

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe, with their approved or conjectural identifications:

Abez	Town	Ukneifis?
Anaharath	do.	[Meskatah]??
Anem	do	See EN-GANNIM
Aphek	do.	[El-Fuleh]?
Beth-gan	do.	See EN-GANNIM
Beth-pazzez	do.	[Beit-Jenu]??
Beth-shemesh	do	Kaukab-el-Hawa?
Chesulloth or Chisloth Tabor	do	Iksal
Dabareh or Daberath	do	Debureh
En-gannim	do	Jenin
En-haddah	do	[Ain Mahil]?
Gur	Ascent	[Mukeibileh]?
Hapharaim	Town	[El-Afuleh]?
Ibleam	do	[Jelameh]?
Ittah-kazin	do	[Kefr Kenna]?
Jarmuth	do	See RAAMOTH
Jezreel	Town	Zerin

	Plain	Merj Ibn-Amer.
	Fountain	Ain Meyiteh
Jokneam or Jokneam	Town	El-Kaimon
Kedesh	do	Kashaneh?
Kibzaim	do	See JOKNEAM
Kishion	do	See KEDESH
Maralah	do	[Mujeidil]?
Meroz	do	Kefr Musr?
Nain	do	Nein
Nazareth	do	En-Nasirah
Rabbith	do	[Sunurieh]?
Ramoth or Remeth	do	[Tell between Sundeoa and Mukeibileh]?
Shahazimah	do	[Shara]?
Shihon	do	[Esh-Shijrah]?
Shunem	do	Solam

## Picture for Issachar

This territory was, as it still is, among the richest land in Palestine. Westward was the famous plain which derived its name, the “seed-plot of God”—such is the signification of Jezreel—from its fertility, and the very weeds of which at this day testify to its enormous powers of production (Stanley *S. and P.* p. 348). *SEE ESDRAELON*; *SEE JEZREEL*. On the north is Tabor, which, even under the burning sun of that climate, is said to retain the glades and dells of an English wood (*ibid.* p. 350). On the east, behind Jezreel, is the opening which conducts to the plain of the Jordan—to that Beth-Shean which was proverbially among the Rabbis the gate of Paradise for its fruitfulness. It is this aspect of the territory of Issachar which appears to be alluded to in the blessing of Jacob. The image of the “sturdy he-ass” (מִרְגָּ, רִמְּוֹ) —the large animal used for burdens and field-work, not the lighter and swifter she-ass for riding ” couching down between the two stalls,” chewing the fodder of stolid ease and quiet—is very applicable, not only to the tendencies and habits, but to the very size and air of a rural agrarian people, while the sequel of the verse is no less suggestive of the certain result of such tendencies when unrelieved by any higher aspirations: “He saw that rest was good and the land pleasant, and



he bowed his back to bear, and became a slave to tribute” — the tribute imposed on him by the various marauding tribes who were attracted to his territory by the richness of the crops. The blessing of Moses completes the picture. He is not only “in tents”—in nomad or semi-nomad life—but “rejoicing” in them; and it is perhaps not straining a point to observe that he has by this time begun to lose his individuality. He and Zebulum are mentioned together as having part possession in the holy mountain of Tabor, which was near the frontier line of each (<sup><6538></sup>Deuteronomy 33:18, 19). We pass from this to the time of Deborah: the chief struggle in the great, victory over Sisera took place on the territory of Issachar, “by Taanach at the waters of Megiddo” (Judges 5, 19); but the allusion to the tribe in the song of triumph is of the most cursory nature, not consistent with its having taken any prominent part in the action.

One among the judges of Israel was from Issachar Tola (<sup><6700></sup>Judges 10:1) —but beyond the length of his sway we have only the fact recorded that he resided out of the limits of his own tribe — at Shamir, in Mount Ephraim. By Josephus he is omitted entirely (see *Ant.* 5, 7, 6). The census of the tribe taken in the reign of David has already been alluded to. It is contained in <sup><6300></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1-5, and an expression occurs in it which testifies to the nomadic tendencies above noticed. Out of the whole number of the tribe no less than 36,000 were marauding mercenary troops—”bands” ((μυδωεΓ)) —a term applied to no other tribe in this enumeration, though elsewhere to Gad, and uniformly to the irregular bodies of the Bedouin nations round Israel. This was probably at the close of David’s reign. Thirty years before, when two hundred of the head men of the tribe had gone to Hebron to assist in making David king over the entire realm, different qualifications are noted in them—they “had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do and all their brethren were at their commandment.” To what this “understanding of the times” was we have no clew (see Deyling, *Observ.* 1, 160 sq.). By the later Jewish interpreters it is explained as skill in ascertaining the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, and dates of solemn feasts, and the interpretation of the signs of the heavens (Targum, ad loc.; Jerome, *Quaest. Heb.*). Josephus (*Ant.* 7:2, 2) gives it as “knowing the things that were to happen;” and he adds that the armed men who came with these leaders were 20,000. One of the wise men of Issachar, according to an old Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (*Quaest. Heb.* on <sup><4716></sup>2 Chronicles 17:16), was Amasiah, son of Zichri, who, with 200,000 men, offered himself to

Jehovah in the service of Jehoshaphat (<sup><1476></sup>2 Chronicles 17:16); but this is very questionable, as the movement appears to have been confined to Judah and Benjamin. The ruler of the tribe at this time was Omri, of the great family of Michael (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 27:18; compare 7:3). May he not have been the forefather of the king of Israel of the same name the founder of the “house of Omri” and of the “house of Ahab,” the builder of Samaria, possibly on the same hill of Shamir on which the Issacharite judge, Tola, had formerly held his court? But, whether this was so or not, at any rate one dynasty of the Israelitish kings was Issacharite. Baasha, the son of Ahijah, of the house of Issachar, a member of the army with which Nadab and all Israel were besieging Gibbethon, apparently not of any standing in the tribe (compare <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 16:2), slew the king, and himself mounted the throne (<sup><1157></sup>1 Kings 15:27, etc.). He was evidently a fierce and warlike man (16:29; <sup><1340></sup>1 Chronicles 16:1), and an idolater like Jeroboam. The Issacharite dynasty lasted during the twenty-four years of his reign and the two of his son Elah. At the end of that time it was wrested from him by the same means that his father had acquired it, and Zimri, the new king, commenced his reign by a massacre of the whole kindred and connections of Baasha—he left him “not even so much as a boy” (16:11).

Distant as Jezreel was from Jerusalem, the inhabitants took part in the Passover with which Hezekiah sanctified the opening of his reign. On that memorable occasion a multitude of the people from the northern tribes, and among them from Issachar, although so long estranged from the worship of Jehovah as to have forgotten how to make the necessary purifications, yet by the enlightened piety of Hezekiah were allowed to keep the feast; and they did keep it seven days with great gladness—with such tumultuous joy as had not been known since the time of Solomon, when the whole land was one. Nor did they separate till the occasion had been signaled by an immense destruction of idolatrous altars and symbols, “in Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim and Manasseh,” up to the very confines of Issachar’s own land — and then “all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities” (<sup><1400></sup>2 Chronicles 31:1). Within five years from this date Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, had invaded the north of Palestine, and after three years’ siege had taken Samaria, and, with the rest of Israel, ‘had carried,’ Issachar away to his distant dominions. The only other scriptural allusion to the tribe is that, with the rest of their brethren of all the tribes of the children of Israel (Dan only excepted), the twelve

thousand of the tribe of Issachar shall be sealed in their foreheads (Rev. 7:7).

2. A Korhite Levite, one of the door-keepers (A.V. “porters”) of the house of Jehovah, seventh son of Obed-Edom (<sup>1335</sup>1 Chronicles 26:5). B.C. 1014.

### Issendorp, Hendrik

belonged to the Evangelical Lutherans of Holland. He was called in 1723 to the charge of a Lutheran church at Purmerend. In 1737 bodily infirmities rendered a colleague necessary. In 1743 he resigned his charge. Though obliged to desist from his ministerial work, he rendered himself eminently useful to his denomination by presenting to the Dutch a translation of some three or four hundred German hymns. See Glasius. *Godgeleerde Nederland*, 2, 196 sq.; also *Gesch Medenis van het godsdienstig Gezang bij de Luiherschen in de Nederlanden door*. (J. P.W.)

### Isserlein, Israel ben-Petachya

a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars in the 15th century, and one of the representatives of truly learned German synagogal teachers, flourished about 1427-1470. At first he was settled over a congregation at Marburg; later he removed to Neustadt, near Vienna. Isserlein was a very liberal-minded Jew, and did much by his influence to advance the standing of Jewish scholarship in his day. More particularly was his influence felt in the theological schools of his Hebrew brethren all over Germany. From the most distant parts of Europe students flocked to the schools at Erfurt, Nuremberg, Regensburg, and Prague, where the Talmud was expounded in a most masterly manner (comp. Zunz, *Ziir Gesch. u. Lit.* p. 167 sq.). According to Jost (*Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, 3, 116), Isserlein died obscurely in 1452, but this seems improbable, as Furst has evidence of Isserlein's activity in 1457, His works are  $\sqrt{Dhi t m \sqrt{r T} ] tw \zeta}$ , a collection of 354 opinions on the different fields of Rabbinism (Venice, 1519, 4to; Firth, 1778, 4to): —  $\mu y b \hat{a} k \sqrt{\mu y q \hat{a} p}$  on the Halachoth (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often; Firth, 1778, 4to): —  $hr / Thil [ i y \zeta r l ] \mu y r \hat{w} a B \hat{a} e$  or Expositions on Rashi's Commentary to the Pentateuch (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often): —  $ar \sqrt{d} y r \hat{e} y i s e ] \mu y r \hat{w} a B \hat{a} e$  or Commentary on the Book Sha'are Dura of Isaac Duran (Venice, 1548, 4to, and often); etc. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8, 220 sq.; Furst.

*Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 154; Frankel, *Israel Isserlein* (*Lib. d. Or.* 1847), c. 675-678. (J. H. W.)

## Isserles, Mose ben-Israel

a celebrated Polish Rabbi, was born at Cracow in 1520. The son of a very wealthy man, and a relative of the distinguished sagan Meir Katzenellenbogen of Padua, he was afforded peculiar advantages for thorough culture. Of these he readily availed himself, and, in consequence, filled very prominent positions at quite an early age. He was distinguished, however, rather for his early acquisitions and extended knowledge than any great natural abilities. He died in 1573. The writings of Isserles are very varied, covering the departments of theological, exegetical, ecclesiastical, and even historical and philosophical literature. In all of these he was perfectly at home. His most important works are *hl / [h; tr]T seon Sacrifices and other subjects of Jewish Antiquities* (Prague, 1569): — *yrj æ* or *Commentary on the Book of Esther* (Cremona, 1559, 4to; Amsterd. 1769, 8vo). For a list of all his works, see Fiirst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2, 155 sq. See Frankel, *Los. b.* — *Israël genannt Mose Isserles*, in the *Oriental Literaturblatt* (1847), c. 827-10; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9, 472 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Issbi'ah

(a, <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 24:21; b, <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 24:25). *SEE ISHIAH.*

## Issue

besides its ordinary sense of *going forth* (*dgn*]Chald. to *flow*, <sup><2710></sup>Daniel 7:10; also *t/ax/T*, *exit*, i.e. source, <sup><1003></sup>Proverbs 4:23, frequently of the direction or terminus of a boundary; *ἐκπορεύομαι*, to *go out*, <sup><6917></sup>Revelation 9:17, 18), and *progeny* *td] /m*, <sup><0486></sup>Genesis 48:6, elsewhere; *' kindred*; *t/[ypæ]* *shoots*, i.e. offspring, <sup><2224></sup>Isaiah 22:24; *σπέρμα*, *seed*, <sup><4125></sup>Matthew 22:25), is the rendering employed by our translators for several terms expressive of a purulent or unhealthy discharge, especially from the sexual organs. The most emphatic of these *b/z*, from *bWz*, to *flow*, both the verb and noun being frequently applied to diseased or unusual secretions, e.g. the monthly courses or *catamenia* of women, and the seminal flux or *gonorrhœa benigna* of men (Leviticus 15; <sup><0482></sup>Numbers 5:2). *SEE DISEASE.* A more intense and chronic form of this

discharge was the “issue of blood,” or uterine hemorrhage of the woman in the Gospels (ῥύσους αἵματος, <sup><4185></sup>Mark 5:25; <sup><4188></sup>Luke 8:43, 44; αἱμορροῖον, <sup><4191></sup>Matthew 9:20), which, as it made her ceremonially unclean, she was so anxious to conceal when she came in contact with the multitude and with Christ. (See monographs in Volbeding, *Index*, p. 49; *Hase, -Leben Jesu*, p. 141.). The term *hmr̄tæ* <sup><4271></sup>Ezekiel 23:20, signifies a pouring, and is applied to the *emissio seminis* of a stallion, to which the idolatrous paramours of Judaea are compared in the strong language of the prophet. **SEE ADULTERY**. The only other term so rendered is *r/qm*; a *fountain*, applied to the womb, or *pudenda muliebra*, as the source of the menstrual discharge (<sup><4127></sup>Leviticus 12:7; 20:18; comp. *πηγή*, <sup><4189></sup>Mark 5:29). **SEE FLUX**.

“The texts <sup><4182></sup>Leviticus 15:2, 3; 22:4; <sup><4182></sup>Numbers 5:2 (and <sup><4189></sup>2 Samuel 3:29, where the malady is invoked as a curse), are probably to be interpreted of gonorrhœa. In <sup><4185></sup>Leviticus 15:3 a distinction is introduced, which merely means that the cessation of the actual flux does not constitute ceremonial cleanness, but that the patient must bide the legal time, seven days (ver. 13), and perform the prescribed purifications and sacrifice (ver. 14). ‘See, however, Surenhusius’s preface to the treatise *Zabim* of the Mishna, where another interpretation is given. As regards the specific varieties of this malady, it is generally asserted that its most severe form (*gon. virulenta*) is modern, having first appeared in the 15th century. Chardin (*Voyages en Perse*, 2, 200) states that he observed that this disorder was prevalent in Persia, but that its effects were far less severe than in Western climates. If this be true, it would go some way to explain the alleged absence of the *gon. virul.* from ancient nosology, which found its field of observation in the East, Greece, etc., and to confirm the supposition that the milder form only was the subject of Mosaic legislation. But, beyond this, it is probable that diseases may appear, run their course, and disappear, and, for want of an accurate observation of their symptoms, leave no trace behind them. The ‘bed,’ ‘seat,’ etc. (<sup><4185></sup>Leviticus 15:5, 6, etc.), are not to be supposed to have been regarded by that law as contagious, but the defilement extended to them merely to give greater prominence to the ceremonial strictness with which the case was ruled. In the woman’s ‘issue,’ (5. 19), the ordinary menstruation seems alone intended, supposed to be prolonged (5. 25) to a morbid--extent. The scriptural handling of the subject not dealing, as in the case of leprosy, in symptoms, it seems gratuitous to detail them here: those who desire such

knowledge will find them in any compendium of therapeutics. See Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 6; 6:9,3; Mishna, *Chelim*. 1, 3, 8; Maimon. *ad Zabim*, 2, 2: whence we learn that persons thus affected might not ascend the Temple mount, nor share in any religious celebration, nor even enter Jerusalem. See also Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, 4:282” (Smith). **SEE UNCLEANNESS.**

### Issus

or, rather, Isus (“Ἴσος), mentioned by Josephus (*Ant. 10*, 8, 6) as high-priest between Joram and Axioramus; apparently corresponding to the Jehoshaphat of the *Seder Olam*. **SEE HIGH-PRIEST.**

### Istalcu’rus

“In 1 Esdr. 8:40. the son of Istalcurus’ (ὁ τοῦ Ἰσταλκούρου) is substituted for ‘and ZABBUD’ of the corresponding list in <sup><1370></sup>Ezra 8:14. The *Keri* has *Zilkkur* instead of Zabbud, and of this there is perhaps some trace in Istalcurus.”

### Is’uah

(<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30). **SEE ISHUAH.**

### Is’ui

(<sup><0467></sup>Genesis 46:17). **SEE ISHIR**, 1. Itala, a name attributed to the old Latin version, which was the foundation of Jerome’s Vulgate. **SEE ITALIC VERSION.**

### Ital’ian

(Ἰταλικός) occurs but once in Scripture, in the mention of the “Italian band,” i.e. Roman cohort, to which Cornelius belonged (<sup><400></sup>Acts 10:1). “This seems to have been a cohort of Italians separate from the legionary soldiers, and not a cohort of the ‘*Legio Italica*,’ of which we read at a later period (Tacitus, *Hist.* 1, 59, 64; 2, 100; 3:14) as being raised by Nero (Dio Cass. 55, 24; Sueton. *Nero*, 19). (See Biscoe, *On the Acts*, p. 300 sq.) Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 145) thinks they were Italian volunteers; and there is an inscription in Gruter in which the following words occur: ‘Cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria, quae est in Syria’ (see Ackerman, *Numismatic Illustrations*, p. 34)” (Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1,

113). There is a monograph on the subject: Schwarz, *De cohorte Italica et Augusta* (Altdorf, 1720). *SEE COHORT.*

### Italian-School of Philosophy

By-the Italian school is properly understood the blending of the Pythagorean and Eleatic systems of philosophy into one. It is sometimes, however, used of the Pythagorean system merely. The reason for designating it as the Italian school is because Pythagoras is said to have taught in Italy. *SEE PYTHAGORAS.*

### Italian Versions of the Scriptures

The earliest translation of the Bible into the modern Italian is said to have been made by Giacomo da Viraggio (Jacobus de Voragine), archbishop of Genoa, in the beginning of the 13th century. This rests exclusively on the authority of Sixtus Senensis (*Biblioth. Sanct.* lib. 4), and there is weighty reason for doubting the statement. That at an early period, however, versions of parts, if not of the whole of Scripture into Italian were made, is evinced by the fact that there exist in various libraries MSS. containing them. In the Royal Library at Paris is an Italian Bible in two vols. folio, as well as several codices containing parts of the Bible in that language; in the library at Upsala is a Codex containing a history compiled from the first seven books of the O.T. in Italian; in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is an Italian translation of the N.T., with portions of the Old, and in other libraries like relics are preserved (see Le Long, *Bib. Sac.* cap. 6:§ 1).

The earliest printed Italian Bible is that of Nicolo di Malermi (or Malherbi), a Venetian Benedictine monk of the order of Camaldoli: it appeared under the title of *Biblia Volgare Historiata*, etc. (Ven. 1471.) The translation is from the Vulgate, and is pronounced by R. Simon to be executed in a harsh style and carelessly (*Hist. Crit. du N.T.* p. 487). It was, however, repeatedly reprinted; the best editions are that superintended by Marini (Ven. 1477, 2 vols. fol.), and that issued at Venice in 1567 (1 vol. fol.). In 1530 Antonio Bruccioli issued his translation of the N.T., and in 1532 the first edition of his translation of the entire Bible, containing a revised and corrected translation of the N.T., under the title of *La Biblia che contiene Sacri libri del vecchio Testamento tradotto nuovamente de la Hebraica verita in lingua Toscana, con divini libri del N.T. tradotti da Greco in lingua Tosc. con privilegio de olicito Senato Venetao e letera a Francescol, Rege Christianissimo* (fol. Venice, ap. Luc. Ant. Juntae). This



translation is said by Simon to follow in the O.T. the Latin version of Pagnini rather than to be made from the original Hebrew, and to partake of the rudeness and barbarism of Pagnini's style. It was put in the index of the prohibited books among works of the first class. Many editions of it, however, appeared, of which the most important is that of Zanetti (Ven. 1540, 3 vols. fol). Bruccioli's version of the O.T. in a corrected form was printed at Geneva in 1562, along with a new version of the N.T. by Gallars and Beza; to this notes are added, and especially an exposition of the Apocalypse. The translation of Marmochini, though professedly original, is, in reality, only a revised edition of that of Bruccioli, the design of which was to bring it more fully into accordance with the Vulgate. Several translations of the Psalms (some from the Hebrew) and of other parts of Scripture appeared in Italy between the middle and end of the 16th century, and a new translation of the N.T., by a Florentine of the name of Zacharia, appeared in 8vo at Venice in 1542, and at Florence in 1566, copies of which are now extremely rare. The Jew David de Pomis issued a translation of Ecclesiastes with the original Hebrew (Ven. 1578).

In 1607 appeared at Geneva the first Protestant Italian version—that of Giovanni Diodati (*La Biblia: Cioè I Libri del Vecchio e del Nuovo Testamento* [sm. folio]). To this are appended brief marginal notes. This version was made directly from the original texts, and stands in high esteem for fidelity. It has been repeatedly reprinted. Being in the plain Lucchese dialect, it is especially adapted for circulation among the common people. It is that now adopted by the Bible Societies.

A version affecting greater elegance, but by no means so faithful, is that of Antonio Martini, archbishop of Florence. The N.T. appeared at Turin in 1769, and the O.T. in 1779, both accompanied with the text of the Vulgate, and with copious notes, chiefly from the fathers. This work received the approbation of pope Pius VI. It is made avowedly from the Vulgate, and is in the pure Tuscan dialect. Repeated editions have appeared; one, printed at Livorno (Leghorn), and those issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society (Lond. 1813, 1821), want the notes, and have consequently been placed in the index of prohibited books. To read and circulate this book, though bearing the papal sanction, was, till lately, a grave offense, as the well-known case of the Madaia in Florence proves.

*SEE VERSIONS.*



## Italic Version

(*Vetus Itala*), the usual name of the old Latin version of the Scriptures, used prior to the days of Augustine and Jerome, and probably made in Northern Africa in the 2nd century. The Italic, however, is properly a revision of this old Latin version, which was in use in Northern Italy, or around Milan. Fragments of it have been preserved by Blanchini and Sabatier (Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.). Portions containing the books of Leviticus and Numbers have been published by Lord Ashburnham (London, 1870) from an ancient Codex in his library. *SEE LATIN VERSIONS.*

## Italy

(Ἰταλία, of uncertain etymology), the name of the country of which Rome was the capital (<sup><418D></sup>Acts 18:2; 27:1, 6; <sup><513B></sup>Hebrews 13:24). This, like most geographical names, was differently applied at different periods. In the earliest times the name “*Italy*” included only the little peninsula of *Culabrias* (Strabo, 5, 1). The country now called Italy was then inhabited by a number of nations distinct in origin, language, and government, such as the Gauls, Ligurians, and Veneti on the north, and the Pelasgi, Sabines, Etrurians, etc., on the south. But, as the power of Rome advanced, these nations were successively annexed to the great state and the name “*Italy*” extended also, till it came to be applied to the whole country south of the Alps, and Polybius seems to use it in this sense (1, 6; 2, 14). For the progress of the history of the world, see Smith’s *Dictionary of Classical Geography*, s.v. From the time of the close of the republic it was employed as we employ it now, i.e. *in* its true geographical sense, as denoting the whole natural peninsula between the Alps and the Straits of Messina. In the New Testament it occurs three or, indeed, more correctly speaking, four times. In <sup><418D></sup>Acts 10:1, the Italian cohort at Caesarea (ἡ σπεῖρα ἡ καλουμένη Ἰταλική, A.V. Italian band”), consisting, as it doubtless did, of men recruited in Italy, illustrates the military relations of the imperial peninsula with the provinces. *SEE ARMY.* In <sup><418D></sup>Acts 18:2, where we are told of the expulsion of Aquila and Priscilla with their compatriots ‘; from Italy,’ we are reminded of the large Jewish population which many authorities show that it contained. <sup><427D></sup>Acts 27:1, where the beginning of St. Paul’s voyage ‘to Italy’ is mentioned, and the whole subsequent narrative, illustrate the trade which subsisted between the peninsula and other parts of the Mediterranean. Lastly, the words in Heb. 13:24, “They of Italy (οἱ

ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you,” whatever they may prove for or against this being the region in which the letter was written (and the matter has been strongly argued both ways), are interesting as a specimen of the progress of Christianity in the West. A concise account of the divisions and history of ancient Italy may be found in Anthon’s *Class. Dict.* s.v. Italia. *SEE ROME.*

## Italy, Modern

a kingdom in Southern Europe, with an area of 112,852 square miles and a population in 1870 of 26,500,000 inhabitants. The name originally belonged to the southern point of the Apennine peninsula alone; at the time of Thucydides it embraced the whole southern coast *from* the river Laus, on the Tyrrhenian Sea, Metapontium to the Sicilian Straits; after the conquest of Tarentum by the Romans it was extended to all the country from the Sicilian Straits to the Arno or Rubicon; finally, at the time of Augustus, it came to be used of the whole of the peninsula. In a still wider sense it was, under Constantine, the name of one of the four chief divisions of the Roman Empire, being subdivided into three (according to others into four or two) dioceses — Illyria, Africa, and Italy Proper. But this wider significance died out with the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and the name has since been confined to the Apennine peninsula. It denoted a century, the people of which gradually coalesced into one nation, united by the same language, literature, and habits, but which never, for any length of time, constituted one political commonwealth. Not until 1859 did the national aspirations for unity succeed in erecting by far the larger portion of the peninsula into the kingdom of Italy; in 1866 Venetia was added, and in 1870 the incorporation of Rome completed the structure of national unity.

## Picture for Italy, Modern

### I. Church History; —

(1.) The planting of Christianity in Italy can be traced to the first years of the Christian sera. The apostle Peter, according to old accounts, visited Rome as early as A.D. 42, but no satisfactory evidence can be adduced for the assertion of Roman theologians that Peter was at any time bishop of the Church of Rome, and still less that he held this office for twenty-five years. In 53 the Christians, together with the Jews, were expelled from Rome by order of the emperor Claudius. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (about

55) indicates that the Church in Rome was at that time fully organized. Under Nero, Peter and Paul were probably put to death, together with numerous other professors of Christianity. Among those who were put to death under Domitian (81-96) was Flavius Clemens, a man of consular dignity, and belonging to the imperial family. Many other churches in Italy, besides that of Rome, trace their foundation to 'assistants of the apostles; thus Barnabas is said to have established the Church of Milan, Mark the Church of Aquileja, Apollinaris the Church at Ravenna. The churches of Lucca, Fiesole, Bologna, Bari, Benevento, Capua, Naples, Palermo, Syracuse, Pavia, Urbino, Mantua, Verona, Pisa. Florence, and Sienna also claim to be of apostolic origin. That many of the churches were really organized during the first century is not doubted, but hardly any of them has a documentary history which ascends beyond the beginning of the 2nd century. Even the history of the Church of Rome is so involved in obscurity that it is not known in which order the first four bishops succeeded each other. From the beginning of the 2nd century bishoprics rapidly increased, and down to the year 311 there are enumerated many seats of bishops in all the provinces. The first epistle of the Roman bishop Soter (A.D. 175 sq.) was written to the bishops of Campania, and his second to the bishops of Italy. The Roman bishop Zephyrinus (203-221) addressed his first epistle to *all* the bishops of Sicily, and Eusebius his third to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania. A "Provincial Synod of Rome," consisting of twelve bishops, was presided over by Telesphorus (142-154); it was followed by a synod under Anicetus (167-175); another in 197, and many more in the 3rd century. At the beginning of the 4th century Christianity was so firmly established throughout Italy that the pagans could make no notable resistance when Christianity under Constantine the Great became the religion of the state. The apostasy of Julian retarded but little the victory of Christianity, which became complete when, towards the close of the 4th century, Theodosius exterminated paganism by fire and sword. As the bishop of Rome was from the earliest period of the Church one of the three great bishops of the Christian Church (Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch), the churches of Italy became subordinate to his superintendence and jurisdiction: only the Church provinces of the metropolitans of Mailan and Aquileia remained independent of the jurisdiction of Rome for many more centuries. The more the power of the bishops of Rome rose, the more the Church history of Italy is absorbed by the history of the papacy and the Roman Church. In no other country of Europe was the unity of faith better preserved and less interrupted than in

Italy. The rule of the Arian Goths (493-563) lasted too short a time to establish Arianism on a firm foundation, and all the following changes in the secular government of the country recognized the predominant Church. The unity of the Italian Church during the Middle Ages was but little disturbed by heretical sects; the Catharists and Pasagii never became powerful, and soon disappeared; only the Waldenses, in the remote valleys of Piedmont, survived all persecution. *SEE PAPACY.*

(2.) *History of the Reformation.* — Italy, like other countries, had its forerunners of the Reformation, the most prominent of whom was the Dominican monk Savonarola (q.v.), who fearlessly advocated a radical reform of the Church. The revival of the classical studies on the one hand, and the corruption which prevailed at the papal court on the other, disposed at the beginning of the 16th century many minds towards abandoning the doctrines of Rome. In general, however, the tendency towards freethinking was stronger among the malcontents than the wish for a religious reform. One of the most important efforts in the latter direction was made in the time of Leo X by some twenty earnest men, who formed a society for the purpose of rekindling in the Church a spirit of piety in opposition to the prevailing corruption. Among them were Cajetan, subsequently founder of the order of the Theatines; Caraffa, subsequently pope Paul IV; and Contarini, subsequently cardinal. All of them desired to effect a reformation within the Church, though some of them strongly inclined towards the reformatory doctrine of justification by faith alone. To this class of reformers belonged also Bruccioli, who published an Italian translation of the Bible (1530-1532), which passed through several editions. Among the sympathizers with this movement were also Foscarari, bishop of Modena; San Felice, bishop of Cava; cardinal Morone, Grimanaï, patriarch of Aquileia, and Folengo, a pious Benedictine of Monte Casino. In consequence of the frequent intercourse of Upper Italy with Germany and Switzerland, the writings of Luther and other reformers began to circulate in Italy from the beginning of the Reformation. To evade the Inquisition, they were generally published either anonymously, or under the name of other authors.

Venice appears to have been the first city of Italy in which the Reformation took root. This was chiefly due to its constant intercourse with Germany, and to the independent position maintained by that republic towards the see of Rome. As early as 1520 Luther received news from Venice that a great need was felt there of evangelical preachers and books, and in 1528 he was

informed that the cause was making good progress. The fact that Venice was a refuge for all who in other parts of Italy were persecuted for their faith was likewise favorable to the progress of Protestantism. The proceedings of the Diet of Augsburg (1530) excited the attention of the friends of the Reformation at Venice to a high degree, and Lucio Paolo wrote a pressing letter in their name to Melancthon, imploring him to resist to the last. Even priests were found in the evangelical party, as Valdo Lupetino, provincial of the Franciscans, who advised his relative, M. Flacius, of Illyria, afterwards one of the champions of Protestantism, to go to Germany, where he would learn a better theology than he would find in a convent (1537). Through such men, who were in personal communication with the reformers, Venice remained regularly connected with Wittenberg. In 1539 Melancthon addressed an epistle to Venice which affords most valuable information concerning the position of the evangelical party in that city at that time. The evangelical party increased not only in the city of Venice, but in the whole territory of the republic, particularly at Vicenza and Treviso, and it does not appear that the government ever interfered with its peaceful development. It is only after 1542 that, at the instigation of Rome, the Protestants of the Venetian republic began to experience serious difficulties. Although very numerous, they had not till then organized themselves into a society. They were obliged to observe the greatest caution and secrecy. They were without a leader, and, besides, there were differences of opinion dividing them. Balthasar Altieri, a native of Aquila, and secretary of the English ambassador, succeeded in uniting them. He also wrote to Luther, asking him to obtain for the Protestants, through the intercession of German Protestant princes, permission from the senate to act according to the dictates of their conscience, at least until the council should decide on the points of difference. He also invoked the mediation of Luther to allay the manifold divisions which weakened the Protestants of Venetia. As Italy had intercourse with Switzerland as well as with Germany, both the Reformed and the Lutheran reformations had found their adherents; and, in particular, disputes arose about the doctrine of the Eucharist. Bucer had in vain endeavored to heal these difficulties, and it was now expected that Luther would be more successful. The answer of Luther expressed, however, distrust towards the Swiss and their doctrines, and warned the people against the works of Bucer. Melancthon was deeply grieved at the tone of Luther's answer, as he knew the Italians to be only too prone to indulge in discussions and arguments on disputed points of doctrine. Probably about

this time secret societies began to be formed for the discussion of theological doctrines, principally concerning the Trinity; and those anti-Trinitarian schemes which, in the following century, separated Italian Protestantism from that of other countries, originated-in them. About 1542 the principles of Protestantism were- introduced into Istria by Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d' Istria, and for a while made rapid progress, which, however, was, soon interrupted. After opposing Protestantism for a long while, particularly in Germany, where he was for a while papal legate, and took part as such in the Conference of Worms, Vergerio was, by-the reading of Luther's works, which he had procured for the purpose of refuting them, brought to embrace their views. His first convert was his brother, the bishop of Pola. Both now labored zealously, and with great success, to evangelize their dioceses, until in 1545 the Inquisition finally interfered, and Vergerio was obliged to flee.

Next to Venice, Ferrara became one of the central points of Protestantism. It was introduced there by Renata, wife of Hercules II, duke of Ferrara, and the daughter of Louis XII, king of France. She had become acquainted with the doctrines of the Reformation through Margaret of Navarre, and when she came to Ferrara in 1527, she soon found herself surrounded by persons holding the same views. Some were scholars who held offices in the university or at court, while others were refugees who, persecuted in their own country for their Protestant opinions, found there a safe refuge. Calvin himself spent a few months there in 1536, and ever after remained in active correspondence with the duchess; also Hubert Languet, who distinguished himself in the history of the French Reformation. Among the Italians were Flaminio and Calcagnini, a friend of Contarini and Poole; Peter Martyr Vermigli, Aonio Paleario, and Celio Secondo Curione, who won over Peregrino Morata, the tutor of the duke's brother, to Protestantism. The learned daughter of Morata, Olympia, whose letters express a truly evangelical spirit, was one of the ornaments of the court. and the companion of the young daughter of Renata.

From Ferrara probably the movement spread over to Modena, which belonged also to the duke of Ferrara. Already in 1530 a papal rescript commanded the Inquisition to use every exertion to suppress the heretical tendency among the monks of the diocese of Ferrara. Yet the movement did not really break out until 1540, when the learned Sicilian Paolo Iicci came to Modena and established a congregation there. Ladies of high rank protected the new doctrine, especially a certain countess Rangone. As a

sign of the spirit of opposition against Rome, we may mention the satires which were published, as, for instance, a letter purporting to come from Jesus Christ, and worded in the manner of the papal commandments, announcing that our Lord contemplated resuming the absolute and immediate government of the Church himself. Cardinal Morone, bishop of Modena, although evangelically inclined himself, complained much in his letters (1540-1544), written during his stay in Germany as papal legate, of the progress of Protestantism in his diocese, and said he was told that Modena had become Lutheran. But with the news of the progress of the Reformation came also the information that the differences concerning the Eucharist had arisen, and Bucer wrote to the Protestants of Modena and Bologna to heal the breach (1541). At Bologna, the Germans who came there to attend the university gained many supporters to evangelical views; the most important among them was Giovanni Mollio, a Minorite, who labored long as a preacher and professor. The presence of the Saxon ambassador, John of Planitz, who came to Bologna with Charles V, gave the Protestants an opportunity to present a request in which they asked for the convocation of a synod, and expressed their veneration for the German princes who had protected Protestantism in their states. — They hoped by the council to get freed from the yoke of Rome, and to obtain religious liberty; in the mean time they wished only permission to use their Bibles without being on that account considered as heretics. The movement was propagated also through other parts of the Papal States, at Faenza and Imola; and in Rome itself there were many who privately approved the doctrines of Luther. In Naples, the principles of the Reformation were imported by the German soldiers in 1527, and they appear to have taken root, for an imperial edict was issued in 1536 to counteract the Protestant tendencies by threatening the severest punishments against the so-called heretics. Yet in the same year the emperor himself sent to Naples the man who was destined to play the most important part in the evangelization of Italy. Juan Valdez came to Naples as secretary of the viceroy. Position, education, intelligence, and character combined to make him influential. A small but eminent circle silently formed around him for reciprocal edification and the promotion of an inner, living Christianity. Among them were count Galeazzo Caraccioli, nephew of pope Paul IV; the martyr Pietro Carnesecchi, Roman protonotary; Giulia Gonzaga, duchess of Trajetto; Vittoria Colonna, the widow of Pescara; and the noble confessor Isabella Maurica. Valdez only continued his evangelizing labors for four years: he died in 1540. But his work was continued by two of his

followers, Pietro Martyr Vermigli and Bernardino Occhino. The former, having been sent as prior to an Augustinian convent at Naples, read some of Bucer's and Zwingle's works, and, having become converted to their doctrines, he began working in the same direction as Valdez. He delivered lectures on the epistles of St. Paul, which were attended not only by his own monks, but also by the most distinguished members of the clergy and the laity. In the mean. time the Capuchin Occhino, confessor of Paul III, general of his order, and one of the most eminent men of the Church at the time, was invited to preach the Lent sermons at Naples. first in 1536. and again in 1539. An attentive reading of the Bible had already caused him to regard faith as the only means of salvation; his intercourse with Valdez strengthened him still more in his views; he began preaching justification by faith, and gained many adherents by his fiery eloquence. Although none of these men thought as yet to separate from the Church of Rome, they were soon looked upon with suspicion. The Theatine Cajetan, friend of the zealot Caraffa, was the first to call attention to them. Vermigli was summoned to appear, and to justify himself, but was saved from any annoyance this time by the interference of several cardinals. Soon after, having been at Naples for about three years, he demanded his recall; and having been appointed prior at Lucca, he began to labor for the evangelization of this new field. New persecutions finally decided him to separate openly from the Church of Rome, and to flee the country for safety. Three of his most intimate disciples accompanied him: Paolo Lacisio, afterwards professor at Strasburg, Theodosio Trebellio, and Giulio Terenziano. Eighteen others followed him soon after; among them Gelso Martinengho, who died as pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva; Em. Tremellio, who, after various vicissitudes, became professor of Hebrew at the Academy of Sedan, and H. Zanchi, who occupied a distinguished place among the most eminent theologians of Germany. At Florence Vermigli met with Occhino, who, stimulated by his example, also sacrificed his position, and left Italy. Another champion of the Reformation, the. learned Celio Secundo Curione, replaced for, a while Martyr in the congregation at Lucca, and afterwards labored at various places, until he. also was obliged to seek safety in flight, and went to Switzerland.

Thus the movement had become general throughout Italy. Many admitted that no reforms were to be expected from the Church or its hierarchy, and separated from it, some silently, others openly; the latter inclined more and



more to a union with the Protestants of Germany. and Switzerland. Still a large number retained the hope that the Church itself would make the necessary reforms, either by the long-wished-for council, or by other concessions. The evangelical tendencies finally acquired such influence, even among the clergy, that pope Paul III thought it best to make apparently some concessions; he appointed Contarini, Sadolet, Poole, and Fregoso (but at the same time also Caraffa), members of the college of cardinals. As a preliminary step towards the convocation of a council, he formed them, together with some other prelates, into a congregation, with the mission of drawing up a project of the reforms most needed. Soon, however, the uncompromising opponents of all reformatory measures gained the ascendancy with the pope, and it was resolved to put down the reformatory movement at any price. A superior tribunal of the Inquisition was established at Rome, with full power of life and death in all cases concerning religion, and acting with the same severity against all, without distinction of rank or person. The bull establishing the new Congregation of the Holy Office was issued July 21, 1542. It was composed of six cardinals, with Caraffa at their head. They were authorized to appoint envoys, with full power to act for them in the different provinces. The pope alone had the power of pardoning those they had condemned. The new institution was soon adopted in Tuscany, Milan, and Naples; all the Italian states gave it the necessary support. Venice itself was unable to resist its introduction, though here lay judges. were joined to the inquisitors. Books were also subjected to the judgment of the Inquisition; after 1543 no book was permitted to be published without its sanction, and soon there appeared lists of forbidden books. Next to the Inquisition, the Council of Trent proved a heavy blow to Italian Protestantism. Many who were wavering or lacked courage were induced to return to the old fold; many others left their native land for safety, and a great number became martyrs to their faith in dungeons or at the stake. Rome gave the signal of most of the persecutions which the Protestants suffered in Italy. Caraffa had spies everywhere. Among the first who were obliged to seek safety in flight were Occhino and Vermigli. The congregation which had been established by them and Valdez at Naples was subjected to severe attacks as soon as the latter was dead; many of its members gave way under the persecution, and the others were obliged to use the utmost secrecy. Giovanni Mollio, of Montalcino, a Franciscan, still officiated among them for some time, but he also was obliged to leave Naples in 1543. An Augustinian from Sicily,

Lorenzo Romano, subsequently shared the same fate, and finally became reconciled with Rome.

The congregation founded at Lucca by Peter Vermigli met with the same fate. Rome compelled the senate in 1545 to issue severe edicts against the Protestants, who here also submitted to outward conformity, and by so doing lost the spirit which had animated them, so that when the Inquisition was really established among them the greater number became reconciled to the Church. Manay, however, resisted to the last, and a number of prominent citizens left for Geneva, Berne, Lyon, and other places. *SEE INQUISITION.*

The countess of Ferrara was no longer able to protect her fellow-Protestants. A papal decree commanded that all suspicious persons should be examined; imprisonment, banishment, death, or, at best, fight, was the usual fate of the accused. Fannio, of Faenza, fell a martyr to his faith. Renata herself was much persecuted by her husband, but remained steadfast, and after her husband's death retired to France, where she showed herself a courageous protector of the Protestants. All Italy was awed into obedience by the Inquisition. The prisons at Rome were filled with prisoners brought from all parts of Italy. Mollio, having returned from Naples to Bologna, was taken, brought to Rome, and executed. The Gospel had made great progress among the Franciscans, especially in Upper Italy; a large number of them were imprisoned, others escaped and most of them were compelled to recant. The persecution became still more violent when Caraffa himself, aged seventy-nine years, ascended the papal throne in 1555 under the name of Paul IV. To purify and restore the Church was his chief aim, and, in order to attain this, he was most zealous in the persecution of all unbelievers and heretics. He spared none—not even the leaders of the moderate reform party. The most distinguished of these (Contarini being dead), cardinal Morone, remained a prisoner until the pope's death, in the castle of St. Angelo. Bishop Foscarari, of Modena, and San Felice, of Cava, were also arrested, while cardinal Poole was summoned to come from England to justify himself. Among the chief points of accusation against Morone were that he doubted the correctness of the decisions of the Council of Trent, especially in regard to justification; that he rejected the efficiency of good works, and advised his hearers to trust only in the redeeming sacrifice of Christ. The first martyr in the reign of Paul IV was Pomponio Algieri, who had labored faithfully for the propagation of evangelical views at Padua; he died courageously at the

stake. Under Pius IV, the Inquisition did not relent in its work. He was himself present at an autoda-fe at which Ludovico Pascali, a minister of the Waldenses of Calabria, was executed. When the Dominican Ghislieri, former president of the Inquisition, and a worthy disciple of Caraffa, ascended the papal throne in 1566, under the name of Pius V, the Inquisition entered a new era of prosperity. He accomplished the final suppression of Protestantism in Italy. Prisoners were sent to Rome from all parts of Italy. The duke of Florence himself sent there, as his peace-offering, the eminent apostolical protonotary. Pietro Carnesecchi, whom his learning, piety, and position had heretofore protected, and who now became a martyr. The same fate befel Antonio del Pagliarici (Aonio Paleario), who, as professor of rhetoric at Sienna, Lucca, and Milan, had acquired universal reputation, and who is generally considered as the author of the treatise *Del Beneficio di Christo*, a truly evangelical work, which, by its clear exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith, gained many adherents to Protestantism.

The numerous Protestants of Venetia also experienced the effects of the papal persecution, although the republic resisted the Inquisition, and sought to counteract it by a number of decrees. Already, in 1542, the papal nuncio Della Casa procured the arrest of a priest, Giulio Milanese, and, soon after, that of the provincial of the Minorites, Baldo Lupetino. The former, however, succeeded in making good his escape. In 1546 pope Paul III gave a fresh impulse to the persecutions, and many fled the country, some recanted, and others were imprisoned for life. The persecution was still more violent in the neighborhood of Venice than in the city itself. The bishop of Bergamo himself, Soranzo, was obliged to go to Rome to give an account of his faith, and was imprisoned. A few only succeeded in hiding themselves in the midst of the greatest dangers. Altieri, who had so often obtained protection for the Italian Protestants from the princes forming the League of Smalcald, was at last in danger himself, and, after many escapes, died poor in the neighborhood of Brescia in 1550. After 1557, foreigners who visited Venice for study or commerce received, however, some degree of protection. This encouraged the native Protestants, who called a minister, and again formed a congregation in private. They were soon betrayed, and most of them imprisoned. The senate now for the first time consented that their offence should be punished by death. They were not burnt, however, but thrown into the sea at night. Baldo Lupetino was among these. The destruction of the little

church of the Waldenses, who, since the end of the 14th century, had settled at St. Pisto and Montalto, in Calabria, is one of the saddest episodes of the sad history of Italian Protestantism. The other evangelical communities of Locarno, etc., met with the same fate.

(3.) *Church History from the Suppression of the Reformation until the present Day.* — Throughout the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, Italy remained dismembered into a number of small states, which prevented the people from becoming one consolidated nation. Its ecclesiastical history during this period is as unimportant as the political. Only once an aera of ecclesiastical reforms appeared to dawn, when Leopold, grand-duke of Tuscany, brother of emperor Joseph II, attempted, by the agency of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato, to reform the polity of the Church. At a synod of his clergy which Ricci assembled at Pistoia (1786), and which was largely attended, the principles of the Gallican Church and of the most liberal Jansenism were adopted; the prerogatives claimed by the popes, and in particular, the claim of infallibility, were severely denounced, many superstitious ceremonies were abolished, and it was determined that public worship should be conducted in the language of the people, and that the Scriptures should be circulated among them. But these enactments were opposed by most of the bishops of Tuscany, and when Leopold ascended the imperial throne of Austria, the hierarchy obtained a complete victory. The territorial changes which the French republic and the first Napoleon introduced in Italy were not of long duration, but the revolutionary ideas which during this period had been kindled in the minds of many Italians survived. A secret society, the *Carbonari*, which at first aimed at the introduction of a universal republic, but subsequently had the establishment of a national union and the introduction of liberal reforms, and, in particular, religious toleration, for its chief object, spread with great rapidity throughout the peninsula, and became the rallying-point for all the educated Italians who wished to break the omnipotent influence of the Church upon the political and social affairs of the people. The *Carbonari* succeeded in 1821 in compelling the government of the Two Sicilies to grant a liberal constitution, but an armed intervention of the Austrians soon restored the absolute power of the king and the despotic influence of the Church. It was, however, apparent that the educated classes of Italy only yielded to brutal force, and that the desire to emancipate the people from the influence of the priests, and, in particular, from the temporal rule of the popes, became stronger every year. In 1830 a new revolution broke out in

the papal provinces, and within a fortnight four fifths of the States of the Church had made themselves free from papal rule, and constituted themselves an independent state. Again it required the armed intervention of Austria to arrest the success of the liberal and anti-papal movement throughout Italy. The accession to the throne of Sardinia of Charles Albert in 1831 gave, however, to Italy one prince who openly adhered to the programme of the national liberal party, and therefore awakened great hopes for the future. In the same year Mazzini organized the secret society Young Italy, which repeatedly attempted insurrections for the purpose of establishing an Italian republic. All these attempts were unsuccessful, but they greatly increased the breach between the Italian people and the Church of Rome. The liberal priest V. Gioberti, in his work on the moral and political primacy of the Italians (1843), endeavored to prove that a reconciliation between the national liberal party and a reformed papacy was possible, and that the best way for securing a political regeneration of Italy was the establishment of a confederation of the several states, with a liberal pope at its head. When, in 1846, Gregory XVI died, and the new pope, Pius IX, seemed to adopt some of the views of Gioberti, the belief in the practicability of the scheme found many adherents among the liberal party, but the large body of the ultramontane party looked upon them with distrust and even regarded many steps taken by the new pope as a mistaken policy.

The revolutionary movements of 1848 at first appeared to have a great influence upon the religious affairs of the country. In Rome a Constituent Assembly was called, which on Feb. 5, 1849, abolished the temporal power of the pope, and proclaimed the Roman republic. The greatest enemies of the papacy in Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi, were at the head of the republic, which, however, only a few months later (June 4), was struck down by the French troops, which Louis Napoleon, the president of the French republic, had sent there for the restoration of the temporal power. But, although the revolutionary movements, which, if successful, would have abolished throughout Italy the prerogatives of the Church of Rome, were unsuccessful, one of the state governments, Sardinia, remained favorable to the cause of national union and of a liberal legislation in the province of Church affairs. The Legislature, in 1850, adopted liberal laws, introduced by the minister Siccaldi (hence called the Siccaldian laws), which provided, 1, that all civil suits must be decided in civil courts and according to the common law; 2, that all priests in criminal cases be subject to the

jurisdiction of the state; 3, that criminals may be arrested in churches and other sacred places. When archbishop Franzoni, of Turin, resisted the new law of the state, he was promptly arrested; and when he refused the sacraments of the Church to the dying minister Santa Rosa, he was deposed from his office (Sept. 26, 1850) and exiled. The archbishop of Cagliari shared his fate. In the threatening allocutions of the pope (the first dated Nov. 1, 1850), the government replied by sequestrating the revenues of the archbishop. In consequence of the violent opposition made to the government by the monks, the ministry of Cavour (1852-1858), the greatest Italian statesman of modern times issued the stringent laws of March 2, 1855, by which the convents of all monks who did not devote themselves to preaching, to instruction, or to the nursing of the sick were suppressed (331 out of 605). The papal anathema against the authors of these laws remained without the least effect. On the contrary, when the king of Sardinia, in consequence of the war against Austria and the successful revolutions in central and southern Italy, united all the provinces of Italy, with the only exception of a part of the papal territory and of Venetia, into the kingdom of Italy, the liberal Sardinian laws were not only retained, but made more stringent. Nobody seemed to care about the Church laws against those who spoliated the patrimony of St. Peter (the States of the Church), and on Jan. 1, 1866, the obligatory civil marriage was introduced. The government and the Parliament were fully agreed in the wish to complete, as soon as possible, the unity of Italy, by the annexation of Venetia and the remainder of the papal territory, inclusive of the city of Rome. In accordance with the plan of Cavour, the Parliament, as early as 1861, almost unanimously declared in favor of making Rome the capital of Italy, though they expressed a willingness to give to the pope full guarantees for the free and independent exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. The movements of Garibaldi showed that the inhabitants of the papal provinces alone, aided by volunteers from other parts of Italy, would have been fully able to depose the papal government, and unite the territory with the kingdom of Italy; and it required the presence of a large French army in Rome to maintain the detested papal rule. Venetia was obtained as a result of the war of 1866 but the expedition of Garibaldi against Rome in 1867 led to a new occupation of the papal territory by a French army.

The wretched financial condition of Italy, which had become more threatening than ever by the war of 1866, and the September convention of 1864 by which the government engaged to assume a part of the papal debt,

compelled the ministry in 1867 to bring in a bill for the confiscation of the property of the Church. The subject had been under deliberation since 1865, when a personal correspondence took place between the pope and the king, which induced the latter to make to the Church a few concessions. But the sale of the Church property, though for a time delayed, was urgently demanded by the Parliament and public opinion as the only escape from a general bankruptcy, and the government therefore laid a bill before the Parliament which met on March 22, 1867; but the committee elected by the Parliament rejected the project of the government as too compromising and not sufficiently radical, and in the very first article of its own draft demanded the abolition of all monastic institutions, and the confiscation of the whole property of the Church. The government yielded to the views of the committee, and, after several modifications had been agreed upon by the government and the Parliament, both chambers adopted the 'bill for the sale of the Church property by an immense majority (the lower chamber, on July 27, by 296 votes against 41; the senate, on Aug. 12, by 84 against 29). The actual sale began at Florence on October 26, 1867, though even before this drafts on the revenue to be realized by the sale had been issued to the amount of 400 million francs. The new excommunications pronounced against all buyers of Church property failed to have any effect; the government and the overwhelming majority of both chambers unwaveringly persisted in carrying out the new laws concerning the Church and her property.

The Ecumenical Council which was opened by the pope at Rome on Dec. 8, 1869, was unable to improve the influence and the prospects of the papacy among the Italians. The government, the Parliament, and the people at large repudiated the claims of the council more generally than was done in any other purely Catholic country. The nation became more impatient than ever for the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and the incorporation of his states with the kingdom; and when, in 1870, the Franco-German war caused the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome and ultimately led to the destruction of the French Empire, the Italian government could no longer resist the popular pressure for the annexation of the papal states. In September, 1870, count Ponza di San Martino was sent to Rome, and, in the name of the Italian government, proposed to the pope to renounce the temporal rule and to dissolve his army; he was, in this case, to retain the Leonine part of Rome, a civil list, and the right of diplomatic representation. The government also offered to

guarantee the free exercise, by the pope, the bishops, and the priests, of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the immunity of all cardinals and ambassadors. When the pope rejected all these offers of compromise, on Sept. 11, the Italian troops, in compliance with numerous petitions from the subjects of the pope, entered the States of the Church, and on Sept. 20, by the occupation of the city of Rome, put an end to the temporal power of the pope. A note from cardinal Antonelli, the secretary of state, to the foreign government, protested against the act; and the bishops and the ultramontane party in all the countries re-echoed the protest, and many princes, both Catholic and Protestant, were called upon to interfere and to restore the pope to his throne. The pope issued a new brief of excommunication, in which he said, "We declare to you, venerable brethren, and through you to the whole Church, that all those (in whatever notable dignity they may shine) who have been guilty of the invasion, usurpation, occupation of any of our provinces, or of this holy city, or of anything connected therewith, and likewise all who have commissioned, favored, aided, counseled, adhered to them, and all others who promote or carry out the things aforesaid, under any pretext whatever, and in any manner whatever, have incurred the greater excommunication (*excommunicatio major*), and the other censures and penalties which have been provided in the holy canons of the apostolical constitutions and the decrees of the ecumenical councils, in particular that of Trent." None of all these measures produced the least effect. When the first Parliament of all Italy met, the king declared, "We entered Rome in virtue of the national right, in virtue of the compact which unites all Italians to one nation. We shall remain there, keeping the promises which we have solemnly given to ourselves; freedom of the Church, entire independence of the pope in the exercise of his religious functions, and in his relations to the Catholic Church." None of the foreign governments interrupted its amicable relations with the Italian government. In July, 1871, the government transferred its seat to Rome, where, in spite of all the papal excommunications, it received the enthusiastic applause of a large majority of the Italian people, and where it was at once followed by the representatives of all the foreign governments.

Although nearly all the bishops and the overwhelming majority of the priests showed themselves as partisans of the papacy in its struggle against the government and the public opinion of Italy, the idea of reforming the Church by rejecting all or much of the corruptions which had crept into it



during the Middle Ages and in modern times and by reconciling it with the civilization of the 19th century, found more adherents among the priests of Italy than among those of any other country. In a political point of view, the reformers desired the Church, in 'particular, to abandon the temporal rule of the pope, to recognize the national unity of Italy, and to aid in carrying through a separation between Church and State. In the province of religion they all wished to restrict the power of the popes, to enlarge that of the bishops, and one portion went so far as to enter into amicable relations with the High-Church party of the Church of England. They had an organ, the *Examinatore* of Florence; and as even one of the six hundred bishops (cardinal D'Andrea), and the Jesuit Passaglia, who had long been regarded by the ultramontane party as one of their ablest theologians, and other men of high prominence, declared their concurrence with a part or the whole of the reformatory projects, there seemed to be good reason for hoping lasting results from the movement. More recently, the reformatory movement in Germany, headed by Dr. Döllinger, has found the warmest sympathy among the Italian reformers.

After the suppression of the Reformation in the 16th century, cruel laws made it for more than two hundred years impossible for any Italian to declare himself a Protestant; only the Waldenses (q.v.), in their 'remote valleys, maintained with difficulty, and amidst great persecutions, their organization. At the close of the 18th century the victorious French republic recognized the human rights of the Waldenses, and proclaimed religious toleration; but the restored monarchies revived some of the most intolerant laws, and even the Waldenses were placed in so unbearable a position that it required the intervention of England and Prussia to secure for them the merest toleration. At length the liberal constitution of 1848 gave them full political rights in Sardinia; they were allowed to step forward out of their seclusion in the valley, and, with the most hearty sympathy of all friends of religious toleration, opened a chapel in the capital of the kingdom, Turin. In the remainder of Italy the persecution of the Protestants continued. The government of Tuscany, though by no means the most tyrannical of the Italian governments, startled the whole civilized world by its cruel measures against the Madiari couple, against count Guicciardini and Dominico Cecchetti, and only the most energetic remonstrances of the foreign powers prevailed upon the grand-duke to change the penalty of imprisonment into exile. Finally, in 1859, the establishment of the kingdom of Italy gave to the Waldenses the liberty of

extending their evangelistic labors to all parts of the peninsula. They soon occupied a number of important places, transferred their theological seminary to Florence, and had an able representative in the Italian Parliament (the Turin banker Malan). Many Italians, however, who were eager to embrace Protestant views, did not share all the views of the Waldenses, especially those on the ministry and the Church, and, after the model of the Plymouth Brethren in England, organized free Christian organizations. Of their leaders, professor Mazarella and count Guicciardini are the best known. Moreover, a number of missionaries were sent out by the Protestant churches of the United States, Great Britain, and other countries, who laid the foundation of several other Church organizations. Nearly every town of importance has thus received the nucleus of a Protestant population. 'In some places the fanaticism of the priests caused riots against Protestants, none of which was so bloody as that in Barletta in 1866; but the government of Italy, and the immense majority of the Italian Parliaments, have secured the complete triumph of the cause of religious toleration.

**II. Statistics.** — Nearly the whole population of Italy is nominally connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The total population of the kingdom was estimated in 1881 at 28,459,457; of whom 96,000 were Protestants. 36,000 Jews, and 100,000 members of the Greek Church. Practically a large portion of the population is no longer in communion with the Church of Rome, as can easily be proved by the fact that the government and Parliament have been for years in open conflict with Rome, and utterly disregard and set aside the laws of the Church: that the claims of the pope have only a few advocates in the Parliament, and that, in particular the radical party, with men like Mazzini and Garibaldi at their head, have openly and formally renounced the religious communion with Rome.

According to the Papal Almanac (*Annuario Pontifico*) for 1889, the country had, exclusive of Rome and of the six suburban sees (the sees of the cardinal bishops), Ostia, Porto, Palestrina, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina, 268 dioceses, which were distributed among the former Italian states as follows:

	Archbishoprics	Bishoprics
Naples	25	89
States of the Church	7	57

Sardinia	6	32
Tuscany	4	19
Venetia	2	9
Lombardy	1	7
Modena	1	4
Parma		3
Total	47	221

Of these dioceses, 11 archbishoprics and 63 bishoprics are immediately subject to the pope, and without connection with an ecclesiastical province, while 37 archbishops are heads of ecclesiastical provinces, containing, besides them, 155 suffragan bishops. The dioceses of Italy, in point of territorial extent, are smaller than in any other country; and while the (nominally) Catholic population is no more than one eighth of the Roman Catholic population of the world, it has more than one fourth of all the dioceses. Thus the Italian bishops have an undue preponderance at every council; and as they generally hold the most ultramontane views, they have considerably contributed to the success of ultra papal theories within the Catholic Church. The government of Italy has expressed a wish to reduce the number of dioceses, and a considerable number has therefore been kept vacant since the establishment of the kingdom.

The secular clergy in 1866 had about 115,000 members, or about 1 to every 245 inhabitants, showing a relatively larger number of priests than in any other country of the world. Besides the secular clergy, Italy had in 1860 more than 60,000 monks in 2050 establishments, and about 30,000 nuns in 302 establishments. The most numerous among the monastic orders are the Franciscan monks, with 1227 houses; the Dominicans, with 140; the Augustinians, with 138; the Carmelites, with 125; the Jesuits, with 57; the Brothers of Charity, with 49; the Redemptorists, with 31; the Franciscan nuns, with 89; the Sisters of Charity, with 50. The convents were formerly very rich, but a large portion of their property was confiscated during the French invasion at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. More recently the government of Italy has suppressed a large portion of all the convents, and confiscated their property. In 1866, the total number of convents suppressed amounted to over 2000, with 38,000 inmates; of these, 1252, with 20,228 inmates,

belonged to the mendicant orders, and 1162, with 18,168 inmates, were of other orders.

Popular instruction, which until recently was chiefly in the hands of monks and nuns, is, according to official accounts, in a very low condition. In 1862, of the entire male population, only 2,620,269 were able to read; of the female, only 1,258,186; 17,000,000 persons were unable to read and write. Of every 1000 persons, there were, unable to read—in Lombardy, 599; in Piedmont, 603; in Tuscany, 773; in Modena, 799; in the Romagna, 802; in Parma, 818; in the Marca, 851; in Umbria, 858; in Naples, 880; in Sicily, 902; in Sardinia, 911. Since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy public instruction has made great progress. From 1860 to 1863 the number of male teachers increased from 12,475 to 17,604; that of female teachers from 6631 to 13,817. The number of educational institutions amounted in 1881 to 42,510, which were attended by 1,928,706 children. In the same year Italy had 104 gymnasia, with 8268 pupils; 79 lycea, with 3773 pupils; and 135 seminaries, with 10,659 pupils. There were 21 universities, 16 of which were state and 5 free. Six have been declared by the government to be first-class universities: Turin, Pavia, Bologna, Florence, Naples, and Palermo; The number of students had in 1881 decreased to 11,728, from 15,668 in 1862.

The Church of the Waldenses is the only fully organized Protestant Church in Italy. It consists of 16 communities, with a membership of 22,000. Its governing body is called the Table. The Theological School in Florence had in 1869 3 professors (Revel, Geymonat, and De Sanctis) and 14 students, 4 of whom were formerly Catholic priests. According to the report made to the Waldensi: n Synod in 1866, evangelistic work was carried on by this Church at 23 principal stations, which were thus distributed: 7 in Piedmont, 3 in Lombardy, 1 in Emilia, 3 in Liguria, 4 in Tuscany, in the district of Naples, 1 in Sicily, 1 in the Isle of Elba, and 2 in France for Italians. To work these stations it employed 19 pastors, 11 evangelists, and 29 teachers in all, 59 agents. The number of attendants upon public worship was reckoned at from 2000 to 2500; that of communicants at 1095. According to the latest official returns the Waldensian Church had in 1886-87 43 churches and 38 mission churches throughout Italy. The ordained pastors numbered 37, evangelists 6, male and female teachers 56, the total number of salaried agents being 124. The Church had 4005 members, and the day-schools were attended by 2206 scholars, the Sunday-schools by 2482. The Methodist Episcopal Church

entered this field in 1872. The work is now organized into an Annual Conference with two districts, with (1889) 17 preachers, 968 members, and property valued at \$105,900. There is a theological school at Florence. The Nice Foreigners' Evangelization Committee employed in 1867 15 agents, who were stationed at Barletta, Como, Milan, Fara, Florence, Piverone, Sardinia, and Sondrio. The salaries of six of the evangelists are paid by the Evangelical Continental Society of London. The total receipts of the committee, including the money received from the Evangelical Continental Society, were £1323; the expenditures £1180. The American and Foreign Christian Union supports more than 40 agents in Italy. A Theological Training School has been established by the society at Milan where in 1866 the Rev. Mr. Clark, assisted by 4 Italian professors, instructed 19 theological students, superintended churches in 8 different places, and sustained from 10 to 20 colporteurs in North Italy. In 1870 the training school was transferred to the care of a Committee of Evangelization- appointed by the Free Christian Church of Italy. This body was formally organized at Milan in June 1870, and consists of a considerable number of evangelical churches, two thirds of which (more than 20) represent the results of the previous expenditure and labor of this society. These churches and their pastors are still sustained by the board. Another missionary of the society superintended at Sarzana evangelistic operations in some 10 different places. The Wesleyan Missionary Society had in 1867 several agents in Italy under the superintendence of the Rev. H. J. Piggott at Padua. A Ragged School, supported by the society in this city, was regularly attended by 40 lads. Florence also had prosperous schools; there were increasing congregations at Cremona, Parma, Mezzano Inferiore (15 miles from Parma), and at Naples; and efforts, with some success, had been made in other places. The missionaries and other agents were sustained at a cost of about. 20,000. The Scotch Free Church had several ministers settled in various parts of Italy, who were engaged, in addition to their regular labors among their countrymen, in superintending the work of Bible distribution. In addition to these Protestant agencies, free evangelical Italian churches were to be found in several parts, as in Genoa, Florence, etc., all of them being more or less allied with the Plymouth Brethren.

School-work is carried on in connection with most of the churches and stations. In Naples there were in 1868 4 schools, with 14 teachers and 373 children, under the direction of a special committee. There were 3

Waldensian schools in Florence and 2 in Leghorn. The Waldensian schools in the valleys numbered 80, with 3750 children in regular attendance. The "Italian Evangelical Publication Society" selects and translates religious books and tracts suitable for Italy, and prints them at the lowest possible rate. It prints the *Eco della Verita* (weekly) and the *Amico di Casa* (annual). It has published 232 new works, or new editions of works, amounting to 520,000 copies, and has sold since 1862 as many as 390,000 copies. See *Herzog, Real-Encyklop.* 8, 99; *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon*, 5, 582 sq, *Wiggers, Kirchl. Statistik*, 2, 3 sq.; *Neher, Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, 1, 4 sq.; *Nippold, Handbuch der z-Ueecten Kirchengesch.* (2nd ed. Elberf. 1868); *Christian Yearbook-* (London, 1867 and 1868); *Ughelli, Italia Sacra* (Rome, 1644, 6 vols.); *M'Crie, Hist. of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy* (Edinb. 1827); *Erdma-Inn Die Reformation u. ihre Martzrer in Italien* (Berl. 1855); *Leopold, Ueber die Ursachen der Reformation und deren Verfall in Italien* (in *Zeitschrift für hist Theol.* 1843); *Matthes, Kirchl. Chronik.* (A. J. S.)

## Itch

(*srj*, *che' res*, from *srj*; to *scratch* and to *burn*), an inflammatory irritation of the skin, threatened to the Israelites as an infliction in case of idolatry (<sup>4507</sup>Deuteronomy 28:27); probably some coetaneous or eruptive disorder common in Egypt, but of what peculiar character is uncertain, if, indeed, any peculiar malady is intended. *SEE DISEASE.*

## Ith,

a German theologian and philosopher of some note, was born at Berne, Switzerland, in 1747. In 1781 he was appointed to the chair of philosophy at the university of his native place, where he had also pursued his studies, but in 1796 he entered the ministry, and settled at Siselen, where he lived until 1799, when he was elected dean and president of the committee of education and religion in the canton of Berne. He died in 1813. Besides a number of philosophical, philological, psuedogogical, and even homiletical works, he wrote *Versuch einer Anthropologie oder Philosophie der Menschen* (Berne, 1794-5, 2 vols.; new edit. 1803 sq.), which is a very valuable work: — *Verhatnisse d. Staats z. Religion u. Kirche* (ibid. 1798, 8vo): — *Sittenlehre der Braninen* (ibid. 1794, 8vo), really a reproduction

of his translation of *Ezour- Vidam*, an old Hindu work on morals and religion. See Krug, *Philos. Worterbuch*, 2, 558. (J.H.W.)

## Ithacius

*SEE IDACIUS.*

## Ith'ai

(<sup><3113></sup>1 Chronicles 11:31). *SEE ITTAI.*

## Ith'amar

(Heb. *Ithamar'*, **רמתיאם** *ram-ti-a-m* palm-isle; but according to Furst, *not high*, i.e. *little*; Sept. **Ἰθάμαρ**; Josephus **Ἰθάμαρος**, *Ant.* 8, 1, 3), the fourth and youngest son of Aaron (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 6:3). B.C. 1658. He was consecrated to the priesthood along with his brothers (<sup><0103></sup>Exodus 6:23; <sup><0402></sup>Numbers 3:2, 3); and after the death of Nadab and Abihu (<sup><0501></sup>Leviticus 10:1 sq.), as they left no children, he and Eleazar alone remained to discharge the priestly functions (<sup><0506></sup>Leviticus 10:6, 12; <sup><0404></sup>Numbers 3:4; 26:60 sq.; <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 24:2). Nothing is individually recorded of him, except that the property of the tabernacle was placed under his charge (<sup><0321></sup>Exodus 38:21), and that he superintended all matters connected with its removal by the Levitical sections of Gershon and Merari (<sup><0428></sup>Numbers 4:28). The sacred utensils and their removal were entrusted to his elder brother Eleazar, whose family was larger than that of Ithamar (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 24:4). Ithamar, with his descendants, occupied the position of common priests till the high-priesthood passed into his family in the person of Eli, under circumstances of which we are ignorant. *SEE ELI.* Abiathar, whom Solomon deposed, was the last high-priest of that line, and the pontificate then reverted to the elder line of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (<sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 2:27). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.* The traditionary tomb of Ithamar is still shown near that of his brother Eleazar in the hill of Phinehas (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 151). A priest by the name of Daniel, of his posterity, returned from Babylon. (<sup><1502></sup>Ezra 8:2; 1 Esdr. 8:29).

## Ith'iel

(Heb. *Ithiel'*, **אֵיתִיאל** for **אֵיתִיאל** *God with me*, or, according to Furst, *the property of God*; Sept. **Αἰθιήλ**, *Vurlg. Etheel*; but in <sup><1801></sup>Proverbs 31:1,

both translate οἱ πιστεύοντες θεῷ, *cum quo est Deus* and *Deo secum morante*), the name of two men.

**1.** A person mentioned along with Ucal in <sup><310></sup>Proverbs 30:1, apparently as one to whom the “words of Agur’s prophecy” had been addressed. B.C. perhaps cir. 990. *SEE AGUR*. Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 88) thinks that Ithiel and Ucal were the children or disciples of Agur, to whom he inscribed his aphorisms; others regard both words as appellatives, and render the whole clause as follows: “Thus spake the man: *I have toiled for God, I have toiled for God, and have ceased*” (see Stuart’s *Comment.* ad loc.).

**2.** The son of Jesaiah and father of Maaseiah, a Benjamite, one of whose posterity returned with a party from Babylon (<sup><310></sup>Nehemiah 11:7). B.C. long ante 536.

### Ith'mah

(Heb. *Yithmah'*, *hmtjæ* *orphanage*; Sep *Ἰθεμά*), a Moabite, and one of David’s supplementary body-guard (<sup><314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:46). B.C. 1046. *SEE DAVID*.

### Ith'nan

(Heb. *Yithnan'*, *ntjæ* *bestowed, otherwise distance*; Sept. *Ἰθνά* [but the Vat. MS. joins it to the preceding word, *Ἀσοριωνά*, and the Alex. to the following, *Ἰθναζίφ*], Vulg. *Jethram*), one of the cities in the south of Judah, mentioned between Hazor and Ziph (<sup><315></sup>Joshua 15:23); perhaps lying along the southern edge of the highland district. It cannot well have been the *Jedna* of the *Onomasticon* (*Ἰδνά*, the modern *Idhna*), for this is in the mountains west of Hebron (see Keil *Comment.* ad loc.). The enumeration in ver. 32 requires us to join this with the following (there being no copula between), *Ithnan-Ziph*, i.e. Zephath (q.v.). *SEE JUDAH*.

### Ith'ra

(Heb. *Yithra'*, *artjæ* *excellence*; Sept. *Ἰθερ* Vulg. *Jetra*), an Israelite (probably an error of transcription [see Thenius, *Comment.* ad loc.]; a *Jezreelite*, according to the Sept. and Vulg.; but [more correctly] an *Ishmaelite*, according to <sup><317></sup>1 Chronicles 2:17), and father of Amasa



(David's general) by Abigail, David's sister (1 Kings 2, 5); elsewhere called JETHER (<1075>2 Samuel 17:25). B.C. ante 1023.

## Ith'ran

(Heb. *Yithran'*, ἰρθῖαν *excellent*), the name of one or two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰδρόν, Ἰεθρόν; Vulg. *Jethram, Jethran.*) One of the sons of Dishon, and grandson of Seir the Horite (<1035>Genesis 36:26; <1044>1 Chronicles 1:41). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ, Vulg. *Jethran.*) Apparently one of the sons of Zophah, the great-grandson of Asher (<1075>1 Chronicles 7:37); probably the same as JETHER in 5. 58. B.C. long post 1856.

## Ith'reim

(Heb. *Yithream'*, μιθῖμα *superabundance of the people*; Sept. Ἰθεραάμ, Ἰεθράμ; Josephus Γεθροάμης [*Ant.* 7:i, 4]), David's sixth son, born of Eglah in Hebron (<1085>2 Samuel 3:5; <1385>1 Chronicles 3:3). B.C. 1045. In the ancient Jewish traditions (Jerome, *Qucest. Heb.* in <1085>2 Samuel 3:5; 5:23) Eglah is said to have been Michal, and to have died in 'giving birth to Ithream: but this is at variance with the Bible.

## Ith'rite

or, rather, JETHERITE (Heb. *Yithri'*, ἰρθῖαι Sept. Ἰεθρίος and Ἰθερί, but Αἰθαλείμ in <1025>1 Chronicles 2:53; Vulg. *Jethrites* and *Jethrceus* or *Jethreus*), the posterity of some JETHER mentioned as resident in Kirjath-jearim (A.V. "the Ithrites" [<1025>1 Chronicles 2:53]); probably the descendants of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (who settled in this region, <0016>Judges 1:16), and so called as being thus the posterity of JETHRO, the father-in-law of Moses. **SEE KENITE**. Two of David's famous warriors, Ira and Gareb, belonged to this clan (<1025>2 Samuel 23:38; <5140>1 Chronicles 11:40). **SEE DAVID**. Ira has been supposed to be identical with; Ira the Jairite," David's priest (<1085>2 Samuel 20:26). According to another supposition, Jether may be only another form for ITHRA (<1075>2 Samuel 17:25), the brother-in-law of David, and it is possible that the "Ithrites," as a family, sprang from him. According to still another supposition, the two Ithrite heroes of David's guard may have come from JATTIR, in the mountains of Judah, one of the places which were the

“haunt” of David and his men in their freebooting wanderings, and where he had “friends” (~~1~~ 1 Samuel 30:27; comp. 31).

## Itinerancy

a word which Methodism has adopted in its ecclesiastical terminology as expressing one of the most characteristic features of that religious denomination. Wesley’s plans for the revival of Christian life throughout the United Kingdom rendered it necessary that he should travel from town to town. He did so quite systematically through his long life. Very early, a few talented laymen were commissioned by him to preach in the societies which he had organized during his own absence, for he usually staid but a day or two in any one place. These lay preachers, or “helpers,” as he called them, soon multiplied to scores, at last to hundreds; but the societies demanding their labors in the intervals of the great preacher’s visits multiplied still faster. As early as his third Conference (May, 1746), he saw the necessity of extending and methodizing the labors of his “helpers” on some plan of “itinerancy.” He appointed them, therefore, to definitive “circuits” this year. The word “circuit” has ever since been an important technical term in Methodism. The “Minutes,” or journal of this Conference, show that the whole country was mapped into seven of these “itinerant” districts. Wales and Cornwall each constituted one: Newcastle and its neighboring towns another. That of Yorkshire comprised seven counties. London, Bristol, and Evesham were the headquarters of others. By 1749 there were twenty of these “rounds” in England, two in Wales, two in Scotland, and seven in Ireland; and at Wesley’s death there were seventy-two in England, three in Wales, seven in Scotland, and twenty-eight in Ireland. The circuits were long, comprising at least thirty “appointments” for each month, or about one a day. The preachers were changed at first from one circuit to another, usually every year, and invariably every two years; sometimes from England to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and back again.

The “circuit system” has been retained in England down to our day; even the churches of the large cities are combined under a “circuit” pastorate. In “America,” the societies in cities, and also the large societies in the country, are generally “stations,” each being supplied by its own pastor. The “circuit system,” however, is maintained among the feebler churches, and quite generally in the Far West, and nearly everywhere along the frontier settlements of the country.

Two other characteristic features of Wesley's system rendered the "itinerancy" not only possibly, but notably effective. The "local" ministry, consisting of gifted laymen in secular business-supplied the pulpits in the absence of the "regular" or itinerant preachers as the latter could appear in any given place on their long circuits but once a fortnight, in most cases but once a month, and in others but once in six weeks. Thus public ministrations were kept up every Sunday. The class meeting, comprising twelve "members," under an experienced "leader," met weekly, and thus a sort of pastoral supervision of the whole membership was maintained in the absence of the authorized pastor or itinerant. *SEE LAY MINISTRY.*

In these facts, so co-ordinate and co-operative, we have the chief explanation of the remarkable success of Wesley's ministerial system. Some of the circuits, in our own country especially, were five or six hundred miles in extent, including scores or hundreds of societies or "appointments," each of which was regularly visited, at intervals of four or six weeks, by the "circuit preacher," and meanwhile the "local preachers" and "class-leaders" kept each fully supplied with Sabbath, and, indeed, almost daily religious services. In nothing, perhaps, does the legislative genius of Wesley, so highly estimated by Southey, Macaulay, and Buckle, more strikingly appear than in this combination of pastoral provisions.

If its adaptation to England was eminent, it was preeminent in America, where the customary local pastorate of other denominations seemed to afford no adequate provision for the prodigiously advancing population and settlement of the country. "Methodism, with its 'lay ministry' and its 'itinerancy,' could alone afford the ministrations of religion to this overflowing population; it was to lay the moral foundations of many of the great states of the West. The older churches of the colonies could never have supplied them with 'regular' or educated pastors in any proportion to their rapid settlement. Methodism met this necessity in a manner that should command the national gratitude. It was to become at last the dominant popular faith of the country, with its standard planted in every city, town, and almost every village of the land. Moving in the van of emigration. it was to supply with the means of religion the frontiers, from the Canada's to the Gulf of Mexico, from Puget's Sound to the Gulf of California. It was to do this indispensable work by means peculiar to itself; by districting the land into circuits which, from one hundred to five hundred miles in extent, could each be stately supplied with religious instruction by one or two traveling evangelist, who, preaching daily, could

thus have charge of parishes comprising hundreds of miles and tens of thousands of souls. It was to raise up, without delay for preparatory training, and thrust out upon these circuits, thousands of such itinerants, tens of thousands of 'local' or lay preachers and 'exhorters,' as auxiliary and unpaid laborers, with many thousands of class-leaders, who could maintain pastoral supervision over the infant societies in the absence of the itinerant preachers, the latter not having time to delay in any locality for much more than the public services of the pulpit. Over all these circuits it was to maintain the watchful jurisdiction of traveling presiding elders, and over the whole system the superintendence of traveling bishops, to whom the entire nation was to be a common diocese" (*Stevens, Story of Methodisms*). "Without any disparagement of other churches, we may easily see that they were not in a state to meet the pressing wants of the country. The Episcopal Church was much shattered and enfeebled, was destitute of the episcopal order, had to wait long, and urge her plea ardently upon the attention of the bishops of England before they could procure consecration for any of her ministers (and, as is well known, the non-existence of a bishop involves amongst the Episcopalians the non-existence of the Church), so that this community was not in a position to undertake to any great extent an aggressive service. The principles of the Independents, which subordinate the call of a minister to the voice of the Church. placed a bar in the way of their seeking the outlying population, inasmuch as there were no Churches to address this call; and, though the Presbyterian system is not necessarily so stringent in these matters as Independent churches acting on their theories, yet, as they cannot move without the action of their synodical bodies, there was little prospect of their doing much missionary work. Thus this work fell very much into the hands of the Methodist itinerancy. The men were admirably fitted for their task. Rich in religious enjoyment, full of faith and love, zealous and energetic, trained to labor and exertion, actuated by one single motive — that of glorifying God, they thought not of privation, but unhesitatingly followed the emigrants and 'squatters' in their peregrinations wherever they went. American society was thus imbued with Christian truth and principle, as well as accustomed to religious ordinances, in its normal state" (*London Quarterly Ret Review*, October, 1854, p. 125).

Wesley started with no "theory" of ministerial itinerancy. The expediency of the plan alone led to its adoption; but he died believing in it as a theory, as, indeed, the apostolic plan of evangelization. In his estimation, it not

only had a salutary effect on the evangelists, by keeping them energetic and chivalrous, but it had the capital advantage of enabling one preacher to minister the truth to many places, and it made small abilities available on a large scale. He says that he believes he should himself preach even his congregation “asleep” were he to stay in one place an entire year. Nor could he “believe that it was ever the Lord’s will that any congregation should have one teacher only.” “We have found,” he writes, “by long and constant experience, that a frequent exchange of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation.” (A. S.)

There can be no question that an itinerant ministry has the sanction of the highest scriptural examples. Christ was an itinerant. His ministry in the flesh was not a settled pastorate; he went about doing good. The twelve disciples were itinerants, both before and after the crucifixion and resurrection. They went from city to city preaching the Gospel of the kingdom. And the prophets before them were itinerants. Samuel had his circle of appointments; Elijah, and, after him, Elisha, had no settled abode even, but moved about from place to place. These were all itinerants. If in the early Christian Church, even while the apostles were yet at work, there are evidences that a stationary ministry was occasionally introduced, it does not appear to have entered into the original plan of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. “Is there one word,” says Beauchamp (*Letters on the Call and Qualifications of Ministers of the Gospel* [Charleston, S. C., 1849, 18mo], page 97), perhaps too strongly, “in the New Testament from which anything can be inferred in favor of a settled ministry? The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit.” Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a settled ministry, and numerous the efforts to bring it about, most of the Christian preachers were “itinerants.” In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D’Aubigni, *Histoire de la Reformation*, 5, 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant ministers to spread his objections to the doctrine of transubstantiation; Wycliffe, in England, introduced the system of itinerant preaching, and the Swiss historian goes so far even as to assert that the reformatory movements among the Christians of England have all been marled by an

effort to introduce the system of itinerant preaching. “This kind of preaching always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church” (*ibid.* p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing “itinerancy” as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination.

The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is hedged about by one of the restrictive rules in the Meth. Epis. Church (see their *Discipline*, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the traveling preachers may remain on the same “charge” (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. “Presiding elders” can remain only four years on the same “district.”

As to the *advantages* and *disadvantages* of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuation of “itinerancy” than Dr. Crane (*Method. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1866, p. 73 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. “The people are restricted in the choice of their pastors.” If this be true, no other system so soon remedies the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time with the pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.
2. “At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place.” In return, it affords each church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.
3. “Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own good demands.” This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the only one that it is hard to deny. It is with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.
4. “The change sometimes comes inopportunately.” If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister a

pastorate, so long as he is able to work effectively in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is “unemployed ministers.” Thus a writer in the *Intelligencer*, speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: “No man who can work, and wants to work, need be idle, with fields appointed and the Church’s benedictions upon those who strive to till them, and no man is laid upon the shelf till age, infirmity, or misconduct places him there; while, when age and infirmity come, that Church still supports and cherishes those who have worn life out in her and the Master’s work. That a Church thus served with the whole life-long energies other ministry should thrive and grow under the divine blessing, need surprise no one who properly weighs the bearings of cause and effect. The ruling out by our churches of half the aggregate effective force of the ministry, which a growing fastidiousness in the matter of choosing and settling preachers causes to be practically lost to the Church, has a gloomy look for her future prosperity. The prospect of such a life-voyage is not apt to be specially attractive to youth pondering whether or not to embark; for, once embarked, unless it be a Methodist vessel that bears them, they may find themselves stranded high and dry, and that from no fault of theirs, ere the voyage is half run.”

5. “The brief pastorates are liable to create an unwise love of novelty and excitement.” This, if somewhat true, is not a very formidable objection; while, on the other hand, the evil of indifference and dissatisfaction, so liable to be produced by a long pastoral term, is far greater. The brief pastorates afford the minister time and mental force for the preparation of a comparatively small number of sermons, and are therefore favorable to thorough preparation for the pulpit. Says Dr. Isaac Taylor (*Wesley and Methodism*, Lond. 1851), “Any one who, endowed with some natural faculty and fluency of utterance, has made the experiment, will have found it far from difficult to acquire the power of continuous and pertinent speaking upon familiar topics, especially upon religious topics, and so to hold out for thirty or forty minutes or more; and if this habit of speaking be well husbanded, and kept always within the safe enclosures of conventional phrases, and of authenticated modes of thinking, this preacher may be always ready to ascend the pulpit, in season and out of season. His sermon, or his set of discourses, is, in fact, the glib run of the mental associations upon worn tracks, this way or that, as the mind may chance to take its start from a given text. This sort of mindless facility of speaking proves a sore

temptation to many a located minister, and its consequence is to leave many a congregation sitting from year to year deep in a quagmire. Better than this, undoubtedly, would be itinerancy—far better is a frequent shifting of monotones than a fixedness of the same.”

But also to the “itinerant” himself the system affords many advantages, though, it is true, it also subjects him to some disadvantages. The pros and cons of this part of the question are these:

1. “It restricts him in the choice of his field of labor.” But if this be a disadvantage, it is fully atoned for by the fact that, however restricted, the field is certain. — ’
2. “It tends in some cases to lessen the amount paid for the support of the pastor.” If this be true, it can be so only measurably, for of late, at least, the Methodist pastor is remunerated as well as his brethren in the sister churches, while the itinerancy affords him a greater degree of independence, enabling him to “speak boldly, as he ought to speak.”
3. “It deprives the minister and his family of a permanent place of residence.” This the more prolonged stay has measurably remedied, but it is a question whether a still longer term would not deprive the itinerant of one of the greatest blessings, health. It is held by competent judges, and the point is also made by Dr. Crane, that the itinerancy is conducive to health and long life, as the vital forces of a pastor settled over a congregation for many years in succession are necessarily subjected to a fearful strain, and thus what appears at first a family deprivation turns out really to be a great blessing to the entire household. See, besides the articles and books already referred to, Hodgson, *Eccles. Polity of Methodism defended*, especially p. 95-118; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*.

### It'tali-ka'zin

(Heb. *Eth-katsin'*, ἡχᾶτ [etime [according to Furst, *people*] of the judge, only with h local, ἡχᾶτ T[ as Sept. ἐπί πόλιν κασίμ v.r. κατασέμ; Vulg. *Thacasin*), a city near the eastern boundary of Zebulun (but within Issachar), between Gath-hepher and Remmon-methoar (<sup>(4693)</sup>Joshua 19:13), therefore a very short distance (east) from Sepphoris (Seffurieh). It is, perhaps, identical with the *Kefr Kenna* usually regarded as the site of Cana (q.v.) of the N.T.



## It'tai

(Heb. *Ittay'*, *yTiaap* perh. *szea.* or *timely*, otherwise *possessor*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. *Ἐσθαί.*) Son of Ribai, a Benjamite of Gibeah, one of David's thirty heroes (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 23:29), called in the parallel passage (<sup><1313></sup>1 Chronicles 11:31) ITHAI (Heb. *Ithaly*, *ytyaa* fuller form; Sept. *Ἡθού*). B.C. 1046.
2. (Sept. *Ἐθί* [and so Josephus] v.r. *Ἐθθεῖ*). "ITTAI THE GITTITE," i.e. the native of Gath, a Philistine in the army of king David. He appears only during the rebellion of Absalom, B.C. cir. 1023. 'We first discern him on the morning of David's flight, while the *ḥ* king was standing under the olive-tree, below the city, watching the army and the people defile past him. *SEE DAVID*. Last in the procession came the 600 heroes who had formed David's band during his wanderings in Judah, and who had been with him at Gath (<sup><10518></sup>2 Samuel 15:18; comp. <sup><10233></sup>1 Samuel 23:13; 27:2; 30:9,10; and Josephus, *Ant.* 7:9. 2). Among these, apparently commanding them, was Ittai the Gittite (5. 19). He caught the eye of the king, who at once addressed him and besought him as "a stranger and an exile," and, as one who had but very recently joined his service, not to attach himself to a doubtful cause, but to return "*with his brethren*" and abide with the king (5. 19,20). But Ittai is firm; he is the king's slave (*db*⌋, A.V. "servant"), and wherever his master goes he will go. Accordingly, he is allowed by David to proceed, and he passes over the Kedron with the king (xv, 22, Sept.), with all his men, and "all the little ones that were with him." These "little ones" (*āFhāI K*; "all the children") must have been the families of the band-their "households" (<sup><10273></sup>1 Samuel 27:3). They accompanied them during their wanderings in Judah, often at great risk (<sup><10316></sup>1 Samuel 30:6), and they were not likely to leave them behind in this fresh commencement of their wandering life.

When the army was numbered and organized by David at Mahanaim, Ittai again appears, now in command of a third part of the force, and (for the time at least) enjoying equal rank with Joab and Abishai (<sup><10382></sup>2 Samuel 18:2, 5, 12). But here, on the eve of the great battle, we take leave of this valiant and faithful stranger; his conduct in the fight and his subsequent fate are alike unknown to us. Nor is he mentioned in the lists of David's captains and of the heroes of his body-guard (see 2 Samuel 23; 1

Chronicles 11), lists which are possibly of a date previous to Ittai's arrival in Jerusalem.

An interesting tradition is related by Jerome (*Quaest. Hebr.* on <sup><310></sup>1 Chronicles 20:2). "David took the crown off the head of the image of Milcom (A.V. 'their king'). But, by the law, it was forbidden to any Israelite to touch either gold or silver of an idol. Wherefore they say that Ittai the Gittite, who had come to David from the Philistines, was the man who snatched the crown from the head of Milcom; for it was lawful for a Hebrew to take it from the hand of a man, though not from the head of the idol." The main difficulty to the reception of this legend lies in the fact that if Ittai was engaged in the Ammonitish war, which happened several years before Absalom's revolt, the expression of David (<sup><1050></sup>2 Samuel 15:20), "thou camest but yesterday," loses its force. However, these words may be merely a strong metaphor.

From the expression "*thy* brethren" (15:20) we may infer that there were other Philistines besides Ittai in the six hundred; but this is uncertain. Ittai was not exclusively a Philistine name, nor does "Gittite" — as in the case of Obed-edom, who was a Levite — necessarily imply Philistine parentage. Still David's words, "stranger and exile," seem to show that he was not an Israelite. — Smith. Others, however, have hazarded the supposition that this Ittai is the same as the preceding, having been called a Gittite as a native of *Gittaim*, in Benjamin (<sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 4:3). and a "stranger and an exile" as a Gibeonite, who, having fled from Beeroth, a Gibeonitish town (<sup><0007></sup>Joshua 9:17), had, with his brethren, taken up his residence in Gittaim. All this. is very improbable. *SEE GITTITE.*

### Ittig, Thomas

a German Lutheran divine, was born at Leipzig Oct. 31, 1643. He studied at the universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Strasburg. After filling the pastorate, he became, in 1698, professor of philosophy in the university of his native city. In 1691 he was transferred to the chair of theology. He died April 7, 1710. Ittig was a very able man, but he lacked all tolerance towards those who chose to differ from him, and in some of his writings he is quite severe against other religious bodies than Lutherans. He is especially celebrated as a collector of the writings of the apostolical fathers (see below). His principal works are, *Animadversiones in censuram facultatis theologicae Parisiensis*, etc. (Leipzig, 1685, 4to): — *De Heresiarchis cevi apostolici et apostolico proximi* (Leipz. 1690 and 1703, 4to): —

*Prolegomena ad Flavii Josephi opera Graeco-Latina* (Cologne, 1691, fol.) — *Bibliotheca Patrum apostolicorum Graeco-Latina*, etc. Leipzig. 1699, 8vo) (above alluded to): — *Operum Clementis Alexandrini Supplementum*, etc. (Leipzig, 1700. 8vo): — *Exercitationum Theologicarumz varii aogumenti*, etc. *Accedunt duce orationes inaugurales*, etc. (Leipzig, 1702): — *Exercitatio theologica de novisnsfnaticorugm quo Irundam nostrae cetatis puratoriis* (Lpz. 1703, 4to): — *De Syiodi Carentonensis a reformatis in Gallia ecclesiis anno 1631 ccelebratae indulgentia erga Luther-anos*, etc., *Dissertatio theologica. Accedunt quatuor Proammata* (Lpz. 1705, 4to): — *Historia Synodorum nationalium a reformatis in Gallia habiftarune*, etc. (Lpz. 1705): — *De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum*, etc. (Lpz. 1707, 8vo): — *Historia ecclesiastice primi a. Christo nato sceculi selecta Capita de scriptoribus et scriptis ecclesiasticis*, etc. (Lpz. 1709, 4to): — *Schediasma de autoribus qui de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis egerunt* (Lpz. 1711, 8vo): — *Historia Concilii Nicceni* (Leipz. 1712, 4to): — *Opuscula varnia*, edita cura Christiani Ludovici (Leipz. 1714, 8vo). See Kern, *Je Vita, Obitu; Scriptisque Th. Ittigii epistolica Dissertatio* (Lpz. 1710); *Acta eruditorum Lipsensiea*, p. 221; Niceron, *memoirs*, 29, 241-252; Sax, *Onomast. Literar.* v, 392; Appendix, 6, 585; Ersch. u. Gruber, *Allg. Encyk.*; J. Fabricius, *Hist. Bibliotheca*, 5, 140, 141, 302, 303, 310; 6:456; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 26:106; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengeschichte*, 2, 515.

## Ituree'a

(**Ἰτουραία**), a small district in the N.E. of Palestine, forming the tetrarchy of Philip, in connection with the adjacent territory of Trachonitis (~~QRI~~ Luke 3:1). The name is supposed to have originated with **rWfyj** *Itur*, or JETUR, one of Ishmael's sons (~~1303~~ 1 Chronicles 1:31). In ~~1359~~ 1 Chronicles 5:19, this name is given as that of a tribe or nation with which Reuben (beyond the Jordan) warred; and, from its being joined with the names of other of Ishmael's sons, it is evident that a tribe descended from his son Jetur is intimated. In the latter text the Sept. takes this view, and for "with the Hagarites, with Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab," reads "with the Hagarites, and Iturseans, and Nephisaeans, and Nadabseans." The old name seems to be still preserved in that of *Jedur*, which the same region, or a part of it, now bears. (This, however, has lately been disputed by Wetzstein [*Reisebericht*, p. 88 sq.] on the precarious ground of the present dependent

situation of the district.) We may thus take the district to have been occupied by Ishmael's son, whose descendants were dispossessed or subdued by the Amorites, under whom it is supposed to have formed part of the kingdom of Bashan, and subsequently to have belonged to that half tribe of Manasseh which had its possessions east of the Jordan. From ~~1~~1 Chronicles 5:19, it appears that the sons of Jetur, whether under tribute to the Amorites (as some suppose), and forming part of the kingdom of Bashan or not, were in actual occupation of the country, and were dispossessed by the tribes beyond the Jordan, who now conquered and colonized the little province of Jetur, which lay between Bashan and Mount Hermon ("in Libano monte" according to Muratori, *Thes. Inscript.* 2, 670).

, During the Exile this and other border countries were taken possession of by various tribes, whom, although they are called after the original names, as occupants of the countries which had received those names, we are not bound to regard as purely descendants of the original possessors. These new Ituraeans were eventually subdued by king Aristobulus (B.C. 108), who reconquered the province, then called by its Greek name Itursea, and gave the inhabitants their choice of Judaism or banishment (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 11, 3). While some submitted, many retired to their own rocky fastnesses, and to the defiles of Hermon adjoining. Nevertheless, the Itureans were still recognizable as a distinct people in the time of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 23). They extended their incursions as far as Phoenicia, but submitted to the Romans under Pompey (Appian, *Mithril.* 106), and appear to have been allowed to retain their native princes as vassals. Ituroea was first formally annexed to the province of Syria by Claudius (Tacitus, *An.* 12, 23, 1; Dio Cassius, 59, 12), having been previously included in Pernea as part of the dominions of Herod. (See F. Minter, *De rebus Iturceorum* [Hav. 1824]). As already intimated, Herod the Great, in dividing his dominions among his sons, bequeathed Ituraea to Philip as part of a tetrarchy composed, according to Luke, of Trachonitis and Ituraea; and as Josephus (*Ant.* 15, 10, 1; comp. 17:8, 1) mentions his territory as composed of Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanaea, some have thought (Reland, p. 106; Lightfoot, *Ior. Heb.*) that the evangelist regarded Auranitis and Paneas as comprehended under Iturea, a name loosely applied by ancient writers (see Pliny, 5, 19; Epiphanius, *laeres.* 19; comp. Paulus, *Comment.* 1, 311; Wetstein, 1, 671). But it properly denoted a well-defined region distinct from Auranitis. Pliny rightly places it north of Bashan and near Damascus (5. 23), and J. de Vitry describes it as adjoining Tracholitis and lying along the base of Libanus, between Tiberias and

Damascus (*Gesta Dei*, p. 1074; comp. p. 771, 1003). The districts mentioned by Luke and Josephus were distinct, but neither of these historians give a full list of all the little provinces in the tetrarchy of Philip. Each probably gave the names of such as were of most importance in connection with the events he was about to relate. Both Batanea and Auranitis appear to have been included in the region of Trachonitis” (**Τραχωνίτιδος χώρα**); and as Josephus mentions a part of the “house of Zenodorus” which was given to Philip, it unquestionably embraced Ituraea (*Ant. 15:10, 3*). According to Strabo (16, 755 sq.), the country known to classical writers was hilly (comp. Jac. de Vitriaco, p. 1074), with many ravines and hollows; the inhabitants were regarded as the worst of barbarians (Cicero, *Philip. 2, 14*), who, being deprived of the resources of agriculture (Apul. *Florid. 1, 6*), lived by robbery (Strabo, 16. 756), being skilful archers (Virgil, *Georg. 2, 448*; Lucan. 7:230, 514). The present Jedu probably comprehends the whole or greater part of the proper Ituraea. This is described by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 286) as “lying south of Jebelkessoue, east of Jebel esSheik (Mount Hermon), and west of the Haj road.” It is bounded on the east by Trachonitis, on’ the south by Gaulanitis, on the west by Hermon, and on the north by the plain of Damascus. It is table-land, with an undulating surface, and has little conical and cup-shaped hills at intervals. The southern section of it has a rich soil, well watered by numerous springs, and streams from Hermon. The greater part of the northern section is entirely different. The surface of the ground is covered with jagged rocks, in some places heaped up in huge piles, in others sunk into deep pits; at one place smooth and naked, at another seamed with yawning chasms, in whose rugged edges rank grass and weeds spring up. The rock is all basalt, and the formation similar to that of the Lejah. See ARGOB. The molten lava seems to have issued from the earth through innumerable pores, to have spread over the plain, and then to have been rent and shattered while cooling (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 465). Jedur contains thirty-eight towns and villages, ten of which are now entirely desolate, and all the rest contain only a few families of poor peasants, living in wretched hovels amid heaps of ruins (Porter, *Damasscus*, 2, 272 sq.). See Robinson, *Bib. Res.* Appendix, p. 149; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p.311.

### Itzchaki

also called *Ben-Jasus*, and by the long Arabic name of *Abu brahim Isaac Ibn-Kastar* (or *Saktar*) *bene-Jasus*, a Jewish philosopher of great celebrity,

and commentator, was born A.D. 982 at Toledo. Like many other Jewish savans, he followed the medical profession, and so distinguished himself that he was appointed physician to the princes of Denia and Mug'ahid, and to Ali Ikbal Addaula. He died in 1057. Itzchaki wrote (1) a Hebrew grammar, called **μυπωρχη ρψ**, *The Book of Syntax*; and (2) on Biblical criticism, called **υγϳ xy ρψ**, *The Work of Itzchaki*. Neither of these works is now known to us, but from Aben-Ezra, who quotes them, we learn that Itzchaki was one of the earliest assailants of the Mosaic authorship of some portions of the Pentateuch. Thus he is said to have maintained that the portion in the Pentateuch which describes the kings of Idumaea (<sup><01670></sup>Genesis 36:30, etc.) was written many centuries after Moses (comp. Aben-Ezra, *Commentaries on* <sup><01670></sup>Genesis 36:30, 31; <sup><02417></sup>Numbers 24:17; *flos. 1, 1*). See Gratz, *Geschichte der nuden*, 6:53; *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morenl. Gesellsch.* 1854, p. 551; 1855, p. 838.

## Itzchaki, Solomon

SEE RASHI.

## I'vah

(Heb. *Ivvaḥ*', **hw[** for **hy[** *i avvah*', an overturning or ruin, as in <sup><0213></sup>Ezekiel 21:32; Sept. **Ἄουά**, but in <sup><23713></sup>Isaiah 37:13, unites with the preced word into **Ἄναεργουγανά**), a city of the Assyrians Whence they brought colonists to re-people Samaria (<sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:34; 19:13; <sup><23713></sup>Isaiah 37:13, where it is mentioned in connection with Hena and Sepharvaim; also in the cognate form "Ava," <sup><12174></sup>2 Kings 17:24, where it stands in connection with Babylon and Cuthah). Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that the site must be sought in Babylonia, and that it is probably identical with the modern *Hit*, which is the Hit of Herodotus (1, 179), a place famous for bituminous springs (see Rich, *First Memoir on Babylon*, p. 64, and Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*, 1, 55). This town lay on the Euphrates, between Sippara (Sepharvaim) and Anah (Hena), with which it seems to have been politically united shortly before the time of Sennacherib (<sup><12913></sup>2 Kings 19:13). He also regards it as probably the Ahava (**awhḥ**) of Ezra (8:15). He believes the name to have been originally derived from that of a Babylonian god, **Iva**, who represents the sky or Ether, and to whom the town is supposed to have been dedicated (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 606, note). In the Talmud the name appears as *Ihiv* (**ayhy**), whence might

possibly be formed the Greek *Iχ*, and the modern *Hit* (where the *t* is merely the feminine ending), if we might suppose any connection between the Greek and the Talmud. Isidore of Charax seems to intend the same place by his *Ἀεί-πολις* (*Mans. Parth.* p. 5). Some have thought that it occurs as *Ist* in the Egyptian inscriptions of the time of Thothmes III, about B.C. 1450 (Birch, in *Otia Eggyptiaca*, p. 80). But these conjectures are destitute of any great probability, as the form of the Heb. name does not well correspond. See AVA.

### Ives, Levi Sillman, D.D., LL.D.

a theologian of some note, more especially on account of his defection from the Protestant Episcopal Church to Romanism, was born in Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797. His parents removed to New York State while he was quite young, and he was prepared for college at Lewisville Academy. At the outbreak of the war in 1812, he served his country for one year, and in 1816 finally entered upon his collegiate course at Hamilton College, pursuing, at the same time, studies preparatory for the work of the ministry. He had been reared in the Presbyterian Church, but in 1819, when impaired health obliged him to quit the college, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and continued his theological education at N. Y. City under bishop Hobart, at whose hands he received deacon's orders in 1822, and whose son-in-law he became in 1825. His first parish was Batavia, N. Y.; but he remained there only a few months, as he received a call in 1823 from Trinity Church, Philadelphia, which he at once accepted, bishop White ordaining him to the priesthood. In 1827 he was called to Christ Church, Lancaster, Pa., and the year following became assistant rector of Christ Church, N.Y. City. This connection he severed six months later, to assume the rectorship of St. Luke's Church, N. Y. In 1831 he was honored with the bishopric of North Carolina, where he became very popular, and for a time wielded great influence; but in 1848 he began to advocate doctrines inadmissible by any Protestant believer of the Christian doctrines, and distrust and alienation on the part of his diocese led him to renounce publicly his mistaken course. But so inclined had he become to the Roman Catholic view of the apostolical succession, and the need of an "infallible" interpreter of the Scriptures, that he soon avowed his former opinions, and in 1852, while in Europe, publicly submitted to the authority of Rome. Of course, this caused his deposition from the bishopric of N. Carolina. In defense of his course, he published *The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism* (Boston, 1854, 8vo), in which he sets forth the Roman



Catholic view of the divine right of episcopacy. Finding that the Protestant Epis. Church does not possess a regular apostolical succession (p. 146-157), he felt obliged to accept the Church of Rome as the true Church. This course was very naturally pursued by bishop Ives, who, while yet in the Episcopal Church, had always inclined to High-Churchism. "Sitting upon the pinnacle of High-Churchism, the head easily turns, or becomes so dizzy as to fall down into the abyss of Popery." Ives fell, like Doane, and Wheaton, and Iarkoe, by carrying out the High-Church principles to their legitimate results. After his change he was employed as professor of rhetoric in St. Joseph's Theological Seminary, and as lecturer on rhetoric and English literature in the convents of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Charity. Ex-bishop Ives evidently was a man of good parts and noble intentions, for during the last years of his life we find him incessantly at work in the establishment of an institution at Manhattanville for the protection of destitute children: here nearly 2000 children are now provided for. He died Oct. 13, 1867. Ives published also a volume of sermons *On the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship*, and another *On Obedience of Faith* (1849, 18mo). See *New Englander*, Aug. 1855, art. 4; *Princeton Review*, 17, 491 (on his sermons); Appleton, *American Cyclop.* annual of 1867, 411 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 945. (J. H.W.)

### Ivimey, Joseph

the historian of the English Baptists, was born in 1773, pursued his studies at the Bristol Academy, and for twenty-nine years was pastor of a Baptist church in London. His principal publications are,

- (1) an edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress, with Notes*: —
- (2) *The Life of John-Bunyan*: —
- (3) *Treatise on Baptism and Communion*: —
- (4) *The Life, Times, and Opinions of John Milton*: —
- (5) *History of the English Baptists* (4 vols. 8vo).

The last, his most important work, is highly commended by Robert Hall for the value of its historical substance and for the quality of the author's style. His *Life of Bunyan* continued to be the chief authority on the subject, until the growing public appreciation of the "ingenious dreamer" enlisted in the illustration of his life the classic pen of Southey and the minute diligence of Mr. Offor. Mr. Ivimey's death occurred in 1834. See G. Pritchard, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Joseph Ivimey* (London, 1835, 8vo).



## Ivo, bishop of Chartres

(*Carnotensis*). Little is known of the life of this prelate beyond what we can learn from his works. The exact date of his birth is not ascertained (it is supposed to have been about 1040), neither is his descent: some say that he was of low extraction (“ex genere minime nobili,” *Gallia Christiana*, 8, 1126), while others give him a noble parentage (“in agro Bellovacensi natus nobili a sanguine nobilem animtmu traxit,” *Vita D. Ivonis*, Paris ed. 1647). He studied philosophy and rhetoric at Paris, then theology under Lanfranc in the convent of Bec; and in 1078 became superior of the convent of St. Quentin, in which office he acquired great reputation as a theologian and canonist. In 1090, upon the deposition of the bishop of Chartres for simony, Ivo was appointed in his place, yet his predecessor had still such strong local interest that Ivo had to be nominated directly by the pope (Urban II), and was only installed in 1092, at Capua.. He is one of the prelates who contributed most to the extension of papal authority, yet he did not hesitate to speak plainly against the abuse of the system of curacy; in the Paris edition of his life he is even praised as one of the defenders of the Gallican liberties. In the difficulty about the question of *investiture* (q.v.), raised by Hildebrand and his followers, the course of Ivo. was marked by great moderation, arising, not from weakness, but from a desire of conciliating and meting justice to all parties. He also endeavored to check the persecuting spirit of the hierarchy when it began to accuse pope Paschal II of heresy for having yielded to emperor Henry V. His private character, as well as his learning, gave him great influence. When Philip I repudiated his legitimate wife to marry another, he alone had the courage to oppose him, and neither promises nor threats could induce him to sanction the misdeed; and by his noble and straightforward course he excited the admiration of the people and nobility, who ail took his part. He died in 1115 (according to Richter and Mejer, in 1125), and was canonized in 1570 for May 20. As a writer, he is known as the author of a *Pannormia* and a *decretum* **SEE CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF**; also of 287 Letters (Paris, 1584-85,1610), which shed much light on the history of his time, and show in how high an estimation his opinions were held; 24 ecclesiastical discourses on synods, festivals, etc.; and, finally, a short chronicle of the French kings. The most complete collection of his works has been published at Paris in 1647, fol., but it does not contain the *Pannormia*. In Migne’s edition of the fathers Ivo’s works were reprinted in 1855 (Paris). See *Hist. Litt. de France*, 10, 102; 5, 150; Herzog, *Real-*

*Encyklopadie*, 7., 189 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 2, 180 sq. Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac.* 21, 423 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 17, 13 sq.; 26., 12 sq.

## Ivory

(**μυΒἡβίμ**, *shenhabbim*, *elephant's tooth*; see A. Benary, in the *Besrliner Lit. Jahrb Ucher*, 1831, No. 96; <sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:22; <sup><1402></sup>2 Chronicles 9:21; and so explained by the Targum, **ל ירפֿאֿ** <sup>^</sup>**ve** and Sept. **ὀδόντες ἑλεφάντινους**) also simply <sup>^</sup>**ve** *a tooth*, <sup><1958></sup>Psalm 45:8; <sup><3275></sup>Ezekiel 27:15; <sup><1004></sup>Amos 6:4; N.T. **ἑλεφάντινος**, *of ivory*, <sup><6812></sup>Revelation 18:12). It is remarkable that no word in Biblical Hebrew denotes an elephant, unless the latter portion of the compound *shem-habbim* be supposed to have this meaning. Gesenius derives it from the Sanscrit *ibhas*, “an elephant;” Keil (on <sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:22) from the Coptic *eboy*; while Sir Henry Rawlinson mentions a word *habba*, which he met with in the Assyrian inscriptions, and which he understands to mean “the large animal,” the term being applied both to the elephant and the camel (*Journ. (of As. Soc.* 12:463). It is suggested in Gesenius’s *Thesaurus* (s.v.) that the original reading may have been **μυβἡβ; ἑ** <sup>^</sup>**ve** “ivory, ebony” (compare <sup><3275></sup>Ezekiel 27:15). By some of the ancient nations these tusks were imagined to be horns (<sup><3275></sup>Ezekiel 27:15; Pliny, 8:4; 18:1), though Diodorus Siculus (1, 55) correctly calls them teeth. As they were first acquainted with elephants through their ivory which was an important article of commerce, the shape of the tusks, in all probability, led them into this error. They are genuine teeth, combining in themselves, and occupying, in the upper jaw, the whole mass of secretions which hi other animals form the upper incisor and laniary teeth. They are useful for defense and offence, and for holding down green branches, or rooting up water-plants; but still they are not absolutely necessary, since there is a variety of elephant in the Indian forests entirely destitute of tusks, and the females in most of the races are either without them, or have them very small; not turned downwards, as Bochart states, but rather straight, as correctly described by Pliny. Only two species of elephants are recognized — the African and the Indian easily distinguished from each other by the size of the ear, which in the former is much larger than in the latter. The tusks of the African elephant attain sometimes a length of 8 or even 10 feet, and a weight of 100 to 120 pounds; but those of the Indian elephant are much shorter and lighter, while in the females they often scarcely project beyond the lips. “Elephant’s tooth,” or simply “elephant,” is a common name for ivory, not only in the

Oriental languages and in Greek, but also in the Western tongues, although in all of them teeth of other species may be included. There can be no doubt, for example, that the harder and more accessible ivory obtained from the hippopotamus was known in Egypt at least as early as that obtained from the elephant. This kind of ivory does not split, and therefore was anciently most useful for military instruments. *SEE ELEPHANT.*

### Picture for Ivory 1

The Egyptians at a very early period made use of this material in decoration. The cover of a small ivory box in the Egyptian collection at the Louvre is “inscribed with the praenomen Nefer-ka-re, or Neper-cheres, adopted by a dynasty found in the upper line of the tablet of Abydos, and attributed by M. Bunsen to the fifth.... In the time of Thothmes III ivory was imported in considerable quantities into Egypt, either ‘in boats laden with ivory and ebony’ from Ethiopia, or else in tusks and cups from the Ruten-nu.... The celebrated car at Florence has its linchpins tipped with ivory” (Birch, in *Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Lit.* 3, 2nd series). The specimens of Egyptian ivory work, which are found in the principal museums of Europe, are, most of them, in the opinion of Mr. Birch, of a date anterior to the Persian invasion, and some even as old as the 18th dynasty. The practice of inlaying or covering the walls with ivory and other valuable substances was in very extensive use among the Egyptians, who used it likewise for ornamenting articles of furniture, as may be seen in the British Museum. Amongst the articles of household furniture there is a seat with four turned legs inlaid with ivory, brought from Thebes; also a high-backed chair on lion-footed legs; the back solid, inlaid with panels of darker wood, with lotus towers of ivory. The ivory used by the Egyptians was principally brought from Ethiopia (Herod. 3:114), though their elephants were originally from Asia. The Ethiopians, according to Diodorus Siculus (i, 55), brought to Sesostris “ebony and gold, and the teeth of elephants.” Among the tribute paid by them to the Persian kings were “twenty large tusks of ivory” (Herod. 3:97). The processions of human figures bearing presents, etc., still extant on the walls of palaces and tombs, attest, by the black, crisp-haired bearers of huge teeth, that some of these came from Ethiopia or Central Africa; and by white men similarly laden, who also bring an Asiatic elephant and a white bear, that others came from the East. In the *Periplus of the Red Sea* (c. 4), attributed to Arrian, Coloe (*Calai*) is said to be “the chief mart for ivory.” It was thence carried down to Adouli (*Zulla*, or *Thulla*), a port on the Red Sea, about three days’ journey from

Coloe, together with the hides of hippopotami, tortoise-shell, apes, and slaves (Pliny, 6:34). The elephants and rhinoceroses from which it was obtained were killed further up the country, and few were taken near the sea, or in the neighborhood of Adouli. At Ptolemais Theron was found a little ivory like that of Adouli (*Periplus*, c. 3). Ptolemy Philadelphus made this port the depot of the elephant trade (Pliny, 6:34). According to Pliny (8, 10), ivory was so plentiful on the borders of Ethiopia that the natives made doorposts of it, and even fences and stalls for their cattle. The author of the *Periplus* (c. 16) mentions Rhapta as another station of the ivory trade, but the ivory brought down to this port is said to have been of an inferior quality, and “for the most part found in the woods, damaged by rain, or collected from animals drowned by the overflow of the rivers at the equinoxes” (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geography*, s.v. Rhapta). The Egyptian merchants traded for ivory and onyx stones to Barygraza the port to which was carried down the commerce of Western India from Ozene (*Peripluzas*, c. 49).

## Picture for Ivory 2

The Assyrians appear to have carried on a great traffic in ivory. Their early conquests in India had made them familiar with it, and (according to one rendering of the passage) their artists supplied the luxurious Tyrians with carvings in ivory from the isles of Chittim (<sup>3276</sup>Ezekiel 27:6). On the obelisk in the British Museum the captives or tribute-bearers are represented as carrying tusks. Among the merchandise of Babylon enumerated in <sup>6182</sup>Revelation 18:12 are included “all manner vessels of ivory.” Mr. Layard discovered several ornaments made from ivory in the Assyrian mounds (*Nineveh*, 2, 15), but they are of uncertain date, and exhibit marks of Egyptian workmanship (*ib.* p. 163, 168). Many specimens of Assyrian carving in ivory have been found in the excavations at Nimrod, and among the rest some tablets “richly inlaid with blue and opaque glass, lapislazuli, etc.” (Bonomi, *Nineveh and its Palaces*, p. 334; comp. <sup>2164</sup>Song of Solomon 5:14). Part of an ivory staff, apparently a scepter, and several entire elephants’ tusks, were discovered by Mr. Layard in the last stage of decay, and it was with extreme difficulty that these interesting relics could be restored (*Nini. and Bab.* p. 195).

In the early ages of Greece ivory was frequently employed for purposes of ornament. The trappings of horses were studded with it (Homer, *II.* 5, 584): it was used for the handles of keys (*Odyssey*, 21, 7) and for the

bosses of shields (Hes. *Sc. Herc.* 141, 142). The “ivory house” of Ahab (<sup><1229></sup>1 Kings 22:39) was probably a palace; the walls of which were paneled with ivory, like the palace of Menelaus described by Homer (*Odys.* 4, 73; compare Eurip. *Aph. Aul.* 583, ἔλεφαντοδέτοι δόμοι. Comp. also <sup><1085></sup>Amos 3:15, and <sup><983></sup>Psalms 45:8, unless the “ivory palaces” in the latter passage were perfume-boxes made of that material, as been conjectured). It is difficult to determine whether the “tower of ivory” of <sup><2104></sup>Song of Solomon 7:4 is merely a figure of speech, or whether it had its original among the things that were. Beds inlaid or veneered with ivory were in use among the Hebrews (Amos 6, 4; compare Homer, *Od.* 23, 200), as also among the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 3, 169). The practice of inlaying and veneering wood with ivory and tortoise-shell is described by Pliny (16, 84). By the luxurious Phoenicians ivory was employed to ornament the boxwood rowing-benches (or “hatches” according to some) of their galleys (<sup><276></sup>Ezekiel 27:6). The skilled workmen of Hiram, king of Tyre, fashioned the great ivory throne of Solomon, and overlaid it with pure gold (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 10:18; <sup><497></sup>2 Chronicles 9:17). The ivory thus employed was supplied by the caravans of Dedan (<sup><2113></sup>Isaiah 21:13; <sup><275></sup>Ezekiel 27:15), or was brought from the East Indies, with apes and peacocks, by the navy of Tarshish (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:22). As an instance of the superabundant possession and barbarian use of elephants’ teeth may be mentioned the octagonal *ivory hunting tower* built by Akbar, about twenty-four miles west of Agra: it is still standing, and bristles with 128 enormous tusks disposed in ascending lines, sixteen on each face. Mr. Roberts, remarking on the words of Amos (6, 4), they “that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon couches,” refers the last word, in conformity with the Tamul version, to swinging cots, often mentioned in the early tales of India, and still plentifully used by the wealthy. But it does not appear that they were known in Western Asia, or that figures of them occur on Egyptian bas-reliefs. It is more likely that *palkies* (those luxurious traveling litters) are meant, which were borne on men’s shoulders, while the person within was stretched at ease. They were in common use even among the Romans, for Cicero fell into his assassin’s hands while he was attempting to escape in one of them towards Naples. Among the Romans, inlaying with ivory seems to have become, at length, rather a common method of ornamenting the interiors (of the mansions of the wealthy; for Horace mentions it as an evidence of his humble way of life that “no walls inlaid with ivory adorned his house.”

## Ivy

### Picture for Ivy

(κισσός) is mentioned but once in the Scriptures, and that in the Apocrypha, namely, in 2 Macc. 6:7, where it is said that the Jews were compelled, when the feast of Bacchus was kept, to go in procession carrying ivy to this deity, to whom it is well known this plant was sacred. Ivy, however, though not mentioned by name, has a peculiar interest to the Christian, as forming the “corruptible crown” (1 Corinthians 9:25) for which the competitors at the great Isthmian games contended, and which St. Paul so beautifully contrasts with the “incorruptible crown” that shall hereafter encircle the brows of those who run worthily the race of this mortal life. In the Isthmian contests the victor’s garland was either *ivy* or *pine*. **SEE CROWN.**

The term κισσός or κιστός seems to have been applied by the Greeks in a general sense, and to have included many plants, and among them some climbers, as the *convolvulus*, besides the common ivy (*Hedera helix*), which was especially dedicated to Bacchus, and which was distinguished by the name of “*Hedera poetica, Dionysia ant Bacchica, quod ex ea poetarum coronae consuerentur.*” It is well known that in the Dionysia, or festivals in honor of Dionysus, and in the processions called θίασοι, with which they were celebrated, women also took part, in the disguise of Bacchee, Naiades, Nymphoe, etc., adorned with garlands of ivy, etc. (Ovid, *Fasti*, 3, 766). Bacchus is generally thought to have been educated in India, and the Indian *Bcyghls* has been supposed to be the original of the name. The fact of Baghes being a compound of two words signifying tiger and master or lord, would appear to confirm the identity, since ‘Bacchus is usually represented as drawn in his chariot by a tiger and a lion, and tigers, etc., are described as following him in his Indian journey. As the ivy, however, is not a plant of India, it might be objected to its being characteristic of an Indian god. But in the mountains which bound India to the north both the ivy and the vine may be found, and the Greeks were acquainted with the fact that Mount Mero is the only part of India where ivy was produced. Indeed, Alexander and his companions are said to have crowned themselves with ivy in honor of Bacchus. The ivy, *Hedera helix*, being a native of most parts of Europe, is too well known to require special notice. **SEE BACCHUS.**

## Ixora

a divinity of the East Indians, or the worshippers of Brahm. They hold him to be of infinite endurance, and illustrate this belief by saying that Brahm himself, desirous of seeing Ixora's head, ascended to heaven on wings, but failed to gain admittance, the power of Ixora preventing it. A very similar desire Vishnu cherished, but all his attempts also to this end Ixora frustrated. He is said to have two wives, one of whom constantly resides with him, and conceals herself in his hair; the other, strangely enough, they say, dies annually, and is by Ixora restored to life again. The Brahmins represent this idol standing on a pedestal, with no less than sixteen arms, each of them grasping something of value, or representing the natural elements, or weapons indicating his power. His head is adorned with long and beautiful hair; his face is white and shining; he has three eyes, and a crescent or half moon upon his forehead. — Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* i, 561. *SEE BRAHMINISM.*

## Iyar

(*Ἰϋαῖος*, Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 3, 1; the Macedonian *Ἀρτεμίσιος*) is the late name of that month which was the second of the sacred, and the seventh of the civil year of the Jews, and which began with the new moon of May. The few memorable days in it are the 10th, as a fast for the death of Eli; the 14th, as the second or lesser Passover for those whom uncleanness or absence prevented from celebrating the feast in Nisan (<sup><091></sup>Numbers 9:11); the 23rd, as a feast instituted by Simon the Maccabee in memory of his taking the citadel Acra, in Jerusalem (1 Macc. 13:51, 52); the 28th, as a fast for the death of Samuel. *SEE CALENDAR.*

Gesenius derives Iyar from the Hebrew root *rwa*, *to shine*; but Benfey and Stern, following out their theory of the source from which the Jews obtained such names, deduce it from the assumed Zend representative of the Persian *bahar*,; spring" (*Monatsnamen*, p. 134). The name Iyar does not occur in the O.T., this month being always described as the second month, except in two places in which it is called *Zif* (<sup><106></sup>1 Kings 6:1, 37). *SEE ZIF.*

## Iyim

*SEE ISLAND; SEE WILD BEAST.*



## Iz'ehar

(<sup><0189></sup>Numbers 3:19). *SEE IZHAR.*

## Iz'eharite

(<sup><0427></sup>Numbers 3:27). *SEE IZHAR.*

## Iz'har

(Heb. *Yitshar'*, **rhxya**oil, as often; Sept. **Ἰσσαάρ, Ἰσαάρ**), the second son of Kohath (son of Levi), and father of three sons (<sup><0168></sup>Exodus 6:18, 21; <sup><0401></sup>Numbers 16:1; <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 6:2, 18, 38; 23:12, 18). In <sup><0419></sup>Numbers 3:19, his name is Anglicized "Izehir." His descendants are called IZHARITES (Heb. *Yitshari'*, **yraxya**Sept. **Ἰσσααρί, Ἰσσαρί, Ἰσσαάρ** [<sup><0427></sup>Numbers 3:27; <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 24:22; 26:23, 29, in the first of which passages it is Anglicized "Izehirites"]). B.C. post 1856. *SEE ZOHAR.* "In <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 6:22, *Alminiadab* is substituted for *Izhar*, as the son of Kohath and father of Korah, in the line of Samuel. This, however, must be an accidental. error of the scribe, as in ver. 38, where the same genealogy is repeated, Izhar appears again in his right place. The Codex Alex. in ver. 22 reads *Izhar* in place of *Amminadab*, and the Aldine and Complut. read *Amminadab* between Izhar and Kore, making another generation. But these are probably only corrections of the text. (See Burrington, *Geneal. Of the O.T.*)" (Smith).

## Izrahi'ah

(Heb. *Yizrachyah'*, **hyj rzyas** sprout of Jehovah sc. into the world), the name of one or two men.

**1.** (Sept. **Ἰζρηιά**; Vulg. *Israhia.*) The "son" of Uzzi, and grandson of Tola, the son of Issachar (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 7:3). B.C. cir. 1014. *SEE OBADIAH.*

**2.** (Sept. omits, but some copies have **Ἰζρηίας**, others **Ἰεσρίας**; Vulg. *Jezraja*; A.V. "Jezrahiah.") The superintendent of the singers (doubtless a Levite) who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (<sup><1622></sup>Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446.



## Iz'rahite

(Heb. *Yizrach'*, *j rzya* only with the art. *j rzya* *the indigenous*, prob. by error of transcription for *yj æyaa* *Yizrachite* [but Furst makes it a man's name = *Izrahiah*], and this again for *yj æa*, *Ezrachite*; Sept. has *Ἰεζραέλ* v.r. *Ἰεσραέ*; Vulg. *Jezerites*), a patronymic epithet of Shamhuth, one of David's generals (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 27:8), prob. so called as being descended from Zerah, Judah's son. *SEE EZRAHITE.*

## Iz'ri

(Heb. *Yitsri'*, *yræya* *the Jezerite*, otherwise a *former*; Sept. *Ἰεσδρί*; Vulg. *Isari*), the leader of the fourth division of Levitical singers under David (<sup><1351></sup>1 Chronicles 25:11); prob. the same with ZERI, of the sons of Jeduthmu, mentioned in ver. 3. B.C. 1014.