THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Neceres - Nevis

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

Neceres

is the name which the Turks give to a clan of people inhabiting the mountains about Jebily, in Syria, who are of a very strange and singular character. It is the principle of the Neceres to adhere to no certain religion; chameleon like, they put on the color of religion, whatever it be, which is reflected upon them by the persons with whom they happen to converse. With Christians, they profess themselves Christians; with Turks, they are good Mussulmans; with Jews, they pass for Jews; being such Proteuses in religion that nobody was ever able to discover what shape or standard their consciences are really of. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sacra*, 2, s.v. *SEE NASSARIANS*.

Necessarians

SEE NECESSITARIANS.

Necessary Doctrine and Erudition

(for any Christian man) is the title of a book which the English people received from their sovereign, Henry VIII, in the year 1543, in connection with the legal prohibition of reading the Scriptures. In contradistinction to the *Institution of a Christian Man* (q.v.), which was called the "Bishops' Book," the present formulary was called the "King's Book." The *Necessary Doctrine* was not, like the other, sanctioned by the authority of Convocation, but was composed by a committee originally nominated by the king, their compositions receiving the stamp of his personal approbation. Henry himself had a considerable share in the execution of the work, the chief part of which was corrected by his own hand; and evidence still remains of the diligence with which he had collected and compared the opinions of his bishops and divines on the different points of discussion. The Preface was probably written by himself, and, among other matter, contains a vindication of the late prohibition of the Bible. Cranmer also wrote a portion of it-that concerning faith. But while it was evangelical in doctrine, it was popish in other things, affirming transubstantiation, calling marriage a sacrament, and maintaining the seven sacraments of Romanism. As an authorized formula it retained authority till the king's death. This work has occasioned in the present day much discussion and dispute, arising from the prejudices of its readers. One party has confidently appealed to it as a criterion of the opinions of the Reformers on many doctrinal points, in opposition to the Church from which they had

separated; another party has condemned it in the most unqualified terms, as leaning even in doctrine towards popery rather than Protestantism. For a full account of the plan and contents of this work, see Carwithen, *Hist. of the Church of England*, volume 1, chapter 7; see also Palmer, *On the Church*, 1:468 sq., 481 sq.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.;* Eden. *Theol. Dict.:* Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.;* Burnet, *Ref.* 1:459, 586; 3, 624; *Amer. Theol. Rev.* February 1860, page 172; *Bib. Sacra*, 1865, page 350; 1863, page 891.

Necessitarians

an appellation which may be given to all who maintain that moral agents act from necessity. *SEE NECESSITY*. Some object not only to the name, but to the dispute on a subject so perplexing as the explanation of the most consistent mode of divine government, and insist that the theme should be left entirely to the future sphere, where even the truth, according to Milton, has never yet dawned. Says the poet:

> ***"Others apart sat on a hill retired,***
> ***In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd high***
> ***Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fite,***
> ***Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute;***
> ***And found no* end — *in* wandering mazes lost*!"***

Dr. Watts thinks it probable that the discussion of this subject will constitute one of the sublime employments of the blessed in the heavenly world.

Necessity, Doctrine Of

I. *Definition*. — In metaphysics, according to the common statement, "necessity" is that quality of a thing by which it cannot but be, or whereby it cannot be otherwise. When in a proposition which affirms anything to be true there is a fixed invariable connection between the subject and the predicate, then that thing is understood to be necessary. Necessity is opposed to chance, accident, contingency, and to whatever involves the idea of uncertainty and of possible variation. It is usually distinguished in philosophy and, theology into physical, metaphysical or logical, and moral.

1. *Physical* necessity has its origin in the established order and laws of the material universe. It is founded in the relation of cause and effect, and implies that where certain causes or forces are present certain effects must uniformly and inevitably follow. "By natural [or physical] necessity, as

applied to men," says Edwards, "I mean such necessity as men are under through the force of natural causes. Thus men placed in certain circumstances are the subjects of particular sensations by necessity; they feel pain when their bodies are wounded; they see the objects presented before them in a clear light when their eyes are opened; so by a natural necessity men's bodies move downwards when there is nothing to support them" *(Works,* 2:13, Carter's ed.).

2. *Metaphysical* or *logical* necessity expresses "the nature of our belief in certain fundamental truths, such as the reality of a material world, the law of causation, and the axioms of mathematics." Logical necessity is characteristic of truths or ideas, as physical necessity is of events or phenomena in the material world. "It is alleged by some philosophers that the truths held by us as most certain are the result of experience. Others contend that such first principles as the axioms of mathematics are not only true. but *necessarily* true; we not only do believe them, but we *must* believe them. Such necessity, it is argued, cannot come from mere experience, and therefore implies an innate or intuitive source. Hence the theory of necessary truth is only another name for the theory of intuitive truth." This necessity, as characteristic of certain truths, may be grounded in the impossibility of conceiving the opposite to be true. Thus Dr. Whewell, in his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1:54, 55), teaches that necessary truths are those in which we not only learn that the proposition *is* true, but see that it *must* be true; in which the negation of the truth is not only false, but impossible. That there are such truths cannot be doubted. We may take, for example, all relations of number. We cannot, by any freak of thought, imagine three and two to make seven. John Stuart Mill, in his *System of Logic,* argues against the theory of necessary truths, especially that the common mathematical axioms are such truths. Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his argument for the existence of God, reasons from a belief in the existence of the Divine Being being necessary in this sense. " So," says Edwards, "the eternal existence of being, generally considered, is necessary in itself, because it would be in itself the greatest absurdity to deny the existence of being in general, or to say there was absolute and universal nothing" *(Works,* 2:11). Besides the meaning of the term necessary in connection with intuitive, or *a priori* truths, the truth of a statement is sometimes said to be necessary by reason of its being implied in another. "Thus if we say that all the apostles were Jews, it follows necessarily that Peter was a Jew." Here is involved the general axiom of

syllogistic reasoning that what is true of a whole class is true of each individual, which axiom may be itself an intuitive or necessary truth. But each particular proposition or conclusion from premises is necessary, because it is *implied* in the premises, or because "to withhold assent from it would be to violate the above axiom." This is, more strictly, *logical* necessity. *SEE LOGIC*.

3. *Moral necessity* has reference to the volitions and actions of rational agents, and is intended to express the connection between these volitions and actions and certain moral causes, as inclinations, desires, or motives generally. Whether there be any connection which, Strictly speaking, may be termed necessary between such motives and the volitions and actions of men, or whether independent of them the will has a self-determining power, is an inquiry which has always largely engaged the attention of both philosophers and theologians. *SEE WILL*. The term which stands opposed to necessity in the history and literature of the subject is liberty, or freedom. *SEE LIBERTY*.

The consciousness of mankind in general, the Christian consciousness especially, has always asserted the fact of freedom, even in connection often with theories that have been called theories of necessity. The freedom of the will was strongly and almost universally affirmed, with little or no qualification or psychological analysis, as the doctrine of the Church during the anteNicene period. "All the Greek fathers, as well as the apologists Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Athenagoras. also the theologians of the Alexandrian school, Clement and Origen, exalt the autonomy, self-determination *(avrEiovafov)* of the human soul with the freshness of youth and a tincture of Hellenistic idealism, but also influenced by a practical Christian interest" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* 1:155). With this the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy was in harmony. Its ethics presupposes freedom. The forms in which the idea of necessity appears in the early history of philosophy, and in the popular sentiment of the first Christian centuries, are those of materialism and fatalism.

II. *Historical Development of the Necessitarian Idea.* 1. In the early Greek philosophy we find all things — the cosmos — subjected to a materialistic necessity, of which the conceptions of matter and mind peculiar to the materialistic philosophy of the present day are in some measure a reproduction. Heraclitus (about B.C. 500) "assumes as the substantial principle of things ethereal fire," identifies it with the Divine

Spirit, the λόγος, or the eternal all-embracing order, which is according to him immanent, as the universal principle of the constant flux of all things. Democritus, with his theory of atoms, according to which "the soul consists of fire, smooth and round atoms, which are also atoms of fire," held that the motion or rest of the atoms is not due to "an all-ruling Mind," but to natural necessity. The Stoics reproduced the doctrine of Heraclitus, affirming matter and force as two ultimate principles, that the working force in the universe is God, "that the rise and decay of the world are controlled by an absolute necessity; this necessity is at once fate *(*εἱμαρμένη*)* and the providence *(*πρόνοια*)* which governs all things. In the human soul, which is a part of the Deity, or an emanation from the same, is a governing force *(*τὸ ἡγεμονικόν*)*, to which belong representation, desires, and understanding." As the attention of these philosophers was directed mainly to the universe of nature instead of man, making their philosophy cosmological rather than anthropological, they seem not to have attempted any special explanation of the phenomena of volition, or any logically rigorous application of their doctrines of necessity to the working of the human will. In their ethics they speak of men's action as if they were free. Heraclitus "calls upon each individual to follow in his thought and action the universal reason." Democritus says, "Not the act as such, but the will determines moral character." "The Sage alone is free; he is lord also over his own life, and can lawfully bring it to an end according to his own free self-determination." Later, in the more theological Greek philosophy, as that of Philo, "God alone is free; everything finite is involved in necessity." In the less philosophical and more popular thought of the time, human action was sometimes viewed as under the control of a fate which stands in some magical way in intimate connection with the stars, or with other objects in nature. Such views were held by some of the Gnostics.

2. In the more special and systematic treatment of Christian doctrines following the Council of Nice, the theologians undertook to harmonize the doctrines of the freedom of the will and divine predestination and foreknowledge. The heathen philosophy already noticed, in attempting to be theological, had so conceived of the Divine Being in relation to the world as to bring both men and things under a necessity, physical or fatalistic. Christianity, much more decidedly theological, now undertook to give a philosophy of God's relations to human action. In the controversy on the freedom of the will between Augustine and the Pelagians, the point of

dispute was the relation of the will in its activity to the grace of God. Freedom was affirmed on both sides, each asserting that its own was the true idea of freedom. The differences consist in the degree and manner of influence upon the soul ascribed to divine grace. The views of Augustine are historically of much importance in the presentation of this subject, as they have formed the basis of the Calvinistic view in modern times. "This general view has been designated a theory of necessity, though its adherents object to the term as ambiguous and misleading. Augustine looked upon grace as the active principle of life, generating as an abiding good that freedom of the will which is entirely lost in the natural man." Pelagius admitted that man stands in need of divine aid; "but he supposed this grace of God to be something external, and added to the efforts put forth by the free-will of man." "He has not the conception of a life unfolding itself; he only recognises the mechanical concatenation of single acts." Augustine "recognises in the grace of God an inspiration of love *(inspiratio dilectionis),* and considers this the source of everything. It was not the view of Augustine that man is like a stone or stick, upon whom grace works externally; he could conceive of grace as working only in the sphere of freedom" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* 1:301,302). In accordance with the idea and definition of the will and its freedom, which distinguishes the Latin from the Greek anthropology (comp. Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* 1:61), Augustine's idea of freedom is *self* determination, as distinguished from indetermination. In his view the activity of the will proceeds purely from within the man himself, and this is freedom. In all the conditions in which he contemplates man-namely, as unfallen, as fallen, and as renewed-there is self-determination, that is the "human will moves towards a proposed end by its own self-motion." The will is free in evil, even when by virtue of the moral condition of the man it can will nothing else but evil, because it delights in evil. Hence in the will of Adam, as created, there was an inclination to holiness, but at the same time also, united with it, the possibility of sinning *(possibilita speccandi).* In the fallen Adam, the activity of the will is inclination to sin, "the unforced, free, selforiginating, self-moved energy of the creature." It is freedom in sin, but at the same time a necessity or certainty of sinning. In the renewed, or in those in whom there is any holy activity, the motion or determination of the will from the very beginning is conditioned upon the grace of God working in the soul in some wonderful hidden way ("interna et occulta, mirabili ac ineffabili potestate") to produce voluntary action in holiness. This is the truest freedom, and its highest development consists in the *non posse*

peccare, the felix necessitas boni. This grace Augustine designates as irresistible. "By this he meant, not that the human will is converted unwillingly or by compulsion, but that the divine grace is able to overcome the utmost obstinacy of the human spirit" (Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* 1:73). Augustine's idea and explanation of the activity of the will are from the theological point of view rather than the psychological.

In the scholastic period, as two representatives of its views, we may mention Thomas Aquinas on the one hand, and Duns Scotus on the other. Aquinas held that "the will depends upon the understanding; that which appears good is necessarily sought after; but necessity arising from internal causes, and reposing on knowledge, is freedom." The will is not subject to the necessity of compulsion, but to that necessity which does not destroy freedom — the necessity of striving after ends. Duns Scotus maintained, on the contrary, that "the human will is not determined by the understanding, but has power to choose with no determining ground."

In the German mysticism, which grew up in the 13th and 14th centuries out of scholasticism, the will was treated as subordinate to the knowing faculty, and extreme emphasis was laid on the presence in the divine nature of the element of natural necessity. "True union with God takes place in cognition; knowledge, which is God's action in man, is the foundation of all essence, the ground of love, the determining power of the will."

3. With the decline of scholasticism, and the rise of the spirit of the Reformation, the views of the phenomena of volition are modified by the fact that philosophy becomes more independent of the current theology in its interpretation of the universe of nature and mind. But in their views and methods they largely influence each other. Des Cartes emphasized human freedom; but, as according to his theory the will has no power of itself over the body, his disciples, as Malebranche, introduced the doctrine of Occasionalism — that God by his direct agency moves the body in accordance with our will. Spinoza, developing and transforming the Cartesian dualism into a pantheism, making God the immanent cause of the totality of finite things, holds that God works according to the inner necessity of his nature, in which consists his freedom; that he produces all finite effects only indirectly through finite causes; that there is no such thing as human freedom independent of causality, but that all events, including all acts of volition, are determined by God, though through finite causes, and not immediately. In the seventh definition of his Ethics he

defines freedom and necessity as follows: "That thing is called free which exists by the sole necessity of its nature, and the determining cause of whose activity is in itself alone. But that is called necessary, or rather constrained, which owes its existence to another, and whose activity is the result of fixed and determinable causes." Spinoza's idea of free agency differs but little from that of Augustine, as being self-determination; and he "rightly seeks for the proper opposite of freedom, not in necessity taken generally, but in a distinct kind of necessity, namely, constraint, which is to be defined as necessity having its source, not in the nature of the subject of constraint, but in something foreign to that nature (whether in the internal or external world), and overruling the endeavors to which that nature itself gives rise" (Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* 2:68). Leibnitz, whose philosophy, like that of Des Cartes and Spinoza, was fundamentally theistic, maintained the power of self-determination in the soul; that "freedom, not as an exemption from law, but as the power of deciding for one's self according to known law, belongs to the essence of the human spirit;" but in place of the natural operation of the spirit upon or through the body, and of the occasionalism of Des Cartes's disciples, Leibnitz substituted the theory of pre-established harmony, "that God, at the beginning, so created soul and body that, while each follows the law of its internal development with perfect independence, each remains at the same time at every instant in perfect agreement." Kant's doctrine of the activity of the will as presented in his *Critique of the Practical Reason,* is given by Ueberweg as follows: "Kant defines the word *maxim* as denoting a subjective principle of willing; the objective principle, on the contrary, which is founded in the reason itself, is termed by him the *practical law;* he includes both together under the conception of the practical *principle,* i.e., a principle which contains a universal determination of the will, involving several practical rules. All the ends to which *desire* may be directed furnish sensuous and egotistic motives for the will, all reducible to the principle of personal happiness or self-love. But a rational being, on the other hand, in so far as he is rational, conceives his practical universal laws as principles, which are fitted to direct the will, not by their matter, but only in view of their form. The will which is determined by the mere form of universal law is independent of the law of sensible phenomena, and therefore free. A free will can only be determined by the mere form of a maxim, or by its fitness to serve as a universal law. Hence his categorical imperative of morals. Self-determination in conformity to the categorical imperative he terms 'autonomy of the will.' The opposite of this is the 'heteronomy of arbitrary

choice.' Thus in the moral law, or categorical imperative, he finds a law of causality through freedom. The conception of cause is here employed only with practical intent, the determining motive of the will being found in the intelligible order of things. The freedom which man has as a personal being, not subject to the universal mechanism of nature, is the faculty of being subject to peculiar practical laws, given by his own reason; in other words, every person is subject to the conditions of his own personality." Developments, somewhat diverse from these views of Kant, are found in the philosophy of J.G. Fichte, raising self-determination to a creative activity of the Ego; in that of Schelling, who held "that only in God is man capable of freedom, that the freedom of man was exercised in an intelligible act done before time, that as an empirical being man is subject to necessity resting on his non-temporal self-determination;" in that of Hegel, in his philosophy of spirit, the development of which "is the gradual advance from natural determinateness to freedom, through the *momenta* of subjective, objective, and absolute spirit;" in the philosophy and theology of Schleiermacher, who made prominent the feeling of freedom in connection with the feeling of dependence; in the philosophy of Schopenhauer, in which motives are one of the forms of causality, the action of which is known not only from without, but from within, so that we learn by experience the mystery of the production of effects by causes in its innermost nature; in the philosophy of Herbart (1776-1841), defined by himself as "the elaboration of conceptions," according to which freedom of the will is the assured supremacy of the strongest masses of ideas over single affections or impressions; and in that of Beneke, who reduced all the phenomena of self-consciousness to four fundamental processes, under which certain feelings and judgments arise regarding the comparative worth of processes, which feelings and judgments control the tendencies of the moral agent and determine the will, so that "moral freedom consists in such a decided preponderance, and such a firm establishment of the moral nature in man, that his volition and action are determined by it alone." These views are necessitarian in general, in the sense that the volitions, or choices, and actions, are regarded as determined by, or in accordance with, reasons, motives, principles, desires, feelings, judgments, or, in general, certain prevolitional conditions.

In England as on the Continent the impulse accompanying the Reformation occasioned a freer and more prolific discussion of the freedom of the will among other theological and philosophical topics. In the empirical method

of Bacon, and its decided direction of the attention to physical sciences, we have a line of thought, the tendency of which was to reduce the phenomena of volition to some law either *analogous* to the law of cause and effect observed in physical phenomena, or *identical* with it, and a part of it, giving a physical or materialistic necessity. Hobbes plainly declares that the activity of the will is from necessary causes, and he does not distinguish this necessity from ordinary physical causation. *SEE LIBERTY*. Locke, in the first edition of his *Essay,* asserts the necessitarianism of Hobbes. "In later editions a power to suspend the determinations of the will is accorded." "That which immediately determines the will from time to time," he says, "to every voluntary act is the uneasiness of desire, fixed on some absent good." In 1715 appeared Anthony Collins's argument for necessity. He states his view thus: "First, though I deny liberty in a certain meaning of the word, yet I contend for liberty as it signifies a power in man to do as he wills or pleases. Secondly, when I affirm necessity, I contend only for moral necessity, meaning thereby that man, who is an intelligent and sensible being, is determined by his reason and his senses; and I deny man to be subject to such necessity as is in clocks, watches, and such other things, which for want of sensation and intelligence are subject to an absolute physical or mechanical necessity." Dr. Samuel Clarke replied to Collins, affirming “that all proper action of the soul is *ipso facto* free action; that the laws which determine the judgment of the understanding next preceding any activity are diverse from those which pertain to the production of the action itself." Hartley followed Collins in his theory of the will, modifying it, however, by his peculiar doctrine of medullary vibrations, and the action of the soul dependent upon them by association. He thus in a measure anticipated the physiological and associational psychology of James Mill, John Stuart Mill, Bain, and Herbert Spencer. The necessitarians found their most effective champion in Priestley, who took up the materialistic theories and deduced from them their logical consequence, which he called a "philosophical" necessity. According to John Stuart Mill, "the law of causality applies in the same strict sense to human actions as to other phenomena." "Correctly conceived," he says, "the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity is simply this: that given the motives which are present to an individual's mind, and given likewise the character and disposition of the individual, the manner in which he will act may be unerringly inferred" *(System of Logic,* 2:405, 406). He allows at the same time a power in the mind to cooperate in the formation of its own character, and complains of the application of the term necessity to the

doctrine of cause and effect in human character as improper. But causation with him means "nothing but invariable, certain, and unconditional sequence," with no "mysterious constraint or compulsion" in the cause over the effect. Alexander Bain considers the will as "a collective term for all the impulses to motion or action. It is absurd to ask whether such a power is free." Dr. Reid (1710-1796), in opposition to the various forms of necessity, denies that every action is performed with some view or from some motive. Dugald Stewart, however, concedes "that for every action there must be a motive;" but maintains that "liberty as opposed to necessity means that the connection between motives and actions is not a necessary connection like that between cause and effect." "The question," he says, "is not concerning the *influence* of motives, but concerning the *nature* of that influence." This is most truly the pivotal point of the whole controversy. For the opinions of Hamilton and Mansel, *SEE LIBERTY*.

4. In this country a fresh theological importance was given to this subject by Jonathan Edwards, who based his theory of voluntary action on the doctrine of moral necessity, taking pains to distinguish it from natural or physical necessity. *SEE LIBERTY*. His treatise was directed against the doctrine of the self-determining power of the will as advocated by Arminian writers, endeavoring to prove at the same time that this necessity was not inconsistent with liberty. This moral necessity he defines as "that necessity of connection and consequence which arises from such moral causes as the strength of inclinations or motives, and the connection which there is in many cases between these and such certain volitions and actions" *(Works*, 2:13). One great purpose in his work was to reply to the objection that the Calvinistic notions of God's moral government are contrary to the common-sense of mankind. Freedom, as involving the self-determining power of the Arminians, he argued, would involve contingency and the absence of certainty. This would exclude foreknowledge. The views of Edwards have been modified, and controverted even, by Calvinistic theologians. The term moral necessity is still used to characterize the theories of those who affirm that the will is determined or determines itself under the influence of motives, as distinguished from the theories of those who affirm a "power to the contrary," or "the power or immunity to put forth in the same circumstances either of several volitions," or such an independence of motives as to make the action of the agent contingent and uncertain, and not certainly or necessarily determined by them. It is applied also to the theories of those who hold to Augustinian and Calvinistic views

of the operation of divine grace upon the will. In general they object, and it is acknowledged with justice in some respects, to the term necessity as confusing, and in its associations implying ideas which they disown, since they assert the freedom of the will as the condition of moral obligation and moral divine government. Some, as Dr. Hodge, propose and use the term certainty, as distinguished from necessity on the one hand and contingency on the other. Dr. Hodge teaches that freedom consists in the fact that a man's "volitions are truly and properly his own, determined by nothing out of himself, but proceeding from his own views, feelings, and innermost dispositions, so that they are the real, intelligent, and conscious expression of his character, or of what is in his mind." "We hold," says Dr. M'Cosh, "that the principle of cause and effect reigns in mind as in matter. But there is an important difference between the manner in which this principle operates in body and in spirit. In all proper mental operations the causes and the effects lie both within the mind. Mind is selfacting substance. We hold that the true determining cause of every given volition is not any mere anterior incitement, but the very soul itself by its inherent power of will."

III. *Objections to this Theory*. — The anti-necessitarians notwithstanding allege that the doctrine of necessity, in the light of these various interpretations of Calvinistic theologians, "charges God as the author of sin; that it takes away the freedom of the will; renders man unaccountable to his Maker; makes sin to be no evil, and morality or virtue to be no good; and that it precludes the use of means, and is of the most gloomy tendency. The necessitarians, on the other hand, deny these to be legitimate consequences of their doctrine, which they declare to be the most consistent mode of explaining the divine government; and they observe that the Deity acts no more immorally in decreeing vicious actions than in permitting all those irregularities which he could so easily have prevented. All necessity, say they, does not take away freedom. "The actions of a man may be at one and the same time both free and necessary. Thus it was infallibly certain that Judas would betray Christ, yet he did it voluntarily; Jesus Christ necessarily [?] became man, and died, yet he acted freely. A good man does naturally and necessarily love his children, yet voluntarily. They insist that necessity does not render actions less morally good; for, if necessary virtue be neither moral nor praiseworthy, it will follow that God himself is not a moral being, because he is a necessary one [i.e., necessarily such; rather such by nature]; and the obedience of Christ cannot be good, because it was necessary [?]. Further, say they, necessity does not preclude

the use of means; for means are no less appointed than the end. It was ordained that Christ should be delivered up to death; but he could not have been betrayed without a betrayer, nor crucified without crucifiers." That it is not a gloomy doctrine, they allege, because nothing can be more consolatory than to believe that all things are under the direction of an all-wise Being, that his kingdom ruleth over all, and that he doeth all things well. They also urge that to deny necessity is to deny the foreknowledge of God, and to wrest the sceptre from the hand of the Creator, and to place that capricious and undefinable principle, the self-determining power of man, upon the throne of the universe. In these statements there is obviously a confused use of terms in different meanings, so as to mislead the unwary. For instance, *necessity* is confounded with *certainty;* but an action may be certain, though free — that is to say, certain to an omniscient Being, who knows how a free agent will finally resolve; but this certainty is, in fact, a quality of the prescient Being, not that of the action, to which, however, men delusively transfer it. Again: God is called a necessary Being, which, if it mean anything, signifies, as to his moral acts, that he can only act right. But then this is a wrong application of the term necessity, which properly implies such a constraint upon actions, exercised *ab extra,* as renders choice or will impossible. But such necessity cannot exist as to the Supreme Being. Again: the obedience of Christ unto death was necessary — that is to say unless he had died, guilty man could not have been forgiven; but this could not make the act of the Jews who put him to death a necessary act — that is to say, a forced and constrained one; nor did this necessity affect the act of Christ himself, who acted voluntarily, and might have left man without salvation. That the Jews acted *freely* is evident from their being held liable to punishment, although unconsciously they accomplished the great designs of heaven, which, however, was no excuse for their crime. Finally: as to the allegation that the doctrine of free agency puts man's self-determining power upon the throne of the universe, that view proceeds upon notions unworthy of God, as if he could not accomplish his plans without compelling and controlling all things by a fixed fate; whereas it is both more glorious to him, and certainly more in accordance with the Scriptures, to say that he has a perfect foresight of the manner in which all creatures will act, and that he, by a profound and infinite wisdom, subordinates everything without violence to the evolution and accomplishment of his own glorious purposes.

"The doctrine of necessity is nearly connected with that of predestination, which of late years has assumed a form very different from that which it formerly possessed; for, instead of being considered as a point to be determined almost entirely by the sacred writings, it has, in the hands of a number of able writers, in a great measure resolved itself into a question of natural religion, under the head of the philosophical liberty or necessity of the will; or, whether all human actions are or are not necessarily determined by motives arising from the character which God has impressed on our minds, and the train of circumstances amid which his providence has placed us? The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination is that 'God, for his own glory, hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.' The scheme of philosophical necessity, as stated by the most celebrated necessitarian of the age, is, 'that everything is predetermined by the Divine Being; that whatever has been, must have been; and that whatever will be, must be; that all events are preordained by infinite wisdom and unlimited goodness; that the will, in all its determinations, is governed by the state of mind; that the state of mind is in every instance determined by the Deity; and that there is a continued chain of causes and effects, of motives and actions, inseparably connected, and originating from the condition in which we are brought into existence by the Author of our being.' On the other hand, it is justly remarked that 'those who believe the being and perfections of God, and a state of retribution, in which he will reward and punish mankind according to the diversity of their actions, will find it difficult to reconcile the justice of punishment with the necessity of crimes punished. And they that believe all that the Scripture says on the one hand of the eternity of future punishments, and on the other of God's compassion to sinners, and his solemn assurance that he desires not their death, will find the difficulty greatly increased.' It is doubtless an article of the Christian faith that God will reward or punish every man hereafter according to his actions in this life. But we cannot maintain his justice in this particular, if men's actions be necessary either in their own nature or by the divine decrees. Activity and self-determining powers are the foundation of all morality; and to prove that such powers belong to man, it is urged that we ourselves are conscious of possessing them. We blame and condemn ourselves when we do amiss; but guilt, and inward sense of shame, and remorse of conscience are feelings which are inconsistent with the scheme of necessity. It is also agreed that some actions deserve praise, and afford an inward satisfaction; but for this there would be no foundation, if we were invincibly determined in every volition: so that approbation and blame are consequent on free

actions only. Nor is the 'matter at all relieved by bringing in a chain of circumstances as motives necessarily to determine the will. This comes to the same result in sound argument as if there was an immediate *co-action* of omnipotent power compelling one kind of volitions only; which is utterly irreconcilable to all just notions of the nature and operations of will, and to all accountability. Necessity, in the sense of irresistible control, and the doctrine of Scripture, cannot coexist."

IV. *Roman Catholic* theologians recognise also two other kinds of necessity, namely, a necessity of means, and a necessity of precept. Baptism they consider as a necessity of means, or absolute necessity, because it is the only means of salvation instituted by Christ; so that no one can be saved who has not been baptized, whether it be by his own fault or not. Communion is only a necessity of precept. If a man voluntarily refuses to participate in the Lord's Supper, he is deserving of condemnation; but if he was only involuntarily deprived of participating in it, he is not guilty.

See Priestley, *A Free Discussion of the Doctrines of Materialism and Philosophical Necessity* (Lond. 1778, 8vo); Bray, *Philosophy of Necessity;* Clarke, *Boyle Lectures* for 1704; Crombie, *Essay on Philos. Necessity;* Toplady, *On Christian and Philos. Necessity;* Butler, *Analogy,* chapter 6; Copleston, *Inquiry into the Doctrine of N. Graves on Calvinistic Predestination;* Jackson, *Defence of Human Liberty;* Tucker, *Light of Nature;* Watson, *Theol. Institutes,* ii, 350; Hodge, *Christian Theology* (see Index); *Amer. Theol. Rev.* Jan. 1860; Oct. 1861; *Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev.* January 1865; *North British Rev.* volume 10; and the literature under WILL *SEE WILL* .

Necham, Neckham, or Nequam, Alexander

an English monk, noted as a universal scholar, a proficient in the whole circle of science, including canon law, medicine, and theology, was born at St. Albans in 1157; lived and studied at Paris, and after his return to his native country was made abbot of Cirencester, and died in 1217. He is the author of a great variety of works remaining in MS. But the most important of all his productions, including many theological and philosophical works, is his *De Natunis Rerum,* which is believed to have had quite a large circulation towards the close of the 12th century. It has recently been edited and published by the noted English antiquarian, Thomas Wright, who has written much about Necham in the *Biog. Brit.*

Lit. (Anglo-Norman Period), pages 449-50. The *De Naturis Rerum* (Lond. 1863) aims to interest the student of nature in the Author of nature. It is iconoclastic in tendency, and rejects the aid of art in religious ceremonies. See, besides Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.*, Piper, *Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie*, pages 557-59; Cave, *Historia Literaria*, s.v.

Ne'cho

Picture for Necho

(Heb. *Neko'*, wkn], an Egyptian name; Sept. and Josephus, Νεχαώ; fully wkn] h[oPi, *Pharaoh Necho*, <12329>2 Kings 23:29, 33, 34, 35, etc.; once Heb. hkn], *Nekoh'*, <244602>Jeremiah 46:2; Herodotus, Νεκώς; on the twofold appellation of this king on the monuments, see Rosellini, *Monuum. Stor.* 2:131 sq., tab. 9), an Egyptian king, son and successor (according to Herodotus, 2:158) of Psammetichus, and contemporary of the Jewish king Josiah (B.C. 609). The wars and successes of Pharaoh-Necho in Syria are recorded by sacred as well as profane writers, affording a striking instance of agreement between them. On coming to the throne he organized powerful fleets on the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. Having engaged some Phoenician sailors, he sent them on a voyage of discovery along the coasts of Africa. According to Herodotus (4:42, 3), they circumnavigated that continent from the Arabian Gulf by the Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar) to Egypt, and related that in the south they had the sun on their right hand, which that historian could not believe. Most modern writers, consider this testimony sufficient, and the voyage attested (see Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, 3:283 sq.; Beck, *Welt-Gesch.* 1:595 sq.; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 2:67; Arrian, *Rer. Ind.* ad fin.). Necho undertook to check the growth of Babylonian power, and with this view collected a powerful army, and entering Palestine, followed the route along the sea-coast of Judaea, intending to besiege the town of Carchemish on the Euphrates. But Josiah, king of Judah, offended at the passage of the Egyptian army through his territories, resolved to impede, if unable to prevent, their march. Necho sent messengers to induce him to desist, assuring him that he had no hostile intentions against Judsea, "but against the house wherewith I have war; for God commanded me to make haste." This conciliatory message was of no avail. Josiah posted himself in the valley of Megiddo, and prepared to oppose the Egyptians. Megiddo was a city in the tribe of Manasseh, between forty and fifty miles to the north of Jerusalem, and within three

hours of the coast. It is apparently confounded by Herodotus with Magdolus in Egypt. In this valley the feeble forces of the Jewish king, having attacked Necho, were routed with great slaughter. Josiah being wounded in the neck with an arrow, ordered his attendants to take him from the field. Escaping from the heavy shower of arrows with which their broken ranks were overwhelmed, they removed him from the chariot in which he had been wounded, and placing him in a "second one that he had," they conveyed him to Jerusalem, where he died (<12329>2 Kings 23:29, 30; <14650>2 Chronicles 35:20 sq.). *SEE JOSIAH*. Necho continued his march to the Euphrates. But three months had scarcely elapsed when, returning from the capture of Carchemish and the defeat of the Chaldeans, he learned that, though Josiah had left an elder son, Jehoahaz had caused himself to be proclaimed king on the death of his father, without soliciting Necho to sanction his taking the crown. Incensed at this, he deposed Jehoahaz (apparently having summoned him to Riblah), and carried him a prisoner to Jerusalem. On arriving there, Necho made Eliakin, the eldest son, king, changing his name to Jehoiakim; and taking the silver and gold which had been levied upon the Jewish nation, he returned to Egypt with the captive Jehoahaz, who there died (<12331>2 Kings 23:31 sq.; <14601>2 Chronicles 36:1-4). Herodotus says that Necho, after having routed the Syrians (the Jews) at Magdolus, took Cadytis, a large city of Syria, in Palestine, which, he adds, is very little less than Sardis (2:159; 3:5). By Cadytis there is scarcely a doubt he meant Jerusalem; the word is only a Greek form of the ancient, as well as the modern, name of that city. In the fourth year after this expedition Necho again marched into Syria, and advanced to the Euphrates. Here Nebuchadnezzar completely routed his army, recovered the town of Carchemish, and, pushing his conquests through Palestine, took from Necho all the territory belonging to the Pharaohs, from the Euphrates to the southern extremity of Syria (<12407>2 Kings 24:7,8; <24602>Jeremiah 46:2; <14609>2 Chronicles 36:9). *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*. Necho soon after died, and was succeeded by Psammetichus II (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 1:157 sq.). *SEE EGYPT*. According to Manetho (Euseb. *Chronicles Arzen.* 1:219), Necho was the sixth king in the twenty-sixth dynasty, successor of Psammetichus, and as there had been another of the same name, he was properly Necho the Second. The period of his reign was, according to Manetho, six, according to Herodotus sixteen, vears (consult Gesenius, *Jesaia*, 1:596). See Larcherj *Ad Herod.* 2:158 sq.; 4:42; Diod. 1:33, and Wess. ad loc.; Strabo, 1:56; Heeren,

African Nat. 2:374, 389; Bunsen, *Egyptens Stelle in der Welt-Geschichte*, 3:141 sq; *SEE PHARAOH*.

Nechites

SEE NICITAS.

Nechosheth

SEE BRASS; *SEE COPPER*.

Nechunjah Ben-Ha-Kanah

a famous rabbin at Jamnia, who, like his contemporary Nahum of Gimso (q.v.), had a school and method of his own, was a disciple of Hillel (q.v.), and a contemporary and equal colleague of Jochanan ben-Zachai (q.v.). Nechunjah strictly adhered to his teacher's method of Biblical interpretation, and decidedly opposed Nahum's additional rule of "extension and restriction." He was of a mild and compliant character, and is said to have chiefly occupied himself with mystical theology. So much was this the case, that later tradition ascribed the composition of the oldest cabalistic works to him or to his father, viz., the books *Bahir* (ryhiB;) and *Peliah* (hay:læp]), which, however, belong to a later time. Like his colleague, Jochanan ben-Zachai, Nechunjah reached a good old age. Himself a living protest against the supposed worldliness of some of his contemporaries, his recorded motto was, "Every one who takes upon himself the yoke of the law is set free from the yoke of the kingdom and the yoke of conformity to the world; but to every one who discards the yoke of the law shall be given the yoke of the kingdom and the yoke of the fashions of this world" *(Aboth*, 3:5). It is interesting to notice that Nechunjah was one of the few who were wont to ejaculate a short prayer both when entering the college and again when leaving it. He assigned the following reasons for this unusual practice: "When I enter," he said, "I pray that I may not be the occasion of error; and when I leave I bless the Lord for my calling" *(Beracoth*, 4:2). Later writers (Bartol. 4:246, etc.) have, without sufficient reason, supposed that he became a convert to Christianity. Certainly both the ground and the objects of his prayers savor more of the pride of the Pharisee than of the spirit of the Christian. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leipsic, 1866), 4:22; Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten*, 2:26; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico* (Germ. transl.) page 245; Edersheim, *History of the Jews*, page 158; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew*

Literature, page 65; Frankel, *Hodegetica in Mishnam* (Leipsic, 1859), page 99. (B.P.)

Neck

Picture for Neck 1

(usually ãr,[o, *o'reph,* as <014908>Genesis 49:8; <030508>Leviticus 5:8; often raW;x', *tsavvar',* as <012716>Genesis 27:16; and same in Chald., as <270507>Daniel 5:7; once the plur. cognate µyn;roW;x', <220409>Song of Solomon 4:9; also, *garo n',* prop. *throat,* <230316>Isaiah 3:16; or the plur. cognate, ˆwOrG;r]Gi, <200322>Proverbs 3:22; once tq,r,p]mi, *maphre'keth,* <090418>*1* Samuel 4:18; Gr. τράχηλος*),* a part of the human frame used by the sacred writers with considerable variety and freedom in figurative expressions, though seldom in such a way as to occasion difficulty to a modern reader. With reference to the graceful ornament which a fine neck gives, especially to the female form, it is said of the spouse in the Canticles, "Thy neck is like the tower of David, builded for an armory" (<220404>Song of Solomon 4:4); or, as it is again, "like a tower of ivory" (<220704>Song of Solomon 7:4). The neck, however, being that part of the body through which in man, and still more in the lower animals, the life is frequently destroyed, it is sometimes taken as the representative of the animal life; hence "to lay down the neck" (<451604>Romans 16:4) is a strong expression for hazarding one's life; to "give one the necks of one's enemies" (<102241>2 Samuel 22:41) was to surrender their life into his hands; also "to reach even to the neck," or "to the midst of the neck" (<230808>Isaiah 8:8; 30:28), was to approach the point of overwhelming destruction, which, in <350313>Habakkuk 3:13, takes the peculiar form of "discovering the foundation to the neck" — the allusion in the last passage being to the foundation of a house, which is like the neck upon which the head rests. But by much the most common reference was to beasts of burden, which bore upon their neck the yoke whereby they did service, and as such were viewed as emblems of men in their relation either to a good or a bad, to a true or a false service. Christ invites all to "take up his yoke" (upon their neck understood), in other words, to yield themselves obediently to his authority (<401129>Matthew 11:29); and a stiff or hardened neck is a familiar expression for an unpliant, rebellious spirit. In the contrary direction, many passages in the prophets convey threatenings of coming judgment by the hands of enemies under the form of laying bands or yokes upon the people's necks (<052848>Deuteronomy 28:48; <231027>Isaiah 10:27; <242702>Jeremiah

27:2). Hence putting the feet on the neck is a usual expression in the East for triumphing over a fallen foe. In the numerous battle-scenes depicted on the monuments of ancient Egypt and Assyria, we see the monarchs frequently represented treading on the necks of their enemies; and a similar practice obtained among the Hebrews. When Joshua had conquered the five kings, he said unto the captains of the men of war which went with him, Come near, put your feet upon the necks of these kings.

Picture for Neck 2

And they came near, and put their feet upon the necks of them" (Joshua 10:24; comp. 2 Samuel 22:41). In India, when people are disputing, should one be a little pressed, and the other begin to triumph, the former will say, "I will tread upon thy neck, and after that beat thee." A low caste man insulting one who is high is sure to hear some one say to the offended individual, "Put your feet on his neck." Nor was this custom peculiar to the East: Quintus Curtius, relating the particulars of a single combat between Dioxippus, an Athenian, and Horratus, a Macedonian, says that, in the end, the former, closing with the latter, struck up his heels, and threw him with great violence on the ground; then. after taking his sword from him, he *set his foot upon his neck*, and was about to dash out his brains, when the king (Alexander) interposed his authority to prevent him. *SEE TRIUMPH*.

Necker, Jacques

an eminent financier and religious statesman, father of the noted French female writer, Madame de Stael, was born of distinguished parentage Sept. 30,1732. He was sent to Paris in his youth, and was employed in the house of Thellusson, the great banker, who, after a time, took him into partnership. Necker realized a very large fortune, and retired from business at forty years of age. He now began to aspire to official situations, and wrote several works on financial affairs, which made him favorably known. One of these works, a memoir upon the French finances, suggesting the means of making up the deficiency in the revenue, and forwarded to the minister Maurepas, the president of the council of finances, so delighted this French statesman that he obtained for the author, from Louis XVI, after some hesitation, as Necker was an alien and a Protestant, the appointment of director of the treasury in 1776. Necker was appointed director-general of finances in June 1777, but without a seat in the council; being averse to imposing new taxes, he endeavored to make up the national

income by economy and loans. In 1781 he published his *Compte Rendu,* which disclosed for the first time the state of the revenue and expenditure of France, and made him numerous enemies, and he resigned in May 1781. He withdrew to Switzerland, where he purchased an estate at Copet, on the banks of the Leman Lake, and there he wrote his work *Sur l'Administration des Finances,* 1784. In 1787 Necker returned to Paris, where he wrote against Calonne, who had just been dismissed from his office of comptroller-general of the finances, and he was in consequence banished from the capital, but was soon after recalled. In the following year (August 1788), on the resignation of Brienne, and at the suggestion of that minister, Louis XVI appointed Necker director-general of finances, as the only man capable of restoring order in the administration. The king had already promised the convocation of the states-general, and Necker urged him to keep his promise. But he failed as a statesman in not arranging beforehand a plan for the sittings of those states, so as to prevent the collision that took place on their first meeting. In fact Necker was a financier, but not a statesman; he was a philosopher and a man of letters, but not a jurist or a legislator, and he was thus considered by a man well qualified to judge of these matters. His second ministry was short. Unable to check or direct the popular storm, and not enjoying the confidence of the court, Necker, unwilling to become the reproach of the agitators, quitted his place and the kingdom. On the 11th of July, 1789, he set off for Switzerland. After the taking of the Bastille, the National Assembly demanded the recall of Necker, and Louis complied. Necker was received in triumph, but his popularity was short-lived. He did not go far enough to please the movement-men. In December of the following year, 1790, he gave in his resignation to the National Assembly, which received it with cool indifference. He spent the remainder of his life in Switzerland, in retirement and study, and wrote several political tracts. He had written, several years before, a work, *De l'Importance des Opinions Religieuses* (translated into English under the title *Of the Inportance of Religious Opinions* [London, 1788, 8vo]). This work is eminently able and serviceable to Christianity. In 1800 he published his last and greatest work on the religious view of morality. This work is highly esteemed, and secured a prominent rank for Necker as a moralist. He died April 9, 1804. His works were collected and published by his accomplished daughter in 15 volumes, 8vo (1821). See Madame de Stael, *Vie privee de M. Jacques Necker* (1804-1821); Lanjuinais, *Etudes biograph. sur Antoine Arnauld, P. Nicole, et J. Necker* (1823); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi,* 7:329 sq.;

Edinb. Rev. January 1803; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cycl. Bibliog.* 2:2166.

Necker, Madame, nee Susannah Curchod

a noted French philanthropist, was born in 1739, in the mountain village of Grassy, situated between the Pays de Vaud and Franche-Comte. Her father, a pastor of the Swiss Church, was a man of considerable talents; her mother was descended from an ancient family of Provence, who had fled to Switzerland on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. She was the wife of minister Necker, and she greatly distinguished herself during his terms of office in every possible form of benevolence. She erected a hospital in Paris with her own money, was a great reformer of prison abuses, and surrounded herself with the most distinguished men of the time, among them Buffon, Diderot, D'Alembert, who offered her the homage due to her great learning and her rare goodness of heart. She died in 1795, the year after publishing her *Reflexions sur le Divorce* (Lausanne, 1794, 8vo), an elaborate plea for the indissolubility of marriage. Her complete writings were published by her husband in 5 volumes, 8vo (1798-1801). See Gibbon, *Memoirs;* Marmontel, *Memoires;* Barrere de Vieuzac, *Esprit de Madame Necker* (Paris, 1808, 8vo).

Neckere, Leo De, D.D.

an American Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the first half of this century, was born about the close of the last century, and after taking holy orders rose rapidly to the most distinguished offices in the gift of the Church. He was consecrated bishop of New Orleans in 1829, and died September 4, 1833.

Necklace

Picture for Necklace 1

is a word that does not occur in the A.V. of the Bible, but represents a piece of personal ornament anciently, as well as still very commonly, worn by both sexes in Oriental countries. It seems to be specially denoted in Heb. by dybæ*rabid'* (so called from *binding* the neck), a *collar* or ornamental "chain" for the neck (<01442>Genesis 41:42; <26161>Ezekiel 16:11). *SEE CHAIN*. Necklaces, we learn from the Scriptures, were made sometimes of silver and gold, sometimes of a series of jewels, sometimes of

coral (Exodus 35:22; Numbers 31:50). Three necklaces were commonly worn, one reaching lower than the other; from the one that was suspended to the waist there was hung a bottle of perfume, filled with amber and musk, called vpn,yTbx; *bottey' nephesh*, "houses of the soul" (Isaiah 3:20, margin). *SEE ATTIRE*. Among the ancient Egyptians handsome and richly ornamented necklaces were a principal part of the dress, both of men and women; and some idea may be formed of the number of jewels they wore, from those borrowed by the Israelites at the time of the Exodus, and by the paintings of Thebes. They consisted of gold, or of beads of various qualities and shapes, disposed according to fancy, generally with a large drop or figure in the centre. Scarabaei, gold, and carnelian bottles, or the emblems of Goodness and Stability, lotus flowers in enamel, amethysts, pearls, false stones, imitations of fishes, frogs, lions, and various quadrupeds, birds, reptiles, flies, and other insects, shells and leaves, with numerous figures and devices, were strung in all the variety which their taste could suggest; and the museum of Leyden possesses an infinite assortment of those objects, which were once the pride of the ladies of Thebes. Some wore simple gold chains in imitation of string, to which a stone scarabeeus, set in the same precious metal, was appended; but these probably belonged to men, like the *torques* of the Romans. A set of small cups, or covered saucers, of bronze gilt, hanging from a chain of the same materials, were sometimes worn by women, a necklace of which has been found belonging to a Theban lady offering a striking contrast in their simplicity to the gold leaves inlaid with lapis lazuli, red and green stones, of another she wore, which served, with many more in her possession, to excite the admiration of her friends (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 1:339 sq.). The modern Egyptian ladies are equally fond of wearing necklaces, often of the richest description; the Arabic term for them is *ekd*, and the Egyptians have a great variety; but almost all of them are similar in the following particulars:

1. The beads, etc., of which they are composed are, altogether, not more than ten inches in length; so that they would not entirely encircle the neck if tied quite tight, which is never done: the string extends about six or seven inches beyond each extremity of the series of beads; and when the necklace is tied in the usual manner there is generally a space of three inches or more between these extremities; but the plaits of hair conceal these parts of the string.

2. There is generally, in the centre, one bead or other ornament (and sometimes there are three, or five, or seven) differing in size, form, material, or color from the others. The necklaces mostly worn by ladies are of diamonds or pearls. In the annexed engraving (page 910), the first necklace is of diamonds set in gold. The second consists of several strings of pearls, with a pierced flattish emerald in the centre. Most of the pearl necklaces are of this description. The third is called *libbeh.* It is composed of hollow gold beads, with a bead of a different kind (sometimes of a precious stone, and sometimes of coral) in the centre. This and the following are seldom worn by any but females of the middle and lower orders. The fourth is called, from its peculiar form, *sha'ir* (which signifies "barley"). It is composed of hollow gold. We give a side view (A) and a back view (B) of one of the appendages of this necklace. There is also a long kind of necklace, reaching to the girdle, and composed of diamonds or other precious stones, which is called *kilddeh.* Some women form a long necklace of this kind with Venetian sequins, or Turkish or Egyptian gold coins (Lane, *Modern Egyptians,* 2:405). The Arab females of Palestine at the present day are especially given to wearing necklaces composed of strings of gold coin, which are their own property, and cannot be taken even for debt (Thomson, *Land and Book,* 1:185). *SEE ORNAMENT.*

Picture for Necklace 2

Neco'dan

*(*Νεκωδάν, Vulg. *Nechodalcus),* given (1 Esdr. 5:37) as the name of the head of one of the Israelitish families who had lost their pedigree in Babylon; in place of the NEKODA *SEE NEKODA* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra 2:60).

Necrodeipnon

(Gr. νεκρός, *dead,* and δεῖπνον, a *meal)* was the name of a funeral feast among the ancient Greeks. It commonly took place at the house of the nearest relative of the deceased, and was usually attended by all the friends and relatives, it being regarded as a sacred duty to be present on the mournful occasion. *SEE MOURNING.*

Necrology

(from Gr. νεκρός, *dead,* and λόγος, *discourse,* or enumeration) is the name given in the Roman Catholic Church to a book anciently kept in churches and monasteries, wherein were registered the names of benefactors of such establishments, the time of their death, and the days of their commemoration; as also the deaths of the priors, abbots, religious canons, etc. This record was also called *Calendar* and *Obituary.* The name of Necrology was anciently given sometimes to what is now designated generally as *Martyrology* (q.v.). When the diptychs fell into desuetude, necrologies, obituaries, books of the dead, books of annals or anniversaries, and books of life took their place as records in cathedrals and collegiate churches and minsters of the names of the deceased. The Benedictines adopted them at the beginning of the 6th century. When an abbot or distinguished monk died, a messenger, carrying a brief or roll, a kind of encyclical letter, rode to the various associated abbeys or churches to apprise them of his decease, and left a schedule containing his own name and that of the dead, and the date of his arrival. The new name was then inserted in the several obituaries. These were read after the martyrology at prime, but in a monastery after the rule. The names were recited on their several anniversaries, and in the case of a benefactor the *De profundis* and a special prayer were sung. The abbot was commemorated by the words, "The deposition of lord abbot N." All others had the simple affix "obiit," i.e., he died. First were read out the names of abbots, then monks, provosts, precentors, and in succession those of sacristans, bishops, priests, sovereigns, and soldiers. Saints were also included; and for convenience a single volume generally comprised the monastic rule, the martyrology, and obituary. The gifts of benefactors were often recited; but sometimes only a general commemoration of all brethren and familiars of the order was made, followed by the words, "Requiescat in pace" — may he rest in peace — uttered by the president, and closed by an "amen" chanted by the whole chapter. Cowell says that at the prayer of the prothesis the Greeks had their names inserted in the catalogue, and deposited a present in money, which formed a considerable portion of a country priest's income. See Walcott, *Sacred Archceology,* pages 396, 397; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquites Chretiennes,* pages 432, 433; Martene, *De Antiq. Monach. ritib.* volume 1, part 1, chapter 5.

Necromancer

(Heb. µyteMehAla, vrEDo, *one who inquires of the dead;* Sept. ἐπερωτῶν τοὺς νεκρούς*)*. In many ancient nations there were jugglers who professed to be able by incantations to call up the dead from the under world, chiefly to consult them on the mysteries of the present or future. Already in Homer's time this practice had been introduced (see *Odys.* 11:24 sq.); and the belief in such enchantments, notwithstanding the mockery of the better instructed few (Cicero, *Tusc.* 1:16, 37), kept its ground among the common people in pagan lands down to the latest times (comp. Plin. 30:5 sq.; Herodian, 4:12, 8; Dio Cass. 77, 15; Tertullian, *Apol.* 23; *De Anima*, 57). Particular places were commonly supposed to be, as it were, entrances to Orcus *(*νεκυομαντεῖα*)*, where, on invocation, the shades would actually appear; for example, at Lake Aornos in Epirus and Lake Avernus in Lower Italy (Cicero, *Tusc.* ut sup.; Heyne, *Excur.* 2 sq., ad Virg. En. 6); and at Heraclea on the Propontis (Herod. 5:92, 7; Diod. Sic. 4:22; Pausan. 9:30, 3; Plutarch, *Cim.* 6; Strabo, 5:244). The Eastern Magi were especially famed for necromantic skill (Herodian, *lit sup.;* comp. Strabo, 16:762). Necromancy (twbo/a; Talm. µwtmh la wyçrd; see Othonis *Lex. Rabb.* page 171) had also found an entrance among the Israelites, especially when idolaters were on the throne (<122106>2 Kings 21:6; <143306>2 Chronicles 33:6; <230819>Isaiah 8:19; 29:4 comp. 19:3, where the Egyptian enchantments arm mentioned). In the Law the consultation of these men was forbidden as a heathen superstition (<031931>Leviticus 19:31), and they who disobeyed were threatened with death (<032006>Leviticus 20:6; <050811>Deuteronomy 8:11). Saul, in his distress, caused the shade of Samuel to be summoned from Sheol by an enchantress (<092807>1 Samuel 28:7 sq.; comp. J.C Harenburg in *Iken. Nov. Thesaur.* 1:639 sq.; E.F. Schmersahl, *Nat. Erklar. der Gesch. Sauls mit d. Betrugerin zu Endor* [Gera, 1780]; Hensler, *Erlaut. des* 1 *B. Samuel* page 88 sq.; *Exeget. Handbuch. A.T.* 4:251 sq.; Bottcher, *De Inferis*, 1:111 sq.). Dathe believed in the actual appearance of Samuel by a miracle (comp. Doderlein, *Theol. Biblioth.* 3:331); and the conception the people formed of this apparition, which was not essentially altered by the poets and prophets, afforded a very natural basis for such superstitions. To the spirits thus evoked the enchanter lent a low, soft. almost whispering voice (<230819>Isaiah 8:19; comp. 19:3), as seemed natural for such shades; just as the Greeks and Romans also applied the wordsτρίζειν (τρύζειν*; Iliad*, 33:101; *Odys.* 24 sq.; Lulcian, *Menip.* or *Necromant.* 11) and *stridere* (Statius, *Thebais*, 7:24; Claudian, In Rufin.

1:126; Petronius, *Sat.* 122, 17; comp. Virgil, AEn. 3:39 sq.) to the returning manes. It is by no means proved that the necromancers produced this muttering and whispering by ventriloquism, although the Septuagint usually renders the Hebrew bwa by the Greek ἐγγαστρίμυθος (according to Galen, the ἐγγαστρίμυθοι are so called because, speaking with the mouth closed, they seem to speak from the belly; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 6:14, 2). The meaning of the word has been much discussed' (see Thenius, *On* 1 Samuel 28:3; Knobel, *Prophetism. d. Hebr.* 1:241 sq.; Bittcher, *De Inferis,* 1:101 sq.). Ventriloquism was certainly one of the arts of ancient jugglers (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1019 sq. See also Leo Allat. *De Engastrimytho,* also in the *Tractat. Bibl.* of the *Critici Sacri,* 6:331 sq.; Dickinson, *Delph. Phoeniciss.* page 91 sq.; Gesenius, *Comment. on* Isaiah 1:605 sq., 853; Van Dale, *De Idolat.* page 608 sq.; Millii *Dissertat. Sel.* No. 12, also in Ugolini's *Thesaur.* 23; Tjeeuk, in the *Commentat. Societ. Scient. Vlissing.* 1:546 sq.; Potter, *Greek Archeol.* 1:758 sq.; Heyne, *Excurs.* 1, ad Virg. AEn. 6). *SEE DEMON*; *SEE SORCERY*. In most parts of Greece, necromancy was practiced by priests or consecrated persons in the temples; in Thessaly, it was the profession of a distinct class of persons called Psychagogoi ("Evokers of Spirits"). The practice of it in that country was ultimately connected with many horrid rites, in which human blood, half-burned portions of bodies from funeral piles, the immature foetus cut out of the womb, etc., were employed; sometimes human beings were slain, that their spirits might be consulted ere they finally passed into the lower world. The establishment of Christianity under Constantine caused necromancy to be placed under the ban of the Church. There are evident traces of necromancy in some of the older Norse and Teutonic poems. The mediaeval belief in the evocation of spirits belongs rather to sorcery than to necromancy. See Peucer's *Commentarius de precipuis divinationum generibus* (Zerbst, 1591); *N.A. Review,* 80:512. *SEE DIVINATION*; *SEE MAGIC*.

A species of necromancy, called *Rochester knockings,* from Rochester, N.Y., where it originated, and *spirit rappings,* from the *raps* by which' departed spirits are said to give their responses, has recently prevailed extensively in the United States, and produced no small amount of fanaticism and infidelity. See *Brit. Quar. Rev.* October 1875, art. 6. *SEE MESMERISM*; *SEE SPIRITUALISM*

Necropolis

*(*νεκρόπολις*, city of the dead),* a term applied to the cemeteries in the vicinity of ancient cities. It occurs in classical antiquity only as applied to a suburb of Alexandria, lying to the west of that city, having many shops and gardens, and places suitable for the reception of the dead. The corpses were received and embalmed in it. Here Cleopatra, the last of the Ptolemies, applied the asp to her breast, to avoid the ignominy of being led in triumph by Augustus. The site of the necropolis of ancient Alexandria seems to have been where are now the catacombs, consisting of galleries and tombs hollowed out of the soft calcareous stone of which the city is built, and lying at the extremity of the city. *SEE ALEXANDRIA*. The term necropolis is now, however, used in a much more extended sense, and applied to all the cemeteries of the ancient world. These consisted either of tombs constructed in the shape of houses and temples, and arranged in streets, like a city of the dead; or else of chambers hollowed in the rock, and ornamented with fagades, to imitate houses and temples. Such cemeteries are to be distinguished from the *columbaria*, or subterraneous chambers of the Romans, in which their urns were deposited; or the rows of tombs along the Via Appia; or the cemeteries of the Christians, whose bodies were deposited in the ground. *SEE CATACOMBS*. The most remarkable necropolises are at Thebes, in Egypt, situated in a place called Kurneh, on the left bank of the Nile, capable of holding three thousand persons, and which it is calculated must at least have contained five thousand mummies: those of El-Kab, or Eileithyia; of Beni-Hassan, or the Speos Artemidos; and of Madfun, or Abydos; of Siwah, or the Oasis of Ammon. *SEE EGYPT*. In Africa, the necropolis of Cyrene is also extensive; and those of Vulci, Corneto, Tarquinii, and Capua are distinguished — for their painted tombs, *SEE TOMB*, and the numerous vases and other objects of ancient art which have been exhumed from them. Large necropolises have also been found in Lycia, Sicily, and elsewhere. See Strabo, 18, pages 795-799; Plutarch, *Vit. Anton.;* Letronne, *Journal des Savans* (1828), page 103; Dennis, *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria,* 1:412; 2:276-358. *SEE CEMETERY*.

In this connection we may notice that consorting or living with the dead has been observed as a characteristic of diseased melancholy. Individuals have inhabited graveyards, preferring the proximity and association of corpses with which they had no tie to the cheerfulness and comforts of home; and there is recorded one notorious case, in which a gentleman,

although on bad terms with his wife while alive, carried her body with him through India, scandalizing the natives, and outraging the feelings of all, by placing the coffin under his bed. This hideous tendency may enter into certain developments of cannibalism, where the feast is celebrated in memory of a departed friend rather than in triumph over a slain foe (Chambers). Among the Arabians the *ghouls* are fairies that are supposed to feed on human flesh. Symptoms of this *necrophilism* may be traced in the Gadarene maniacs of the Gospels (Matthew 7:28, etc.). *SEE DEMONIAC*.

Necrothaptae

(Gr. νεκρός, *dead*, and θάπτω, to *bury)* is one of tile names by which the ancient Greeks called the undertakers at funerals. Among the Romans they were called *Libitinarii,* from the goddess *Libitina,* who presided over funerals (Livy, 40, c. 19; Plutarch, *Quaest. Roman.).*

Nectar

was the drink of the immortal gods, according to the early Greek poets, and was served around to them by the hands of *Hebe* or *Ganymede.* It is confounded by some of the ancient writers with ambrosia, the food of the gods. Thus Sappho and Alcman make nectar the food of the gods, and ambrosia their drink. But nectar is the name given by Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and the Greek poets generally, and by the Romans, to the beverage of the gods. Homer describes nectar as resembling red wine, and represents its continued use as causing immortality. By the later poets, nectar and ambrosia are represented as of most delicious odor; and sprinkling with nectar, or anointing with ambrosia, is spoken of as conferring perpetual youth, and these acts are assumed as the symbols of everything most delightful to the taste.

Nectaria

is the name of a celebrated deaconess in the early Christian Church. She flourished in the latter half of the 4th century, and was the cause of the deposition of a certain Elpidius by the synod of Rimini, as he had ordained her for an office of which she proved herself unworthy by breaches of confidence and perjury. See Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* book 4, chapter 24.

Nectarius

is the name of two patriarchs of the Eastern Church who figure prominently in ecclesiastical history.

1. The first, who is most widely known, was a native of Tarsus, and with the assistance of the emperor Theodosius became patriarch of Constantinople after the deposition of Gregory (q.v.) Nazianzen, and immediately before Chrysostom. Nectarius's occupancy of the episcopal chair between two such men would have required extraordinary merit to make him conspicuous. But, in truth, though he does not seem to merit the epithet applied to him by Gibbon; "the indolent Nectarius," the fact of his having been appointed at all is the most remarkable feature in his personal history. When Gregory Nazianzen (q.v.) resigned his office (A.D. 381), it was during the meeting of the second cecumenical council at Constantinople. Nectarius, a senator and a man of the highest family, was at this time intending to visit his native place, and previously waited on Diodorus, the bishop of Tarsus, who was in Constantinople as a member of the council. Diodorus, along with the other bishops, was perplexed as to whom they should nominate to the vacant see. Struck by the majestic appearance and white hair of Nectarius, and taking for granted that he was a Christian and had been baptized, Diodorus requested Nectarius to postpone his departure, and recommended him to Flavian, bishop of Antioch, as a fit person to succeed Gregory. Flavian laughed at the strange proposal; but, to oblige his friend, put Nectarius's name last on the list, and together with the other bishops presented it to the emperor. To the astonishment of all, Theodosius selected Nectarius, and persisted in his choice, even when it was ascertained that this candidate for episcopal honor had not yet been baptized, and had never proposed publicly to join the Church. The bishops at last acceded to the wishes of the monarch who had so rigidly opposed the Arians, while the people, attracted probably by his gentle manners and the venerable appearance of the man, presenting as he did every way a strong contrast to Gregory, loudly applauded the choice. Nectarius was baptized, and, before he had time to put off the white robes of a neophyte, he was declared bishop of Constantinople. Most important matters came under the consideration of the council over which, it is probable, he was now called to preside. He showed his discretion by putting himself under the tuition of Cyriacus, bishop of Adana, but we can hardly believe that Nectarius took any active part in the theological questions which were discussed. It is doubtful whether the canons that

were enacted under the name of the second oecumenical council were not passed at two different sessions, a second taking place in 382. But this does not matter much, as they all bear the name of this council. The principal business transacted in the council, considered in a theological point of view, related to the conforming and extending of the Nicene Creed, mainly to meet the opinions of the Macedonians. The creed thus enlarged is that used at the mass of the Roman Catholic Church. Other canons regulated discipline, the restriction of the authority of each bishop to his own diocese, and the restoration of penitent heretics. The most important article of all, however, historically considered, was one which was conceded not more on account of the natural propriety of the arrangement than the personal favor which the emperor bore to Nectarius. It was decreed that as Constantinople was *New Rome,* the bishop should be next in dignity to the bishop of Rome, and hold the first place among the Eastern prelates. This, which at first was a mere mark of dignity, became a source of substantial power, embroiled Constantinople with, Rome, and was pregnant with all those circumstances "that have marked this important schism. Nectarius was the first who held the dignity of *ex officio* head of Eastern bishops as patriarch of Constantinople. These canons were signed July 9, 381. The zeal of Theodosius in the extirpation of Arianism led to the summoning of a council (not oecumenical) at Constantinople in July, 383. There assembled the chiefs of all the sects. By the advice of Sisinnius, afterwards a Novatian bishop, given through Nectarius, the emperor ensnared his opponents into an approval of the writings of the early fathers. He then required of each sect a confession of its faith, which, having read and considered, he condemned them all, and followed up this condemnation by the most stringent laws, for the purpose of entirely rooting them out. As might have been expected, Nectarius was obnoxious to the Arians; and we find that in 388, while the emperor Theodosius was absent in Italy opposing Maximus, a rumor that had falsely spread of the defeat and death of the prince excited their hopes, and they broke out in riot, in the course of which they set fire to the house of Nectarius. The most important act of his office occurred in 390, when Nectarius, alarmed by the public odium which had been excited by the seduction of a woman of quality by a deacon, abolished the practice of confession which had been introduced into the Eastern Church — a penitential priest *(presbyter poanitentiarus)* having been appointed, whose office it was to receive the confessions of those who had fallen into sin after baptism, and to prescribe for them acts of penitence previously to their being admitted to partake of

the privileges of the Church. The officer of the confessional, while seeking to do his duty, provoked such scandal in the Church that it seemed advisable not to continue an office which was likely to do more harm than good (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:181; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:357, 358). According to Balsamon (Hardouin, *Concil.* 1:955), the last council (not cecumenical) at which Nectarius presided was held in Constantinople in 394, regarding a dispute between Agapius and Bagadius in relation to the bishopric of Bostria, this council deciding that the consent of several bishops of a province is necessary to confirm the deposition of one of their number. Nectarius survived his patron, Theodosius, two years, dying September 27, 397. He seems to have borne his honor meekly, and to have acted with great discretion. In the subtle controversies that agitated the Church we learn that he avoided discussion himself, and was guided by the advice of men better skilled in the puzzling dialectics of the time. If the conjecture of Tillemont *(Histoire Ecclesiastique,* 9:466) be correct, Nectarius was married, and had one son. His brother, Arsatius, succeeded John Chrysostom as patriarch of Constantinople (comp. Fleury, *Histoire Ecclesiastique,* volumes 4 and 5; Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* 5:8, 13; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:8, 9, 14,16; 8:8, c. 23). Nectarius is said to have been the author of a *Homilia in Theodorum martyrem,* which was first published among the discourses of Chrysostom (Paris, 1554), and has since been several times reprinted. The decision of the synod concerning Agapius and Bagadius is contained in Freher's *In Jure Graeco-Romano,* 4:247. See Oudin, *Comment.* 1:686; Tillemont, 9:486; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (ed. Harl.), 9:309; 10:833; 12:390; Cave, *Hist. Literaria,* 1:277; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; *Edinb. Rev.* 1867 (July), page 58.

2. The second Nectarius was patriarch of Jerusalem in the 17th century. Little is known of his history. According to Fabricius, he was born in Crete, educated at Athens under Theophilus Corydales, and while yet a young man entered a convent of Mount Sinai. He succeeded Paisus as patriarch of Jerusalem. A strict partisan of Greek orthodoxy, he opposed both the other parties, and endorsed the Confession of Mogilas in 1662 *(Conf. libr. symb. eccl. Or.* [ed. Kimmel] page 45). During his patriarchate the Romish emissaries were very active in endeavoring to persuade the Greek Christians of Palestine, suffering under the yoke of the Turks, to unite with the Church of Rome; among them a Franciscan, named Peter, was especially active in distributing five tracts in defence of the papal

authority. These tracts Nectarius answered by the publication of another, entitled Κατὰ τ ́ ης ἀρχῆς τοῦ Παππᾶ (Jasii. 1681; Lond. 1702, 8vo), which is a fair refutation of the five principles laid down in the Roman Catholic tracts: 1st, of unity in the primitive Church; 2d, of the harmony of the two principal divisions of the Church in the apostolic time; 3d, of the sole authenticity of the Church of Rome; 4th, of the necessity of the monarchial government of the Church. To the first point Nectarius answers that the union of the Church means the unity between the members of the spiritual Church, which still exists, and this alone constitutes the true Church. To the second, he replies by historical documents showing that, though identical in point of doctrine, the Greek and the Latin churches differed in their form of worship and Church government in the 2d century. To the third, he answers by proving the alteration of the symbols in the Roman Church. Admitting the fourth in principle, he says that the king and head of the Church being Christ, there can be no other head, but naturally an aristocratic organization. He also wrote a work in Greek against the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, which was translated into Latin by Renaudot, who published it, together with Gennadius's *Homilies on the Eucharist*, etc. (Paris, 1709, 4to). Nectarius is said to have also written a history of the Egyptian empire down to sultan Selim. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca* (ed. Harl.), 9:310; Kimmel, 1.c. *Prae.* page 75; *Nic. Commenus in praenott. mystagog. respons.* 6, sec. 2. (J.N.P.)

Necusia

*(*νεκύσια*)*, a name for the offerings among the ancient Greeks and Romans on the anniversary of the day of the death of a relative. According to some the Necusia were the same with the *Genesia.*

Nedabi'ah

(Heb. *Nedabyah',* הָיְבַדְנ, *moved of Jehovah;* Sept. Ναβαδίας v. r. Δενεθεί ; Vulg. *Nadabia),* the eighth and last mentioned of the sons of Jeconiah; a descendant of David, and nephew of Zedekiah, king of Judah (1 Chronicles 3:18). B.C. cir. 560.

Nedarim

SEE TALMUD.

Nedusia

is a surname of *Athene,* derived from the river *Nedon,* on the banks of which she was worshipped. *SEE MINERVA*.

Needham, John

an English dissenting minister who flourished in the first half of the last century, was for some years pastor of the Baptist Church at Hitcham, Suffolk, and afterwards removed to Bristol (in 1746), where he remained until 1787. He is of interest principally as the author of the pleasant harvest hymn, "To praise the ever-bounteous Lord," found in many of our best collections of hymns.

Needham, John Turberville

an English Roman Catholic divine, noted as a scientist, was born in London in 1713, and educated at the College of Douai, where he entered into orders. He removed to the Continent after having attained celebrity as a scientist, and finally became rector of the Academy of Sciences and Belles-lettres at Brussels, where he died in 1781. Mr. Needham wrote observations inserted in Buffon's *Natural History: Inquiries concerning Nature and Religion: — Idee sommaire, ou vue generale du systeme physique et metaphysique sur la generation,* etc. See his life, by abbe Mann, in the memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Brussels; *Lond. Monthly Review,* volume 70, Hutton, *Mathematical and Philos. Dict.* s.v.

Needle

(Gr. ῥαφίς*)* occurs in the Bible only in the proverb "to pass through a needle's eye" *(*τρύφημα*)* (Matthew 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25); for which *SEE CAMEL*. Among the ancient Egyptians some needles were of bronze, from three to three and a half inches in length; but as few have been found, we are not able to form any opinion respecting their general size and quality, particularly of those used for fine work, which must have been of a very minute kind (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2:345). *SEE NEEDLEWORK*. The use of the needle as a female accomplishment may be traced up to the earliest times. It was an art in which the ladies of ancient Egypt particularly excelled, as do their descendants at the present day; and the Hebrew females also no doubt acquired great perfection in it

during their residence in that country, as we read of the embroidery of the sacerdotal robes and curtains of the tabernacle (Exodus 28:39; 26:36); and also of "a prey of divers colors of needlework, of divers colors of needlework on both sides" (Judges 5:30). That the ladies of Assyria and Babylonia also excelled in various kinds of needlework Layard has shown from the recently exhumed monuments of Nineveh (see *Nineveh,* etc., 2:315 sq.). In the British Museum may be seen some needles for sewing, made of bronze, taken from the Egyptian remains; there are likewise some spindles and netting-needles made of wood, nine inches to nine inches and a half in length; and also some skeins of thread, a portion of which is dyed of a reddish color. *SEE EMBROIDERY.*

Needlework

Picture for Needlework 1

occurs in the Auth.Ver. twice (Judges 5:30; Psalm 45:14) as a translation of the Heb. hmqrae *riḳmah',* properly *variegated work* (elsewhere "broidered work"); and also of the cognate µqer, *rokem'* (Exodus 26:36; 27:16; 28:39; 36:37; 38:18), properly an *embroiderer* (as elsewhere rendered). In Exodus the embroiderer is contrasted with the "cunning workman," *chosheb'* (bvex); and the consideration of one of these terms involves that of the other. Various explanations have been offered as to the distinction between them, but most of these overlook the distinction marked in the Bible itself, viz., that the *rokem* wove simply a variegated texture, without gold thread or figures, and that the *chosaheb* interwove gold thread or figures into the variegated texture. We conceive that the use of the gold thread was for delineating figures, as is implied in the description of the corslet of Amasis (Herod. 3:47), and that the notices of gold thread in some instances and of figures in others were but different methods of describing the same thing. It follows, then, that the application of the term "embroiderer" to *rokem* is false; if it belong to either it is to *chosheb,* or the "cunning workman," who added the figures. But if *"embroidery"* be strictly confined to the work of the *needle,* we doubt whether it can be applied to either, for the simple addition of gold thread, or of a figure, does not involve the use of the needle. The patterns may have been worked' into the stuff by the loom, as appears to have been the case in Egypt (Wilkinson, 3:128; comp. Her. 1.c.), where the Hebrews learned the art, and as is stated by Josephus (ἄνθη ἐνύφαντται, *Ant.* 3:7,

2). The distinction, as given by the Talmudists, and which has been adopted by Gesenius *(Thesaur.* page 1311) and Bahr *(Symbolik,* 1:266), is this, that *rikmah,* or "needlework," was where a pattern was attached to the stuff by being sewn to it on *one* side, and the work of the *chosheb* when the pattern was worked into the stuff by the loom, and so appeared on *both* sides. This view appears to be entirely inconsistent with the statements of the Bible, and with the sense of the word *rikmah* elsewhere. The absence of the figure or the gold thread in the one, and its presence in the other, constitutes the essence of the distinction. In support of this view we call attention to the passages in which the expressions are contrasted. *Rikmah* consisted of the following materials, "blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen" (Exodus 26:36; 27:16; 36:37; 38:18; 39:28). The work of the *chosheb* was either " fine twined linen, blue, purple, and *scarlet, with cherubims"* (Exodus 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35), or *"gold,* blue, purple, scarlet. and fine twined linen" (Exodus 28:6, 8, 15; 39:2, 5, 8). Again, looking at the general sense of the words, we shall find that *chosheb* involves the idea of invention, or *designing* patterns; *rikmah,* the idea of *texture* as well as *variegated color.* The former is applied to other arts which demanded the exercise of inventive genius, as in the construction of engines of war (2 Chronicles 26:15); the latter is applied to other substances, the texture of which is remarkable, as the human body (Psalm 139:15). Further than this, *rikmah* involves the idea of a regular disposition of colors, which demanded no inventive genius. Beyond the instances already adduced, it is applied to tessellated pavement (1 Chronicles 29:2), to the eagle's, plumage (Ezekiel 17:3), and, in the Targums, to the leopard's spotted skin (Jeremiah 13:23). In the same sense it is applied to the colored sails of the Egyptian vessels (Ezekiel 27:16), which were either checkered or worked according to a regularly recurring pattern (Wilkinson, 3, 211). Gesenius considers this passage as conclusive for his view of the distinction, but it is hardly conceivable that the patterns were on one side of the sail only, nor does there appear any ground to infer a departure from the usual custom of working the colors by the loom. The ancient versions do not contribute much to the elucidation of the point. The Sept. varies between ποικιλτής and ῥαφιδευτής**,** as representing *rokem,* and ποικιλτής and ὑφαντής for *chosheb,* combining the two terms in each case for the work itself — ') ἡ ποικιλία τοῦ ῥαφιδευτοῦ for the first, ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ποικιλτόν for the second. The distinction, as far as it is observed, consisted in the one being *needle-work* and the other *loom-work.* The Vulgate gives *generally plumarius* for the first, and

polymitarius for the second; but in Exodus 26:1, 31 *plumarius* is used for the second. The first of these terms *(plumarius)* is well chosen to express *rokem*, but *polymitarius*, i.e., a weaver who works together threads of divers colors, is as applicable to one as to the other. The rendering in Ezekiel 27:16, *scutulata*, i.e., "checkered," correctly describes one of the productions of the *rokem*. We have lastly to notice the incorrect rendering of the word /bv; in the A.V. "broider," "embroider" (Exodus 28:4, 39). It means stuff worked in a *tessellated* manner, i.e., with square cavities such as stones might be set in (comp. verse 20). The art of embroidery by the loom was extensively practiced among the nations of antiquity. In addition to the Egyptians, the Babylonians were celebrated for it, but embroidery in the proper sense of the term, i.e., with the needle, was a Phrygian invention of later date (Pliny, 8:48). There are three words for *"weaver"* employed in the descriptions of textures used in the tabernacle and the garments of the priest: 1. grea, *oreg*, the simpler *weaver*, who wrought in one color, even though that color were blue (Judges 16:13; Isaiah 59:5; Exodus 28:32; 39:22, 27); 2. µqer, *rokem*, the *color-weaver*, who wrought in textures of at least three colors, as he wove cloth made of blue, purple, and scarlet threads, and twined linen (Exodus 26:36; 27:16; 28:39; 39:29); 3. bvj, *chosheb*, the *embroiderer*, who wrought in the same colors and materials as the color-weaver or *rokem*, but always with an additional thread, producing figures (Exodus 26:1, 31; 28:6, 8, 15; 29:3) (Paine, *Temple of Solomon*, page 12). See *Art of Needlework from the Earliest Ages*, by the countess of Wilton (Lond. 1840). *SEE EMBROIDER*; *SEE WEAVE*.

Picture for Needlework 2

Neef (or Neefs), James

a Flemish engraver who devoted himself mostly to sacred and secular art, was born at Antwerp, according to Nagler, about 1610. There are various dates assigned for his birth, but Nagler is probably correct, as there are prints by Neef extant dated 1632 and 1633. His last print recorded is dated 1645. He engraved a number of plates after Rubens, Vandyck, and other celebrated Flemish painters. His drawing is correct, but stiff and mannered, and his heads often have an extravagant expression; but his prints are much esteemed. They are executed entirely with the graver, which he handled with great facility. Among his works are, *The Fall of the Angels: — The*

Meeting of Abraham and Melchisedec: — The Crucifixion, with the Virgin and St. John: — St. Augustine: — The Martyrdom of St. Thomas: — The Judgment of Paris: — The Triumph of Galatea (all these are after Rubens): — *Christ and his Six Penitents: — Job and his Wife: — The Martyrdom of St. Lievin: — Christ's offering to Magdalen* (all these after Gerard Segers): — *Christ brought before Pilate,* after J. Jordaens: — St. *Roch interceding for the Persons attacked by the Plague,* after Erasmus Quellinus.

Neef, Jean

a Belgian ascetic writer. was born at Mechlin in 1576. He belonged to the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, in which he filled the office of prior. In 1625 he was appointed provincial for Flanders and Cologne. He died at Mechlin, June 28, 1656. His works are, *Vita sancte Monica* (Antwerp, 1628):*Horologium monasticc perfectionis* (Louvain, 1630): — *De tertiariis ordinis Sancti Augustini* (Antwerp, 1632): — *Eremus Augustiniana foribus honoris et sanctitatis vermans* (Louvain, 1638, 4to), in which is found the life of St. Augustine, and a great number of notices of the remarkable personages of his order: — Le *Nouveau Testament,* in Flemish. See Andre, *Bibl. Belgica,* 2:700.

Neefs, Peter

called *the Old,* an eminent Flemish painter who mostly confined himself to the cultivation of ecclesiastical art, was born at Antwerp in 1570. He was a disciple of the elder Henry Steenwyck, whose manner he closely imitated. He painted views of churches and convents, especially interiors, preferring those in the Gothic style of architecture. He possessed a profound knowledge of perspective, and represented his subjects, with all their rich ornaments and every architectural member, with strict truth, and yet without betraying the appearance of anxious labor. Every object is marked with minute precision, and finished with an exquisite touch and a light pencil. His bright, clear pictures, in which he avoided the darkish brown coloring sometimes observable in the works of his master Steenwyck, are the most esteemed. Being an indifferent designer of figures, he often got F. Francks, Van Thulden, Velvet Breughel, or Teniers to paint the figures; those of the two last greatly enhance the value of the pictures of Neefs. He died in 1651. His son, Peter Martin (called *the Young),* painted in the same

style, and chose the same subjects as his father, but was by no means equal to him.

Neely, Philip P.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford County, Tennessee, September 9, 1819. He was converted in 1836, and in 1837 joined the Tennessee Conference, and was appointed junior preacher on Jackson Circuit, West Tennessee. On the division of the conference he became a member of the Memphis Conference, and was stationed at Holly Springs, Mississippi, in 1841. During the two years following he was stationed in Huntsville, Alabama; in 1844 was appointed president of the Columbia Female College; in 1846 travelled as agent of the Transylvania University. In 1848 he was transferred to the Alabama Conference, and labored in its boundaries until his death at Mobile, Alabama, November 9, 1868. See *Min. Am. Conf. M.E. Church, South*, page 233.

Neemi'as

*(*Νεεμίας v.r. Νεμουσί*)*, the Grsecised form (Ecclus. 49:13; 2 Macc. 1:18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 36; 2:13) of the name of NEHEMIAH *SEE NEHEMIAH* (q.v.).

Neercassel, Jan Van

an eminent Dutch prelate, was born at Gorkum in 1623, and after a thorough education entered into holy orders. He joined the congregation of the Oratory, taught theology at Mechlin and at Cologne, then was nominated archdeacon of Utrecht, and finally, in 1661, was elevated to the bishopric of that city under the title of Bishop of Castoria. In 1663 he became the only bishop of the five hundred thousand Catholics scattered throughout Holland, and governed his vast diocese with such great solicitude that he succeeded in re-establishing ecclesiastical discipline. Neercassel enjoyed the greatest consideration even among Protestants. He was in correspondence with eminent scholars and divines, among these Bossuet, who highly esteemed Neercassel's writings. He died at Zwolle in 1686. Bishop Neercassel was in sympathy with the French Jansenists, and several of them, among others Dr. Arnauld himself, found in his episcopate a refuge. Neercassel himself remained in peace with Rome; but the successor he had pointed out was not chosen on account of the

interference of the Jesuits, who feared that M. van Heussen might prove a schismatic, and finally Coddes, one of the three whom the Society of Jesus proposed to the papal see, was elevated. We have of Neercassel's works, *De Sanctorum et prcecipue B. Marice cultu* (Utrecht. 1675, 8vo), translated into French by abbe Le Roy (Paris, 1679, 8vo): — *Tractatus de lectione Scriptur arum, in quo Protestantium eas legendi praxis refellitu;, Catholicorum vero stabilitur* (Emmerich, 1677, 8vo), translated into French (Cologne, 1680, 8vo): — *Amor penitens, sen de recto usu Clavium* (Emmerich, 1683, 12mo); in a new edition, given the following year, the author suppressed the propositions which had displeased at Rome; the *Amor poenitens* was translated into French (Utrecht, 1741, 3 volumes, 12mo). See Du Pin, *Les Auteurs Ecclisidstiques* 17me *Cent.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.; Tregelles, *The Jansenists* (Lond. 1861, 12mo), page 54, 55. (J.H.W.)

Neesing

(an obsolete word for *sneezing)* is found only in <18410>Job 41:10, as a rendering of hv;yfe[}, *atishah'* (which occurs only there), from an otherwise unused root signifying *to sneeze* (q.v.).

Nefasti, Dies

i.e., *unlawful days,* a term among the ancient Romans for those days on which neither courts of justice nor the assemblies of people could be held; afterwards they were dedicated chiefly to the worship of the gods. Numa PompiIius is said to have been the originator of the *dies nefasti.*

Neff, Felix

a philanthropic Swiss Protestant divine. was born in 1798 at a small village near Geneva. While yet a youth he enlisted as a soldier in the Genevese service, where his excellent conduct and superior qualifications soon procured him advancement. But he became obnoxious to his brother-officers by the unbending principles and the high-toned purity of his life, the result of the careful teachings of his widowed and pious mother. He was advised to leave the army for the pulpit, and finally resolving to follow this advice, he resigned his commission in 1819. He now offered himself for the work of a catechist or parish missionary, and labored for two years in that capacity in several of the Swiss cantons, and afterwards for six months at Grenoble. But when he desired to be ordained, he found that

religious scruples prevented his connecting himself with the Established Church of Geneva, while from his being a foreigner he could not hope to receive ordination through the Protestant Church of France. He was therefore advised to repair to England, where he was ordained, May 19, 1823, in Mr. Clayton's chapel in the Poultry; and a few days afterwards left London to return to the scene of his former labors at Mens. However gratifying his reception among that attached people, his benevolent mind fixed on another place, in a wild and sequestered portion of the High Alps, as more urgently in need of his services. The consistory of the Protestant churches permitting, he entered on his pastoral charge in 1824. Thus this devoted minister, who might have enjoyed comfort and leisure in the beautiful and fertile vales of Languedoc, chose to settle in a poor and wildly extending Alpine district, comprising not less than seventeen isolated villages within a circuit of eighty miles. There was one part of his parish, the Val Fressinibre, where the inhabitants were so low socially, as well as uncivilized in the most common arts of life, as to be scarcely removed in many respects above the condition of barbarism. Neff perceived that his first step must be to supply the want of education, and, unable to pay a teacher, he joined the duties of a schoolmaster to those he already bore. Having at length succeeded in interesting the people in his efforts, he induced them to build. a school-house, he directing the workmen, and acting at once as architect and mason. But such excessive labor exhausted his constitution, and he died April 12, 1829, leaving a name entitled to be ranked among the best benefactors of his fellow-creatures. See Gilly, *Memoirs of Neff; and of his Labors among the French Protestants of Dauphine, a Remnant of the Primitive Christians of Gaul* (Lond. 1832, 8vo); Bost, *Life of Felix* Neff (Lond. 1855) ; Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Relig. Biog.* page 349; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2166; *The London Quarterly Review,* April 1833. (J.N.P.)

Negaim

SEE TALMUD.

Negation

is in philosophical parlance the absence of that which does not naturally belong to the thing we are speaking of, or which has no right, obligation, or necessity to be present with; as when we say a stone is inanimate or blind or deaf, i.e., has no life, sight, or hearing (Watts, *Logic,* part 1,

chapter 2, § 6). According to the scholastic theologian, Thomas Aquinas *(Summa theolog.* part 1, qu. 48, art. 5), "simple *negation* denies to a thing some certain realities which do not belong to the nature of the same. *Privation,* on the contrary, is deficiency in some reality which belongs to the nature of the being." *SEE PRIVATION*. In simple apprehension there is no affirmation or denial; so that, strictly speaking, there are no negative ideas, notions, or conceptions. In truth, some that are so called represent the most positive nullities; as infinity, immortality, etc. But in some ideas, as in that of blindness, deafness, insensibility, there is, as it were, a taking away of something from the object of which these ideas are entertained. This is, however, privation (στέρησις) rather than negation *(*ἀπόφασις*)*, and in general it may be said that *negation* implies some anterior conception of the objects of which the negation is made. Absolute negation is impossible. We have no idea of nothing — it is but a word. "*Nihilum,* or *nothing,"* says Clarke, "is that of which everything can truly be denied, and nothing can be truly affirmed. So that the idea of *nothing* (if I may so speak) is absolutely the negation of all ideas. The idea, therefore, either of a finite or infinite *nothing* is a contradiction in terms" *(Answer to Seventh Letter). Nothing,* taken *positively,* is what does not but may exist, as a river of milk; taken *negatively,* it is that which does not and cannot exist, as a square circle, a mountain without a valley. Nothing positively is *ens potentiale.* Nothing negatively is *non ens.* See Krauth's Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philos.* pages 345, 346.

Negeb

SEE SOUTH COUNTRY.

Neges

(or more commonly CANUSIS) is tie name of an order of Japanese monks or secular priests who officiate in the *mias* or temples. They are either maintained by the endowment money of the mia to which they may happen to belong, or by a pension from the Dairi; but their principal support is derived from the voluntary contributions of the devotees. The Canusis wear, as a badge of their office, either a white or yellow robe over their ordinary dress. Their cap, which is made in the shape of a boat, is tied under the chin with silken strings. Upon this cap are tassels with fringes to them, which are longer or shorter according to the rank of the person who wears them. Their beards are close shaven, but their hair is very long; the

superiors, however, wear it curled up under a piece of black gauze. At each ear is a long piece of silk, which comes forward over the lower part of the face. The order of the Canusis depends, with respect to spiritual concerns, on the decision of the Dairi, and with regard to temporal matters they are subject, like all other ecclesiastics, to the authority of the judge of the temple, who is appointed by the secular monarch. The superiors of the Canusis are remarkable for their pride and contempt of the common people. They are to be seen scattered throughout all the provinces and cities of the empire. The leading monks reside at Miaco; but, though invested with great authority and influence over the people, they are always subject to the imperial authority, which punishes ecclesiastical delinquents with death. The Canusis, in their discourse to the people, dwell chiefly on points of morality. They preach from a rostrum or pulpit, and alongside of them is placed the tutelar idol of the sect or order to which they belong, and to this the devotees present their free-will offerings. On each side of the pulpit there is a lighted lamp suspended from the canopy, and a little below it is a desk or pen for the younger priests, where some of them sit and others stand. The preacher wears a hat upon his head shaped like an umbrella, and holds a fan in his hand. Before commencing his sermon he appears to meditate for a little, then rings a small bell by way of enjoining silence upon his audience; and after quiet is obtained he opens a book which lies upon a cushion before him, containing the moral precepts and fundamental principles of the religion of his sect. Having chosen his text, he delivers his discourse, which is usually clear and vigorous in its language, and strictly methodical in its arrangement. The peroration very often consists of a high-flown eulogium upon the order to which the preacher belongs. The audience are called upon, by the ringing of a little bell, to kneel down and say their prayers, sometimes before and sometimes after the sermon. On certain days set apart for the dead, the Japanese priests, as well as monks, sing the Namanda to the sound of little bells for the repose of their deceased friends. See Macfarlane, *Japan* (Lond. 1852, 8vo), book 4.

Neg'inah

properly NEGINATH (_tnyginæ], *neginath')*, occurs in the title of Psalm 61, "to the chief musician upon Neginah." If the present reading be correct, the form of the word may be compared with that of Mahalath (Psalm 53). But the Sept. *(*ἐν ὕμνοις*)* and Vulg. *(in hymnis)* evidently read "Neginoth" in

the plural, which occurs in the titles of five Psalms, and is perhaps the true reading. Whether the word be singular or plural, it is the general term by which all stringed instruments are described (Smith). In the singular it has the derived sense of the *music of stringed instruments* (<091616>1 Samuel 16:16; <233820>Isaiah 38:20); and of *songs to be accompanied with stringed instruments* (<197707>Psalm 77:7), especially a *song of derision* (<183009>Job 30:9). *SEE NEGINOTH*.

Neg'inoth

(twoyngæ]; *neginoth' songs* with instrumental accompaniment, *SEE NEGINAH*; Sept. ὕμνοι*;* Vulg. *hymni)* is found in the titles of Psalm 4, 6, 54, 55, 67, 76, and the margin of <350319>Habakkuk 3:19 (text "stringed instruments"), and there seems but little doubt that it is the general term denoting all stringed instruments whatsoever, whether played with the hand, like the harp and guitar, or with a plectrum. It thus includes all those instruments which in the A.V. are denoted by the special terms "harp," "psaltery" or "viol," "sackbut," as well as by the general descriptions "stringed instruments" (<19F004>Psalm 150:4), "instruments of music" (<091806>1 Samuel 18:6), or, as the margin gives it, "three-stringed instruments," and the *"instrument* of ten strings" (<193302>Psalm 33:2; 92:3; 144:9). "The chief musician on *Neginoth"* was therefore the conductor of that portion of the Temple choir who played upon the stringed instruments, and who are mentioned in <196825>Psalm 68:25 (µyngæ]o, *nogenim).* The root (ˆGæne = κρούειν*)* from which the word is derived occurs in <091616>1 Samuel 16:16, 17, 18, 23; 18:10; 19:9; <233820>Isaiah 38:20, and a comparison of these passages confirms what has been said with regard to its meaning. The author of the *Shilte Haggibborimn,* quoted by Kircher *(Musurgia,* 1:4, page 48), describes the Neginoth as instruments of wood, long and round, pierced with several apertures, and having three strings of gut stretched across them, which were played with a bow of horsehair. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether the Hebrews were acquainted with anything so closely resembling the modern violin. *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*; *SEE PSALMS*.

Nego

SEE ABED-NEGO.

Negombo, Negosi, and Nepindi

are the names by which the African negroes of Congo, Angola, etc., designate three of their priests.

1. The *Negombo* is looked upon both as a priest and a prophet. He not only professes to foretell future events, but he ascribes to himself likewise an innate virtue of healing all manner of diseases. He is always sufficiently provided with a vast variety of medicaments, the virtues whereof are so deeply impressed on the minds of the negroes that the failure of Negombo's prescriptions is always imputed to the patient.

2. The *Negosi* must take to himself eleven wives, and, as is usual among African tribes, he also acts the part of a magician. When any native meditates revenge upon an enemy, he applies to the Negosi, who cuts off some locks of his hair, and, binding them together, throws them into the fire, uttering all the while various imprecations on the enemy, and all his possessions and kin.

3. The *Nepindi* styles himself master of the elements, and pretends to control thunder, lightning, and storms. To manifest his power, he raises large heaps of earth contiguous to his habitation. After he has finished the usual sacrifices and magical operations, a little animal, they say, creeps out from the foot of one of these, which raises itself by slow degrees, and at last takes its flight towards the heavens. Then thick clouds darken the skies, and thunder, lightning, and rain immediately ensues. See Cavazzi, *Ittor. descrizione de Congo*, etc.

Negores

a religious sect in Japan, which derives its origin from Cambodoxi, a disciple of Xeaca. The sect consists of three classes. The first, who are less numerous than the others, devote themselves to the worship of the gods and the performance of religious ceremonies; the second employ themselves in military affairs, and the third in the preparation of weapons of war. The Negores, as a body, are so numerous and influential that the emperor finds it necessary to secure their favor. They are scrupulously careful about the lives of inferior animals, but their quarrels with each other often end in bloodshed. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, 2:524; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Histor. Sacra*, 2, s.v.

Negosi

SEE NEGOMBO.

Negri (or Negro), Francesco

an Italian Reformer noted for his philological attainments, was born of a noble and ancient family in Bassano, in the Venetian territory, in 1500. Gifted with an active and penetrating mind, he became an excellent student. He entered the Order of Benedictines. The principles of the Reformation preached in Germany and Switzerland penetrating Italy at this time, Negri came forward as one of the first to adopt the new doctrines, and promptly abandoning his order, he went to Germany, joined Zwingliand accompanied the great Swiss Reformer to the conferences of Marburg in 1529, and assisted at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. Negri defended with eloquence the famous Protestant profession of faith known under the name of the Confession of Augsburg, He afterwards returned to Italy; but that country offering no security to the preachers of the Reformed doctrines, he went back to Germany. He stopped some time at Strasburg, then at Geneva, and finally settled at Chiavenna, a small village of the Grisons, where he married, and became the teacher of a school. His small salary scarcely sufficed to support his family. It appears that he attempted to better his position by going again to Geneva; but he was not more fortunate than before, and he returned to Chiavenna, where he died some time posterior to 1559. In his last years Negri departed from the theological platform of his old teachers, Luther and Zwingli, and embraced Socinianism. We have of his works, *Turcicarum rerum commentarius* (Paris, 1538, 8vo), translated by Paul Giovo: — *Rudimenta grammaticae, ex auctoribus collecta* (Milan, 1541), reprinted under the title of *Canones gramnaticales* (Peschiaro, 1555, 8vo): — *Ovidii Metamorphosis in epitomen Phalencis verasibus redacta* (Zurich, 1542; Basle, 1544): — *Traygdia de libero arbitio* (Geneva, 1546, 4to, and 1550, with additions). This singular dramatic allegory upon one of the most disputed questions between the Catholics and the Reformers is rare and recherche; the denouement of the piece is the triumph of Justifying Grace over king Free-Will, who is beheaded, and over the pope, who is recognised as Antichrist. The drama was translated into French under the title *La tragedie du roi Franc-Arbitre* (Villefranche [Geneva], 1559, 8vo). We also have of Negri's works, *De Fanini Faventini ac Dominici Bassanensis morte, qui nuper ob Christum in Italia Romani pontificis jussu impie occisi sunt, brevis*

historia (Chiavenna, 1550, 8vo), one of his rarest and most curious books: — *Historia Francisci Spierae civitatulani qui quod susceptam semel Evangelicae veritatis professionem abnegasset, in horrendum incidit desperationem* (Tiibingen, 1555, 8vo). See Roberti, *Notizie storico-critiche della vita e delle opere di Franc. Negri, apostata Bassanese del secolo xvi* (Bassano, 1839, 4to); *Dizionario istorico* (ed. De Bassano); Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire* (Index); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 27:618, 619. (J.H.W.)

Negri, Girolamo

an Italian humanist, was born at Venice in 1494. After having been vicar of the bishops of Belluno and Vicenza, he became secretary of cardinal Cornaro, and later of cardinal Contarini. Negri obtained afterwards a canonicate at Padua. He died at Padua in 1577. According to the judgment of Sadolet, he wrote Latin with purity and great elegance. We have of his works, *Epistolae et Orationes* (Padua, 1579, 4to, and Rome, 1767). At the head of this last edition is found a biography of Negri, written by abbe Costanzi. See Foscarini, *Storia della letteratura Veneziana.*

Negri, Salomon

(Arabic, *Soleyman Alsadi),* a Greek philosopher, was born at Damascus in the latter part of the 17th century. Instructed by the Jesuit missionaries in the Greek and Latin languages, he came to Paris, and continued his studies at the Sorbonne. He afterwards went to London, and in 1701 to Halle, where he remained four years, giving lessons in Arabic, among others to the celebrated Michaelis. The climate of Germany being injurious to his health, he went to Italy, and afterwards established himself at Constantinople, where he was ordained priest of the Greek Church. The war brought him again to Italy. He sought, but without success, to found at Venice, and later at Rome, a school where he would have taught Arabic, Syriac, and Turkish. He then returned to Halle, where he again passed sixteen months; and finally settled in London, and there obtained employment as interpreter of the Oriental languages. He died there in 1729. Negri has given Arabic translations of the *Psalms* and the *New Testament,* published under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The *Psalms* appeared in 1725 (8vo); the *New Testament* in 1727 (4to). These two versions have been severely criticised by Reiske (see Baumgarten, *Nachrichten von merkwiirdigen Biichern,* 3:283). We have likewise a Latin

translation of the *Vie de Gabriel Bachtishusia* (in the *Opera* of Freind). Lastly, he has published in the *Freiwilliges Hebeopfer* a *Conversation* which he had in Constantinopie with a Turkish mollah. See *Memoria Negriana* (Halle, 1764, 4to); Rotermund, *Supplement* to Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon,* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 37:616.

Negri, Virginia-Angelica-Paula-Antonia

an Italian nun, was born in 1508 at Milan. She early left the world to enter the new monastery of the Angelicas of St. Paul, to the foundation of which she had contributed, and became teacher of the novices. Full of zeal for the propagation of her faith, she travelled over Vicenza, Udine, Padua, Verona, Brescia, preaching everywhere repentance and purity of life. The sick and the poor also became the object of her care, and several hospitals owe their foundation to her. Among the number of conversions that she made, we mention that of Alphonse, marquis of Guaste, governor of the Milanese, whom she comforted by religious counsels on his death-bed. Many of her converts entered the congregation of the Clercs of St. Paul. Calumny did not spare her; and her enemies, seeking to prove her a visionary, found the means to immure her in the convent of the Clarissas. John of Salazar. an Italian prelate, then archbishop of Luciano, was named to examine her conduct, and recognised the falsity of the accusations. A woman of superior mind, she wrote well. She was well versed in Latin. She died at Milan April 4, 1555. We have of her works, *Lettere spirituali della devotae ieligiosa Angelica Paula Antonia de Negri* (Venice, 1547, 4to; Milan, 1563, 8vo). Another edition, published at Rome (1576, 12mo), is preceded by the life of Virginia Negri by J.B. Fontana de Conti. The spiritual letters, to the number of seventy-two, are divided into three parts, and for unction and piety offer some resemblance to those of Saint Catharine of Sienna. There is also attributed to Negri, *Esercizio particolare d'una serva del Signore* (Brescia, 1577, 12mo). See *Biblioth. mediol. scriptorum,* 2:993; Arisi, *Cremona litterata;* Augustinus, *Ab Ecclesia, Teatro delle done letterate,* page 271.

Negrillos or Negritos

Picture for Negrillos

(Spanish, diminutive of *Negroes)* is the name given by the Spaniards to certain Negro-like tribes inhabiting the interior of some of the Philippine Islands, and differing essentially both in features and manners from the

Malay inhabitants of the Eastern archipelago. Among the planters and villagers of the plains they bear the name of *Itas or Ajetas* (pronounced *Abetus).* They are also called by the Spaniards *Negritos del Monte,* from their inhabiting the mountainous districts for the most part; and one of the islands where they are most numerous bears the name of *Isla de los Negros.* These Negritos are also known by the names *Aeta, Aigta, Ite, Inapta,* and *Igolote* or *Igorote.* They bear a very strong resemblance to the Negroes of Guinea, but are much smaller in size, averaging in height not more than four feet eight inches, whence their appellation. They are described as a short, small, but well-made and active people, the lower part of the face projecting like that of the African Negroes, the hair either woolly or frizzled, and the complexion exceedingly dark, but not quite so black as that of the Negroes. The Spaniards describe them as small, more slightly built, less black, and less ugly than the Negroes — *Menos Negros y menos feos.* All writers concur in speaking of them as sunk in the lowest depths of savagedom, wandering in the woods and mountains, without any fixed dwellings, and with only a strip of bark to cover their nakedness; sleeping in the branches of the trees, or among the ashes of the fires at which they had cooked their food. Their only weapons are the bow and arrow; and they live upon roots, wild fruits, and any sort of animals that they can surprise in their haunts or conquer in the chase. By the Malays they are despised and hated; and the buffalo-hunters in the woods, when they meet with them, do not scruple to shoot them down like wild beasts or game. "It has not come to my knowledge," says Mallat, "that a family of these Negroes ever took up their abode in a village. If the Mohammedan inhabitants make slaves of them, they will rather submit to be beaten to death than undergo any bodily fatigue; and it is impossible, either by force or persuasion, to bring them to labor... Prompted by an irresistible instinct to return to the place of their birth, they prefer a savage life to all the charms of civilization. It has occurred that individuals, who have taken Negritos during their infancy, and made sacrifices to give them an education, have found themselves suddenly abandoned by them" (2:95). The same writer, an ecclesiastic, speaks of them as gentle and inoffensive in their manners, whenever he himself came in contact with them; and although informed that some of them were cannibals, he was not inclined to believe the report. Dr. Carl Scherzer, the historian of the circumnavigation of the *Novara,* when at Manilla, had an opportunity of seeing a Negrita girl whom he thus describes: "This was a girl of about twelve or fourteen years of age, of dwarf-like figure, with woolly hair,

broad nostrils, but without the dark skin and wide everted lips which characterize the Negro type. This pleasing-looking, symmetrically-formed girl had been brought up in the house of a Spaniard, apparently with the pious object of rescuing her soul from heathenism. The poor little Negrilla hardly understood her own mother-tongue, besides a very little Tagal, so that we had considerable difficulty in understanding each other." According to Spanish statements, the Negritos are found only in five of the Philippine Islands, viz. Luzon, Mindoro, Panay, Negros, and Mindanao, and are estimated at about 25,000 souls. A few exist, however, in the interior of some of the other islands in the Eastern archipelago; and they are scattered also, though in small numbers, through certain islands of Polynesia. They are altogether an island people, and are hence treated of by Prichard under the designation of Pelagian Negroes. By Dr. Pickering they are regarded as a distinct race, resembling the Papuan, but differing from it in the diminutive stature, the general absence of a beard, the projecting of the lower part of the face or the inclined profile, and the exaggerated Negro features. The hair, also, is more woolly than that of the Papuans, though far from equalling that of the Negroes in knotty closeness. By Latham the Negritos are classified under the subdivision of "Oceanic Mongolidae, C," which subdivision is further modified by him into the designation of "Amphinesians" and "Kelaenonesians." Muller, in his *Allgemeine Ethnographie* (Vienna, 1873), classifies them among the Papuans of the pure type, but Wallace considers them a totally distinct race, and, connecting them with the inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, in the Bay of Bengal, is of opinion that they are probably of Asiatic rather than of Polynesian origin; and Peschel, in his *Volkerkunde* (2d ed. Leipsic, 1875), prefers to call them Asiatic Papuans, in distinction from Australian Papuans. The Negritos out of the Philippine Islands are found for the most part in the islands embraced under the latter designation, as New Guinea, New Ireland, Solomon's Isles, Louisiade, New Caledonia, and Tasmania or Van Diemen's Land. Except in the last-mentioned island, however, the Negritos, strictly speaking — that is, the blackish people with woolly hair — do not preponderate over the other native tribes less strongly marked with Negro features; while in Tasmania itself the race has almost entirely disappeared, amounting at present to not more than two or three dozen souls. Dr. Pickering is of opinion that "the Negrito race once occupied more space than it does at this time, and that it has in many instances preceded the dissemination of other races." We conclude with a description of a Negrito native of Erromango (the island where the missionary

Williams was murdered), supplied to Dr. Pickering by Horatio Hales, his associate in the United States exploring expedition. "He was about five feet high," says Mr. Hales, "slender and long limbed; he had close woolly hair, and retreating arched forehead, short and scanty eyebrows, and small snub nose, thick lips (especially the upper), a retreating chin, and that projection of the jaws and lower part of the face which is one of the distinctive characteristics of the Negro race... Placed in a crowd of African blacks, there was nothing about him by which he could have been distinguished from the rest."

The Negritos have no religion, and adore no star. It appears, however, that they have transmitted to the Sanguianes (a brown race inhabiting the neighborhood), or have learned from the latter, the practice of worshipping for a day a rock or the trunk of a tree in which they find a resemblance to some animal or other. Then they leave it, and think no more about idols until they meet with some other fantastical form, which becomes a new object of an equally frivolous worship. Living in a state altogether primitive, these savages possess no instruments of music; and their language, which resembles the chirruping of birds, contains only a few words incredibly difficult of acquisition by the stranger who tries to learn them. They are faithful in marriage, and have only one wife. When a young man has made his choice, his friends or parents ask the consent of the girl. It is never refused. The day is chosen, and in the morning, before sunrise, the girl is sent into the forest, where she hides herself, or not, according to her inclination towards her suitor. An hour afterwards the young man is sent to seek her; and if he has the good luck to find her, and bring her back to her friends before sunset, the marriage is consummated, and she is his wife forever. But if, on the contrary, he returns without her, he must give up all further claim. Old age is very much respected among the Negritos, and it is always one of the eldest who governs their assemblies. All the savages of this race live in great families of sixty or eights, and stray in the forests without any fixed residence. They hold the dead in great veneration. For several years they resort to their graves for the purpose of depositing a little tobacco and betel upon them. The bow and arrows of the deceased are suspended over his grave on the day of interment, and, according to their belief, he emerges every night from the grave to go hunting. They do not always wait for the death of the afflicted before burying them. Immediately after the body has been deposited in the grave it becomes necessary, according to their usages, that the death should be avenged. The

hunters of the tribe go out with their lances and arrows to kill the first living creature they meet with, whether a man, a stag, a wild hog, or a buffalo. When on a journey in search of a victim, they take the precaution of breaking off the young shoots of the shrubs they pass by, leaving the ends hanging in the direction of their route, in order to warn neighbors and travellers to avoid the path they are taking in search of a man or a beast to be offered up; for if one of their own people fall into their hands, even he is sacrificed as the expiatory victim. See Mallat, *Les Philippines*, etc. (Paris, 1846, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:94 sq.; De la Gironiere, *Vingt Annees aux Philippines* (Paris, 1853), page 294 sq.; Earl, *Native Races of the Indian Archipelago* (Lond. 1853), chapters 7, 8; Semper, *Die Philippinen u. ihre Bewohner* (Wirzburg, 1869).

Negro

(from Latin *niger*, "black") is the name generally applied to the African natives. This is, however, an incorrect use of the word, for Negro races inhabit only portions of the African continent, principally between lat. 10° N. and 20° S. The Negro has no connection, at least not intimately, with the races inhabiting Northern Africa, such as the Egyptians, Berbers, Assyrians, Nubians, etc. The southern extremities of Africa, too, are comparatively free from Negroes; they are inhabited by the Hottentots (q.v.). The Kaffres (q.v.) are sometimes classed with the Negroes In some of the border countries a strict classification of their inhabitants is difficult, as they have considerably intermixed. The Negro, too, is not at all confined to the African continent, but is found in various parts of Asia and its islands, and throughout America and the West Indies, whither he was originally carried for bondage servitude. *SEE SLAVERY*. In Blumenbach's fivefold division of mankind the Negroes occupy the first place under the variety *Ethiopian*, which likewise embraces the Kaffres, Hottentots, Australians, Alforians, and Oceanic Negroes. In Latham's threefold division they are placed among the *Atlantidae*, and form the primary subdivision of *Negro Atlantidae* in that author's classification; while in Pickering's elevenfold division they occupy the last place in his enumeration of the races of mankind. Physically the Negro is distinguished by a soft and silky skin, dull cherry-red in the infant, and growing black very soon; it differs from that of the whites principally in the greater amount of pigment cells in the *Rete Malpighii* (the epidermis being uncolored), and in the greater number of cutaneous glands. His hair is generally called woolly, though improperly, for it differs but little from that of the other races except in

color, and in its curled and twisted form, and is rather harsh and wiry. His lips are thick, the lower part of his face prognathic, or projecting like a muzzle. His skull, which is very thick and solid, is long and narrow, with a depressed forehead, prominent occiput and jaws, a facial angle of 700 to 65°. According to Camper's lateral admeasurement, the head of the Negro shows an angle of 700, while that of the European shows one of 80°, on which difference of 10°, as he considered, depends the superior beauty of the latter. There is not much dependence, however, to be placed on such a mode of admeasurement; and the same may be said of Blumenbach's vertical method. According to this, a considerable difference would appear to exist between the skull of the Negro and that of the European. "But," says Dr. Prichard, "I have carefully examined the situation of the foramen magnum in many Negro skulls; in all of them its position may be accurately described as being exactly behind the transverse line bisecting the antero-posterior diameter of the basis cranii. This is precisely the place which Owen has pointed out as the general position of the occipital hole in the human skull. In those Negro skulls which have the alveolar process very protuberant, the anterior half of the line above described is lengthened in a slight degree by this circumstance. If allowance is made for it, no difference is perceptible. The difference is in all instances extremely slight; and it is equally perceptible in heads belonging to other races of men, if we examine crania which have prominent upper jaws. If a line is let fall from the summit of the head at right angles with the plane of the basis, the occipital foramen will be found to be situated immediately behind it; and this is precisely the case in Negro and in European heads." There is, in fact, neither in this respect — the conformation of the Negro skull — nor in any other, solid ground for the opinion hazarded by some writers, and supported either through ignorance or from interested motives by many persons that the Negro forms a connecting link between the higher order of apes and mankind. The skin, hair, skull, lips, maxillary profile, and general facial appearance of the Negro, are not, however, the only features that distinguish him in a great degree from the European, and seem to stamp him as a distinct variety of the human race. "In the Negro," says Prichard, "the bones of the leg are bent outwards. Soemmering and Lawrence have observed that the tibiae and fibulse in the Negro are more convex in front than in Europeans; the calves are very high, so as to encroach upon the upper part of the legs; the feet and hands, but particularly the former, are flat; and the os calcis, instead of being arched, is continued nearly in a straight line with the other bones of the foot, which is remarkably broad."

As to the supposed excessive length of the forearm in the Negro, a circumstance also dwelt upon as showing an approach to the anthropoid apes, facts are altogether against the statement; there being no greater difference than is observable in individuals of any other variety of mankind. His height is seldom six feet, and rarely below five and a half; and as a rule the Negro figures are fine, especially their torso. Seen from behind, the spine usually appears depressed, owing to the greater curvature of the ribs; the nates are more flattened than in other races, and join the thighs almost at a right angle instead of a curve. Besides these characteristics may be mentioned the projecting upper edge of the orbit; broad, retreating chin, and great development of lower part of the face; small eyes, in which but little of the yellowish-white ball is seen; small, thick ears, standing off from the head, with a small lobe and a general stunted look; black iris; very wide zygomatic arches, giving large space for the muscles of the lower jaw; large and transverse opening of the nasal cavity. The pelvis is long and narrow, its average circumference being from twenty-six to twenty-eight inches, instead of thirty to thirty-six as in the whites; this shape in the female, according to Vrolik and Weber, corresponds to the characteristic shape of the Negro head; those writers considering it as a type of degradation, as it approaches that of the *quadrumana* in the more vertical direction of the iliac bones and their less width, in the smaller breadth of sacrum, and in the consequent less extent of the hips.

In the skin of the Negro there is much oily matter, and he perspires profusely, which serves to keep him in health. The Negro flourishes under the fiercest heats and unhealthy dampness of the tropics, notwithstanding the virulent epidemics and endemics of the country where the white man soon dies; he has less nervous sensibility than the whites, and is not subject to nervous affections; is comparatively insensible to pain, bearing surgical operations well; the effects of opium and other narcotics appear rather in the digestive, circulatory, and respiratory functions than in the cerebral and nervous system; he is little subject to yellow fever, and more to yaws and other cutaneous affections; he is generally very torpid under disease. The senses of the Negroes are acute; the voice in the males is hoarse and not powerful, and in the females high and shrill. They are fond of music, and have many ingeniously contrived musical instruments, generally of a noisy character; they have a keen sense of the ridiculous, and are of a cheerful disposition; though cruel to their enemies and prisoners, and setting little value on human life, they are naturally kindhearted, hospitable to strangers,

and communicative of their joys and sorrows; the females are remarkably affectionate as mothers and children, and as attendants on the sick, even to foreigners. They are less dirty in their persons and dwellings than most other barbarous races. They are ready to receive instruction, and to profit by it up to a certain point; quick to perceive the beauty of goodness, they generally appreciate the services of the missionaries in their behalf, and were not their teachings counteracted by the intoxicating drink brought by traders, they would probably in time, in outward observances if not in reality, merit the name of semi-Christian communities. The custom of polygamy prevails among all the Negro tribes, and where these are constituted into nations or kingdoms, as in Dahomey, the sovereign has often as many as two or three thousand wives, whom he occasionally disposes of as presents to his chief officers and favorites. In those parts of Africa where the slave-trade has flourished the Negro is lowest in the stage of civilized life. In other parts he shows a capacity for practicing the arts of life. Negroes are ingenious in the construction of their dwellings and in the manufacture of their weapons; they have some knowledge of the working of iron and other metals; they manufacture arms, dress and prepare the skins of animals, weave cloth, and fabricate numerous useful household utensils. Neither are they altogether deficient in a knowledge of agriculture. These marks of civilization are, for the most part, apparent in the districts either wholly or partially converted to Mohammedanism. Mungo Park, in his account of Sego, the capital of Bambarra, describes it as a city of 30,000 inhabitants, with houses of two stories high, having flat roofs, mosques in every quarter, and ferries conveying men and horses over the Niger. "The view of this extensive city," he says, "the numerous canoes upon the river, the crowded population, and the cultivated state of the surrounding country, formed altogether a prospect of civilization and magnificence which I little expected to find in the bosom of Africa."

The languages of the various nations and tribes of Negroes are very numerous. Vocabularies of nearly 200 languages have been brought from Africa by the Rev. Dr. Koelle. "A slight examination of these vocabularies," says Mr. Edwin Norris, "seems to show that there are among the Negro idioms a dozen or more classes of languages, differing from each other at least as much as the more remote Indo-Germanic languages do." To these Negro idioms Dr. Krapf has given the name of *Nigro-Hamitic Languages*. These may perhaps have affinities with some of the other African tongues, but not with any of the great well-defined

families of languages. For further information upon this subject, as well as upon the classification of the different Negro races, we must content ourselves with referring to Dr. Prichard's *Natural History of Man,* and especially to a learned note by Mr. Edwin Norris in volume 1 of that work (page 323). It has been said that no Negro nation ever possessed a literature, or had the ingenuity to invent an alphabet, and until recently this was probably true; but Christian missionaries have discovered a tribe in Western Africa, named *Vei,* which possess a well constructed written language, with books, the invention of one of their number still living, who presents a case as remarkable as that of the invention of the Cherokee alphabet. Among the Negro race there is a great variety, greater, perhaps, than among any other family, yet while the several tribes have these clearly distinctive peculiarities, they yet bear a strong general resemblance to each other, not only in their physical appearance, but in their intellectual capacities, moral instincts, customs, and manners.

The religion of the Negroes is but a debased *fetich* worship, *SEE FETICHISM*, except where Mohammedanism has made them acquainted with an ethical religion. Those who have not accepted the teachings of the Koran (q.v.) make fetiches of serpents, elephants' teeth, tigers' claws, and other parts of animals, at the dictation of their *fetich man,* or priest. They also manufacture idols of wood and stone, which they worship; and yet, under all this, they have some idea of a Supreme Being. They believe in good and evil spirits, and are perpetually practicing incantations to ward off the baneful influence of their spiritual enemies. In Eastern Africa, *Speke (Discovery of the Source of the Nile,* page 243) mentions that on one occasion, "as there was a partial eclipse of the moon, all the Wanguana [a Negro race] marched up and down from Rumanika's to Nuanagi's huts, singing and beating our tin cooling-pots to frighten off the spirit of the sun from consuming entirely the chief object of their reverence, the moon." Lander *(Niger Expedition,* 2:180,183) mentions that at Boussa, in Central Africa, an eclipse was attributed to an attack made by the sun on the moon. During the whole time the eclipse lasted the natives made as much noise as possible, "in the hope of being able to frighten away the sun to his proper sphere, and leave the moon to enlighten the world as at other times." They make prayers and offerings to their idols, and have sacred songs and festivals, dances, ceremonies, and places; and they have priests and holy men, who are also magicians and doctors. They believe generally in an after-life (see Lubbock, pages 139,140), without. however, any distinctive

idea of retribution, and some tribes hold the transmigration of the human soul into a gorilla, or other beast, bird, reptile, or fish; they are very superstitious and have great fear of ghosts and apparitions. Their religion, in fact, is one altogether of fear; and as this leads to cruelty, we find them for the most part indifferent to the sacrifice of human life. They sacrifice animals, and in some parts they even offer up human victims to propitiate their deities. They are cruel to their enemies and prisoners, and often shed blood for the mere savage delight they experience in seeing it flow from their victims. We need only allude to the inhuman *customs*, as they are called, of Dahomey, and the *Yan* and *Adai customs* of the Ashantees, as described by Bowdich, in support of this statement. The Negroes are easily influenced by the teachings of ethical religions, and the converts made for Mohammedanism are believed to be very numerous, *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM*; Christian missionaries have met with success also. The Romanists were early workers among them, but in recent years the Protestants have been most successful in propagating Christianity among them. For further details regarding the civil, social, and religious condition of the Negroes, and of missions among them, see the articles *SEE AFRICA*; *SEE KAFFRES*; *SEE LIBERIA*; *SEE MANDINGOES*; *SEE PO, FERNANDO*; *SEE YOMBA*. Of the condition and prospects of the Negroes in the various countries into which they have been imported during the prevalence of the slave-trade we have not room to speak here, but refer to the article *SEE SLAVERY*. They are found in all the West India Islands, to the number of about 3,000,000; in the United States, Brazil, Peru, and other parts of South America; also in the Cape de Verde Islands, Arabia, Morocco, etc. In the British West India Islands they were emancipated from slavery in 1834, and in those belonging to France in 1848. Indeed, slavery now exists nowhere in the West Indies, with the exception of Cuba and Porto Rico. In the United States the Negroes amount to about 6,700,000; they are now liberated, and enjoy civil rights, and some occupy prominent positions in ecclesiastical and political life, and in all the other walks of life many are rising to influence and power.

The Negroes figure in history from very ancient date. They were not much known by the Hebrews and the Homeric Greeks, to judge from the writings at our command, but the Egyptians became acquainted with Negroes, about B.C. 2300, through the conquests of their rulers, and we find Negroes represented on Egyptian monuments as early as B.C. 1000. For nearly thirty-five centuries the type has remained unchanged in Egypt.

The Greeks first knew them in the 7th century B.C., their Ethiopians being merely any people darker than the Hellenic, like the Arabs, Egyptians, Libyans, or Carthaginians, none of whom are Negroes. The typical Negroes of the Guinea coast are generally rude and nearly naked savages, of a deep black color and ugly features; in the interior many of the tribes, like the Fan, and others visited since 1855 by Paul du Chaillu and Winwood Reade, are fierce cannibals, but fine-looking, warlike, ingenious, and skilful in the working of iron. Those on the Slave Coast are more degraded, selling their neighbors to slave-dealers. In the vast region explored by Livingstone, Barth, Du Chaillu, Burton, Speke, Baker, Schweinfurth, and other recent travellers, there are many tribes more or less savage, for an account of which the reader is referred to the respective special notices in this work, and chiefly to the narratives of these explorers.

The father of English ethnology, Dr. Prichard, thought that the original pair must have been Negroes, and that mankind descended from them. His words are: "It must be concluded that the process of nature in the human species is the transmutation of the characters of the Negro into those of the European, or the evolution of white varieties in black races of men. We have seen that there are causes existing which are capable of producing such an alteration, but we have no facts which induce us to suppose that the reverse of this change could in any circumstances be effected. This leads us to the inference that the primitive stock of men were Negroes, which has every appearance of truth" *(Researches,* page 233). It is not a little remarkable that although Blumenbach and Prichard were both advocates for the unity of man, they materially differed in their argumentation. Blumenbach saw in his five varieties of man nothing but degeneracy from some ideal perfect type. Prichard, on the contrary, could imagine no arguments, or knew of any facts, to support such a conclusion. Prichard, however, was not alone in this supposition, for Pallas, Lacipede, Hunter, Dornik, and Link were also inclined to the same view. See Hunt, in *Memoirs of the Anthropol. Society of London,* volume 1, art. 1; see also in these memoirs, same volume, art. 2; Prichard, *Researches into the Phys. Hist. of Mankind,* 1:199-21. (3d ed.); Latham, *Varieties of Man,* page 469 sq.; Nott, *Types of Mankind,* page 260; Quatrefages, *Unite de l'Espece Humaine* (Paris, 1861); Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization,* chapters 4-6; *Trans. of the Ethnological Society of London,* volume 1, new series, page 317 sq.; Casalis, *Les Bassoutos ou Vingt-trois annees de sejour et d'observations au sud d'Afrique* (Paris, 1859), especially pages 257-268;

Burton, *Lake Regions of Central Africa,* (1861), volume 1; Gorz, *Reiseskizzen aus Nordost-Afrika* (1855), 1:162 sq., 175 sq.; Reade, *Savage Africa,* chapters 36; Pruner Bey, *Memoir on the Negro; Wanderings in West Africa,* volumes 1 and 2; the Reverend Henry J. Cox, D.D., in *Methodist Quarterly Review,* January 1875, art. 4; and in the same Review, April 1874, art. 4; *Blackwood's Magazine,* May 1866, art. 3. See also the recent publications on Africa by the celebrated travellers Barth, Livingstone, Speke, Chapman, and Schweinfurth.

Negrone or Nigrone, Pietro

called *Il Giovane Zingaro* ("the young Gypsy"), a painter of the Neapolitan school who devoted himself mostly to sacred art, was born at Calabria about 1505. Dominic says he first studied under Gio. Antonio d'Amato, afterwards under Marco Calabrese; and he commends him as an accomplished and diligent artist. In S. Agnello, at Naples, there is a picture of *The Virgin and the Infant in the Clouds, with Saints and a Glory of Angels;* also in S. Maria Donna Romata are two pictures by him, representing the *Adoration of the Maogi* and the *Scourging of Christ,* painted in 1541. He died, according to Lanzi, about 1565.

Negroponte, Francesco

or ANTONIO, a monk of the Capuchin order, who flourished at Venice in the early part of the 15th century; he devoted himself to the cultivation of sacred art, and was a noted painter, whose works, according to Kugler. resemble those of Jacobello del Fiore.

Nehalennia

a pagan goddess, the origin of whose name it is difficult to trace, was worshipped in ancient Gaul and Germany. An image of this female deity was first discovered in 1646 in Zealand, among some ruins which had long been covered by the sea. Several images have since been discovered in France, Germany, and Italy. Youth seems to have been one of her attributes. She is sometimes represented sitting and sometimes standing. Montfaucon, in his *Antiquities,* gives seven pictures of this goddess. She is represented carrying a basket of fruit, with a dog at her side. The resemblance of her name with the Greek νέα σελήνη (new moon) may trace a connection to the goddess Diana; others think her an ocean deity.

See Bescherelle, *La Mythologie I/lustree*, page 78; Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, s.v.; Mallet, *Northern Antiquities.*

Nehel'amite

(Heb. *Nechelami'*, ymalj]n, with the art.; Sept. Αἰλαμίτης v.r. Ἐλαμίτης, Νεελαμίτης, Αἰλαμί, an appellation of a man named Shemaiah, a false prophet, who went with the captives to Babylon ([242924]Jeremiah 29:24, 31, 32). The name is no doubt formed from that either of Shemaiah's native place or the progenitor of his family; which of the two is uncertain. *SEE SHIEMAIAH*. No place called *Nehelam* is mentioned in the Bible, or known to have existed in Palestine, nor does it occur in any of the genealogical lists of families. It resembles the name which the Sept. has attached to Ahijah the prophet, namely, the Enlamite- oἘνλαμεί*;* but by what authority they substitute that name for "the Shilonite" of the Hebrew text is doubtful. The word "Nehelamite" also probably contains a play on the " dreams" *(chakam)* and " dreamers," whom Jeremiah is never wearied of denouncing (see chapters 23, 27, 29). Furst, however, thinks *(Heb. Lex.* s.v.) that there is an allusion to the failure of an inheritance (l j n), as threatened. The Targum gives the name as *Chelam*, µ l j . A place of this name, *SEE HELAM*, lay somewhere between the Jordan and the Euphrates.

Nehemi'ah

(Heb. -*Nechemyah'*, hy;m]j ;n], *comforted* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Νεεμίας v.r. Νεεμία*;* Josephus, Νεεμίας, *Ant.* 11:5, 6), the name of three men.

1. The second named of the "children of the province," who had been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and lived to return with Zerubbabel to Judsea ([150202]Ezra 2:2; [160707]Nehemiah 7:7). B.C. 536. He was not the same as No. 3 (see Carpzov, *Introd.* 1:341 sq.).

2. Son of Azbuk, of the tribe of Judah; ruler in half the town of Bethzur, in the mountains of Judah, who took a leading part in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem ([160316]Nehemiah 3:16). B.C. 445.

3. The son of Hachallah ([160101]Nehemiah 1:1) and brother of Hanani ([160707]Nehemiah 7:7). He was apparently of the tribe of Judah, since his fathers were buried at Jerusalem, and Hanani his kinsman seems to have been of that tribe ([160102]Nehemiah 1:2; 2:3; 7:2). Some think he was of

priestly descent, because his name appears at the head of a list of priests in Nehemiah 10:1-8; but it is obvious, from Nehemiah 9:38, that he stands there as a prince, and not as a priest-that he heads the list because he was head of the nation. The Vulgate, in 2 Macc. 1:21, calls him *"sacerdos* Nehemias" (comp. Rambach, *Praef. in Nehemiah* page 112; Carpzov, *Introd.* 1:338); but this is a false version of the Greek, which has ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ἱερῖς Νεεμίας, and not ὁ ἱεπεύς, which the Latin would require. The Syriac agrees with the Greek. The expression in verse 18, that Nehemiah "offered sacrifice," implies no more than that he provided the sacrifices. Others, with some probability, infer, from his station at the Persian court and the high commission he received, that he was, like Zerubbabel, of the tribe of Judah and of the house of David (Carpzov, *Introductio,* etc., i, 339). Malalas of Antioch *(Chronogr. 6:*160) singularly combines the two views, and calls him "Nehemiah the priest, of the seed of David."

While Nehemiah was cupbearer in the royal palace at Shushan, in the twentieth year of Artaexerxes Longimanus (q.v.), or B.C. 447, learning the mournful and desolate condition of the returned colony in Judsea (Nehemiah i, 2 sq.; comp. Kleinert, in the *Dorpt. Beitrig.* 1:243 sq.), he obtained permission of the king to make a journey to Jerusalem, and there to act as lieutenant or governor (Heb. hj;P, Nehemiah 5:14. On the title of honor given to Nehemiah [Nehemiah 8:9; 10:1], Tirshatha', atv;r]T;, see Gesen. *Thesaur.* s.v.; Benfey, *Monatsnam.* s. 196, identifies it with the Zend *thvotresta,* "commander." But in Nehemiah 7:65, 70, this title denotes not Nehemiah, but Zerubbabel, as is evident from Ezra 2:63-70). Being furnished with this high commission, which included letters to the satraps and subordinates, and enjoying the protection of a military escort (2:9), Nehemiah reached Jerusalem in the year B.C. 446, and remained there till B.C. 434, being actively engaged for twelve years in promoting the public good (5:14). "It is impossible to overestimate the importance to the future political and ecclesiastical prosperity of the Jewish nation of this great achievement of their patriotic governor. How low the community of the Palestine Jews had fallen is apparent from the fact that from the 6th year of Darius to the 7th of Artaxerxes there is no history of them whatever; and that even after Ezra's commission, and the ample grants made by Artaxerxes in his 7th year, and the considerable re-enforcements, both in wealth and numbers, which Ezra's government brought to them, they were in a state of abject 'affliction and reproach' in

the 20th of Artaxerxes: their country pillaged, their citizens kidnapped and made slaves of by their heathen neighbors, robbery and murder rife in their very capital, Jerusalem almost deserted, and the Temple again falling into decay. The one step which could resuscitate the nation, preserve the Mosaic institutions, and lay the foundation of future independence, was the restoration of the city walls. Jerusalem being once again secure from the attacks of the marauding heathen, civil government would become possible, the spirit of the people and their attachment to the ancient capital of the monarchy would revive, the priests and Levites would be encouraged to come into residence, the tithes and first-fruits and other stores would be safe, and Judah, if not actually independent, would preserve the essentials of national and religious life. To this great object, therefore, Nehemiah directed his whole energies without an hour's unnecessary delay. By word and example he induced the whole population, with the single exception of the Tekoite nobles, to commence building with the utmost vigor, even the lukewarm high-priest Eliashib performing his part. In a wonderfully short time the walls seemed to emerge from the heaps of burned rubbish, and to encircle the city as in the days of old. The gateways also were rebuilt, and ready for the doors to be hung upon them. But it soon became apparent how wisely Nehemiah had acted **in** hastening on the work. On his very first arrival, as governor, Sanballat and Tobiah had given unequivocal proof of their mortification at his appointment, and before the work was commenced had scornfully asked whether he intended to rebel against the king of Persia. But when the restoration was seen to be rapidly progressing, their indignation knew no bounds. They not only poured out a torrent of abuse and contempt upon all engaged in the work, but actually made a great conspiracy to fall upon the builders with an armed force and put a stop to the undertaking. The project was defeated by the vigilance and prudence of Nehemiah, who armed all the people after their families, and showed such a strong front that their enemies dared not attack them. This armed attitude was continued from that day forward. Various stratagems were then resorted to to get Nehemiah away from Jerusalem, and if possible to take his life." But in the face of these difficulties he rebuilt, or repaired, the city wall, hot without serious opposition from parties of Samaritans, finishing the work in fifty-two days (<1665>Nehemiah 6:15); reformed abuses, redressed grievances (chapter 5), introduced law and order (chapter 7), and revived the worship of God (chapter 8 sq.). A strange fable is told of his discovering again the holy fire (2 Macc. 1:18 sq.). The account in 2 Macc. 2:13 of the compilation by

Nehemiah of the Old-Testament writings is disbelieved by Eichhorn *(Apokr.* Page 255 sq.), and is rightly estimated by Hengstenberg *(Auth. d. Dan.* page 241 sq.). *SEE ESDRAS, BOOKS OF*. It should be added that the son of Sirach, in celebrating Nehemiah's good deeds, mentions only that he "raised up for us the walls that were fallen, and set up the gates and bars, and raised up our ruins again" (Ecclus. 49:13). In his important public proceedings, which appear all to have happened in the first year of his government, Nehemiah enjoyed the assistance of Ezra (q.v.), who is named on several occasions as taking a prominent part in conducting affairs (<1680>Nehemiah 8:1, 9, 13; 12:36). Ezra had gone up to Jerusalem thirteen years before, and lived to be Nehemiah's fellow-laborer. These contemporaries are equally eminent among the benefactors of the Jewish people — alike patriotic and zealous, though not uniform in character, or the same in operation. In the character of Ezra we find no indication of the self-complacency which forms a marked feature in that of Nehemiah. The former, in accordance with his priestly calling, labored chiefly in promoting the interests of religion, but the latter had most to do with the general affairs of government; the one was in charge of the Temple, the other of the state. Nehemiah refused to receive his lawful allowance as governor from the people, in consideration of their poverty, during the whole twelve years that he was in office, but kept at his own charge a table for 150 Jews, at which any who returned from captivity were welcome. Nehemiah returned to Persia B.C. 434, but soon heard of new abuses creeping in among the Jews, and he determined to visit Judaea again. The time of this second journey is indefinitely stated as "after some days" (<1630>Nehemiah 13:6, 7), which many have understood as meaning a single year; but this is not long enough to account for such abuses as would require Nehemiah's presence. Prideaux *(Connection,* 1:520 sq.; comp. Jahn, *Archaol.* II, 1:272 sq.; *Einleitung,* 2:288 sq.) has shown sufficient reason for referring it to the second half of the reign of Darius Nothus, say B.C. 410. (But Havernick, *Einleitung ins A. T.* 2:324, holds a medium view, dating this visit B.C. cir. 424. See further, Michaelis on *Nehemiah 13;* Clericus, *ad idem;* Petavius, *Doctrina Temp. 12:*25; Cellarius, *Dissertat.* page 130; *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* January 1862, page 446.) *SEE SEVENTY WEEKS*. After his return to the government of Judsea, Nehemiah enforced the separation of all the mixed multitude from Israel (<1630>Nehemiah 13:1-3), and accordingly expelled Tobiah the Ammonite from the chamber which the high-priest, Eliashib, had prepared for him in the Temple (<1630>Nehemiah 13:49). Better arrangements were, also made for the support of the Temple

service (<16B310>Nehemiah 13:10-14), and for the rigid observance of the Sabbath (<16B315>Nehemiah 13:15-22). One of the last acts of his government was an effort to put an end to mixed marriages, which led him to "chase" away a son of Joiada, the high-priest, because he was son-inlaw to Sanballat the Horonite (<16B323>Nehemiah 13:23-29). It is not unlikely that Nehemiah remained at his post till about the year B.C. 405, towards the close of the reign of Darius Nothus, who is mentioned in 12:22. *SEE DARIUS*. At this time Nehemiah would be between sixty and seventy years old, if we suppose him (as most do) to have been only between twenty and thirty when he first went to Jerusalem. That he lived to be an old man is thus quite probable from the sacred history; and this is expressly declared by Josephus, who *(Ant.* 11:5, 6) states that he died at an advanced age. Of the place and year of his death nothing is known. "On reviewing the character of Nehemiah, we seem unable to find a single fault (unless it be a slightly Ciceronian egotism) to counterbalance his many and great virtues. For pure and disinterested patriotism he stands unrivalled. The man whom the account of the misery and ruin of his native country, and the perils with which his countrymen were beset prompted to leave his splendid residence, and a post of wealth, power, and influence, in the first court in the world, that he might share and alleviate the sorrows of his native land, must have been pre-eminently a patriot. Every act of his during his government bespeaks one who had no selfishness in his nature. All he did was noble, generous, high-minded, courageous, and to the highest degree upright. But to stern integrity he united great humility and kindness, and a princely hospitality. As a statesman he combined forethought, prudence, and sagacity in counsel, with vigor, promptitude, and decision in action. In dealing with the enemies of his country he was wary, penetrating, and bold. In directing the internal economy of the state, he took a comprehensive view of the real welfare of the people, and adopted the measures best calculated to promote it. In dealing both with friend and foe, he was utterly free from favor or fear, conspicuous for the simplicity with which he aimed only at doing what was right, without respect of persons. But in nothing was he more remarkable than for his piety, and the singleness of eye with which he walked before God. He seems to have undertaken everything in dependence upon God, with prayer for his blessing and guidance, and to have sought his reward only from God." See Randall, *Nehemiah the Tirshatha* (Lond. 1874).

Nehemiah, Book Of,

the latest of all the historical books of Scripture, both as to the time of its composition and the scope of its narrative in general, and as to the supplementary matter of chapter 12 in particular, which reaches down to the time of Alexander the Great.

1. *Authorship.* — This book, which bears the title hy;m]j,n] yreb]Di *Nehemiah's Words,* was anciently connected with Ezra, as if it formed part of the same work (Eichhorn, *Einleitung,* 2:627). This connection is indicated by its first word, yhiy]w', *"And* it came to pass." It arose, doubtless, from the fact that Nehemiah is a sort of continuation of Ezra (q.v.). Some ancient writers called this book the second Book of Ezra, and regarded that learned scribe as the author of it (Carpzov, *Introductio,* etc., page 336). There can, however, be no reasonable doubt that it proceeded from Nehemiah, for its style and spirit, except in one portion, are wholly unlike Ezra's. Here we find no Chaldee documents, as in Ezra, though we might expect some from chapters 2, 7, 8, 9, and chapter 6:5; and here also the writer discovers a species of egotism never manifested by Ezra (<160514>Nehemiah 5:14-19; Eichhorn, *Einleitung ins A. Test.* 2:619).

While the book as a whole is considered to have come from Nehemiah, it consists in part of compilation. He doubtless wrote the greater part himself, but some portions he evidently took from other works. It is allowed by all that he is, in the strictest sense, the author of the narrative from Nehemiah 1 to <160705>Nehemiah 7:5 (Havernick, *Einleitung,* 2:304). The account in <160706>Nehemiah 7:6-73 is avowedly compiled, for he says in verse 5, "I found a register," etc. This register we find also in <150201>Ezra 2:1-70, hence it might be thought that our author borrowed this part from Ezra; but it is more likely that they both copied from public documents, such as "the Book of the Chronicles" (µymiY;hi yreb]Di rp,se), mentioned in <161223>Nehemiah 12:23. Had Nehemiah taken his list from Ezra, we might expect agreement, if not identity, in the contents; but the two records vary much in details, and are only reconciled with difficulty. "The second part (chapters 8, 9, 10) is said to be marked by a strong *Levitical* or *priestly* bias, different from the tone of the rest of the book, whose interests all tend in the direction of *civil* society; also by different words and phrases, and by the use of the third person, instead of the first, when speaking of Nehemiah. Hence critics

differ in their opinions, some ascribing these chapters to Ezra, some making them the composition of an unknown author in a later age. The third portion (chapters 9, 12, 13) is again pronounced to be the work of Nehemiah, though with certain additions, which (in the estimation of these critics) are seen to be excrescences, or which betray a different authorship, chiefly on account of chronological facts which are irreconcilable with the supposition that Nehemiah wrote them.

"The most of the supposed difficulties vanish, or rather give place to a conviction of the unity of the book, as soon as we take the proper position for looking at the events narrated, as they would appear to Nehemiah, the narrator of his own feelings and transactions. Such a person does not write exactly in the order of time; nor do events seem in the same proportion to each other in his eyes and in the eyes of many of his readers. This is notorious to every reader of memoirs and biographies, particularly autobiographies. If at times there be something peculiar in the arrangements of this book of Nehemiah, as we have indicated that there is also in Ezra, this ought to be admitted as a consequence of the writer's own state of mind or circumstances. Certainly those who have written later than the date of these books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and have endeavored to arrange their details in a different order to suit their own purposes, have effected little as to the point of consecutiveness. This is seen in the case of the tolerably respectable compiler of the third Book of Esdras, which is preserved in the Apocrypha.

"On the other hand, the book appears from the course of the life of Nehemiah (see below) to be a continuous record, written in a lively, distinct, and energetic manner, such as is admitted, by every one to be very suitable to the circumstances in which it is said to have been composed. This is a fact which strikes us in reading all the accounts-the building of the ruins, the earlier and the later reforms, and the sacred services at the feast of tabernacles. Of course such different subjects are not described in the self-same words or style; and this diversity illustrates the working of Nehemiah's mind as that of a man deeply interested in the affairs in which he took an active part. It is only a perverted ingenuity which would make these differences an evidence that chapters 8, 9, 10 have come from a different author. Those who wish to go into the particulars of a verbal criticism may find the materials in Keil's In*troduction to the Old Testament.* He shows how the difference in the use of the names of God is suitable to the different circumstances in which they are used; how the language of the

Levites in prayer is naturally more akin to the language of the law of Moses and of the Psalms than to that of plain history; how the expression, 'the nobles and the rulers,' which is frequent elsewhere, is wanting in this section; while instead of it we once meet with the Mosaic term, 'chief of the fathers,' or rather, 'heads of the fathers' houses' (chapter 8:13); though he might have mentioned that still a different expression is found in this disputed section, and in a passage which is confessedly genuine (chapter 10:29, and 3:5); and that Ezra is not named among those who signed the covenant, because he acted the part of 'mediator' in the transaction, as Moses had done before. This pre-eminent position assigned to Ezra necessarily threw even Nehemiah somewhat into the background, and led him to speak of himself in the *third* person instead of in *the first,* as in the rest of his book. Indeed this was the more natural and more distinct, because the first person plural, *'we,'* 'our,' is used throughout the account of the sealing (chapters 9, 10), which sufficiently marks the writer as an eye-witness and party in the transaction, yet one who wished not to appear singled out from his countrymen, except where this was unavoidable on account of his official capacity. When he does so mention himself it is with the addition, 'the Tirshatha,' a peculiar word, of uncertain origin and meaning, though unmistakably an attributive title of the governor. Perhaps he may have used this title rather than another, in these descriptions of ecclesiastical affairs, because of the title being given to Zerubbabel, the governor whom God had so greatly honored in the restoration of the church, while it occurs nowhere else.'

The mention of Jaddua as a high-priest (<16121>Nehemiah 12:11, 22) has occasioned much perplexity. This Jaddua appears to have been in office in B.C. 332, when Alexander the Great came to Jerusalem (Joseph. *Ant.* 11:8) how then could he be named by Nehemiah? Some (e.g. Vitringa, Rambach) suppose the: 10th and 11th verses to be a later addition, which seems to be the only reasonable solution; others (Havernick, Keil) endeavor to show that Nehemiah wrote it, supposing that he lived to be an old man, so as possibly to see the year B.C. 370; and that Jaddua had at that time entered on his office, so that he filled it for about forty years, i.e., till B.C. 332 (see especially Havernick's *Einleitung,* 2:320-324). But this Davidson rightly thinks improbable (see Horne's *Introd.* 2:694). Some finally resort to the belief that Jaddua is only mentioned here as having been born, but not as yet an incumbent of high-priesthood. It is difficult in that case to see why he is named at all, as the writer could not have

foreseen that he would ever fill the office. *SEE JADDUA*. A similar addition by a still later hand, probably some member of the so-called "Great Sanhedrim," perhaps Simon the Just, its president, has evidently been made in the list of the Davidic line (1 Chronicles 3:23-24), which comes down to the 3d century B.C. *SEE GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD*. This leads to a presumption of an occasional interpolation of these few genealogical items, which (as in the case of the notice of the death of Moses in Deuteronomy 34:5-12) do not affect the general authorship of the book. *SEE EZRA, BOOK OF*.

2. As to the *date* of the book, it is not likely that it came from Nehemiah's hand till near the close of his life. Certainly it could not have been all written before the expulsion of the priest recorded in chapters 13:23-29, which took place about the year B.C. 413.

3. The *canonical character* of Nehemiah's work is established by very ancient testimony. It should be noticed, however, that this book is not expressly named by Melito of Sardis (A.D. 170) in his account of the sacred writings; but this creates no difficulty, since he does mention Ezra, of which Nehemiah was then considered but a part (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, 2:627). Thus the Book of Nehemiah has always had an undisputed place in the Canon, being included by the Hebrews under the general head of the Book of Ezra, and as Jerome tells us in the *Prolog. Gal.* by the Greeks and Latins under the name of the second Book of Ezra. *SEE ESDRAS, FIRST BOOK OF*. "There is no quotation from it in the N.T., and it has been comparatively neglected by both the Greek and Latin fathers, perhaps on account of its simple character, and the absence of anything supernatural, prophetical, or mystical in its contents. St. Jerome *(ad Paulinam)* does indeed suggest that the account of the building of the walls, and the return of the people, the description of the priests, Levites, Israelites, and proselytes, and the division of the labor among the different families, have a hidden meaning; and also hints that Nehemiah's name; which he interprets *consolator a Domino*, points to a mystical sense. But the book does not easily lend itself to such applications, which are so manifestly forced and strained that even Augustine says of the whole Book of Ezra that it is simply historical rather than prophetical *(De Civit. Dei*, 18:36). Those however who wish to see St. Jerome's hint elaborately carried out may refer to the Ven. Bede's *Allegorica Expositio in Librum Nehenice, qui et Ezrce Secundus*, as well as to the preface to his exposition of Ezra; and, in another sense, to Bp. Pilkington's Exposition upon Nehemiah, and John

Fox's Preface *(Park. Soc.).* It may be added that Bede describes both Ezra and Nehemiah as *prophets,* which is the head under which Josephus includes them in his description of the sacred books *(C. Ap.* 1:8)."

4. The *contents* of the book have been specified above in the biography of the author. The work can scarcely be called a history of Nehemiah and his times; it is rather a collection of notices of some important transactions that happened during the first year of his government, with a few scraps from his later history. The contents appear to be arranged in chronological order, with the exception perhaps of <16127>Nehemiah 12:27-43, where the account of the dedication of the wall seems to be out of its proper place: we might expect it rather after <16701>Nehemiah 7:1-4, where the completion of the wall is mentioned.

“The whole narrative gives us a graphic and interesting account of the state of Jerusalem and the returned captives in the writer's times, and, incidentally, of the nature of the Persian government and the condition of its remote provinces. The documents appended to it also give some further information as to the times of Zerubbabel on the one hand, and as to the continuation of the genealogical registers and the succession of the high-priesthood to the close of the Persian empire on the other. The view given of the rise of two factions among the Jews — the one the strict religious party, adhering with uncompromising faithfulness to the Mosaic institutions, headed by Nehemiah; the other, the gentilizing party, ever imitating heathen customs, and making heathen connections, headed, or at least encouraged by the high-priest Eliashib and his family sets before us the germ of much that we meet with in a more developed state in later Jewish history from the commencement of the Macedonian dynasty till the final destruction of Jerusalem. Again, in this history as well as in the Book of Ezra. we see the bitter enmity between the Jews and Samaritans acquiring strength and definitive form on both religious and political grounds. It would seem from <16401>Nehemiah 4:1, 2, 8 (A.V.), and <16602>Nehemiah 6:2, 6, etc., that the depression of Jerusalem was a fixed part of the policy of Sanballat, and that he had the design of raising Samaria as the head of Palestine, upon the ruin of Jerusalem, a design which seems to have been entertained by the Samaritans in later times. The book also throws much light upon the domestic institutions of the Jews. We learn incidentally the prevalence of usury, and of slavery as its consequence, the frequent and burdensome oppressions of the governors (<16515>Nehemiah 5:15), the judicial use of corporal punishment (<16325>Nehemiah 13:25), the

continuance of false prophets as an engine of policy, as in the days of the kings of Judah (<16607>Nehemiah 6:7, 12, 14), the restitution of the Mosaic provision for the maintenance of the priests and Levites and the due performance of the Temple service (<16310>Nehemiah 13:10-3), the much freer promulgation of the Holy Scriptures by the public reading of them (<16801>Nehemiah 8:1; 9:3; 13:1), and the more general acquaintance with them arising from their collection into one volume, and the multiplication of copies of them by the care of Ezra the scribe and Nehemiah himself (2 Macc. 2:13), as well as from the stimulus given to the art of reading among the Jewish people during their residence in Babylon, *SEE HILICIAH*; the mixed form of political government still surviving the ruin of their independence (<16507>Nehemiah 5:7, 13; 10), the reviving trade with Tyre (<16316>Nehemiah 13:16), the agricultural pursuits and wealth of the Jews (<16511>Nehemiah 5:11; 13:15), the tendency to take heathen wives, indicating, possibly, a disproportion in the number of Jewish males and females among the returned captives (<16030>Nehemiah 10:30; 13:3, 23), the danger the Jewish language was in of being corrupted (<16324>Nehemiah 13:24), with other details which only the narrative of an eye-witness would have preserved to us. Some of these details give us incidentally information of great historical importance.

"**(a.)** The account of the building and dedication of the wall (<16312>Nehemiah 3:12) contains the most valuable materials for settling the topography of Jerusalem to be found in Scripture. *SEE JERUSALEM*.

"**(b.)** The list of returned captives who came under different leaders from the time of Zerubbabel to that of Nehemiah (amounting in all to only 42,360 adult males, and 7337 servants), which is given in chapter 7, conveys a faithful picture of the political weakness of the Jewish nation as compared with the times when Judah alone numbered 470,000 fighting men (<132105>1 Chronicles 21:5). It justifies the description of the Palestine Jews as 'the remnant that are left of the captivity' (<16103>Nehemiah 1:3), and as 'these feeble Jews' (<16402>Nehemiah 4:2), and explains the great difficulty felt by Nehemiah in peopling Jerusalem itself with a sufficient number of inhabitants to preserve' it from assault (<16703>Nehemiah 7:3, 4; 11:1, 2). It is an important aid, too, in understanding the subsequent history, and in appreciating the patriotism and valor by which they attained their independence under the Maccabees.

"**(c.)** The lists of leaders, priests, Levites, and of those who signed the covenant, reveal incidentally much of the national spirit as well as of the social habits of the captives, derived from older times. Thus the fact that *twelve* leaders are named in <160707>Nehemiah 7:7 indicates the feeling of the captives that they represented the *twelve* tribes, a feeling further evidenced in the expression 'the men of the people of Israel.' The enumeration of twenty-one and twenty-two, or, if Zidkijah stands for the head of the house of Zadok, twenty-three chief priests in <161001>Nehemiah 10:1-8, 12:1-7, of whom nine bear the names of those who were heads of courses in David's time (1 Chronicles 24), *SEE JEHOARIB*, shows how, even in their wasted and reduced numbers, they struggled to preserve these ancient institutions, and also supplies the reason of the mention of these particular twenty-two or twenty-three names.

"**(d.)** Other miscellaneous information contained in this book embraces the hereditary crafts practiced by certain priestly families, e.g. the apothecaries, or makers of the sacred ointments and incense (<160308>Nehemiah 3:8), and the goldsmiths, whose business it probably was to repair the sacred vessels (<160308>Nehemiah 3:8), and who may have been the ancestors, so to speak, of the money-changers in the Temple (<430214>John 2:14,15); the situation of the garden of the kings of Judah by which Zedekiah escaped (<122504>2 Kings 25:4), as seen in <160315>Nehemiah 3:15; and statistics, reminding one of Domesday-Book, concerning not only the cities and families of the returned captives, but the number of their horses, mules, camels, and asses (chapter 7), to which more might be added."

5. In respect to *language and style,* this book is very similar to the Chronicles of Ezra. Nehemiah has, it s true, quite his own manner, and, as De Wette has observed, certain phrases and modes of expression peculiar to himself. He has also some few words and forms not found elsewhere in Scripture; but the general Hebrew style is exactly that of the books purporting to be of the same age. Some words, as µyæTil]xæm], 'cymbals," occur in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, but nowhere else. bDeit]hæ occurs frequently in the same three books, but only twice (in Judges 5) besides trG,aæ or aXn ,, "a letter," is common only to Nehemiah, Esth., Ezra, and Chronicles hr;yBæ, and its Chaldee equivalent, ar;yBæ, whether spoken of the palace at Susa or of the Temple at Jerusalem, are common only to Nehemiah, Ezra, Esth., Dan., and Chronicles: lg,ve to Nehemiah and Dan., and Psalm 45. The phrase µyæmV;hæ yheloa and its Chaldee equivalent, "the

God of Heavens," are common to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Dan. vrpom] "distinctly," is common to Ezra and Nehemiah Such words as ˆgs;hnydæ] sDePi and such Aramaisms as the use of lbij; <160107>Nehemiah 1:7, ËlMyæ, *7,* hDmæ, 5, 4, etc., are also evidences of the age when Nehemiah wrote. As examples of peculiar words or meanings, used in this book alone, the following may be mentioned: b rbic; "to inspect," <160213>Nehemiah 2:13, 15; hamæ, in the sense of "interest," <160511>Nehemiah 5:11; ., (in Hiph.), "to shut," <160703>Nehemiah 7:3; l[wm, "a lifting *up,"* <160806>Nehemiah 8:6; twdYhu, "praises," or *"choirs,"* <161208>Nehemiah 12:8; hkWlhTi" a procession," 12:32; arqMæ, in the sense of" reading," <160808>Nehemiah 8:8; hrxæ, for hryxaæai, <161308>Nehemiah 13:8, where both form and sense are alike unusual. The Aramsean form, hdwhy], Hiph. of hdy; for hdwy, is very rare, only five other analogous examples occurring in the Heb. Scriptures, though it is very common in Biblical Chaldee. The phrase µyMhiwj lvæyaæ, <160417>Nehemiah 4:17 (which is omitted by the Sept.), is incapable of explanation. One would have expected, instead of µyMhiwdyB], as in <142310>2 Chronicles 23:10. atv;rTæhi "the Tirshatha," which only occurs in <150263>Ezra 2:63; <160765>Nehemiah 7:65, 70; 8:9; 10:1, is of uncertain etymology and meaning. It is a term applied almost exclusively to Nehemiah, and seems to be more likely to mean "cupbearer" than " governor," though the latter interpretation is adopted by Gesenius *(Thes.* s.v.).

The text of Nehemiah is generally pure and free from corruption, except in the proper names, in which there is considerable fluctuation in the orthography, both as compared with other parts of the same book and with the same names in other parts of Scripture; and also in numerals. Of the latter we have seen several examples in the parallel passages of Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7; and the same lists give variations in names of men. So does <161201>Nehemiah 12:1-7, compared with <161212>Nehemiah 12:12, and. with <161001>Nehemiah 10:1-8. A comparison of <161103>Nehemiah 11:3, etc., with <130902>1 Chronicles 9:2, etc., exhibits the following fluctuations: <161104>Nehemiah 11:4, *Athaiah* of the children of Perez = <130904>1 Chronicles 9:4, *Uthai* of the children of Perez,; <160505>Nehemiah 5:5, *Maaseiah* the son of Shiloni = <160505>Nehemiah 5:5, of the Shilonites, *Asaiah;* <160509>Nehemiah 5:9, *Judah* the son of Senuah (Heb. Ha-senuah) = <160507>Nehemiah 5:7, *Hodaviah* the son of Hasenuah; 5:10, Jedaiah the son of Joiarib, Jachin <160510>Nehemiah 5:10, Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, Jachin; 5:13, *Annasai* son of Azareel = <160512>Nehemiah

5:12, *Maasai* son of Jahzerah; 5:17, Micah the son of *Zabdi* = 1655Nehemiah 5:15, Micah the son of *Zichri* (comp. 1625Nehemiah 12:35). To these many others might be added.

6. *Commentaries*. — The special exegetical helps on the Book of Nehemiah are not numerous: Bede, In *Nehemiae allegorica expositio (in Opp.* 4; and *Works*, by Giles, 1:1); Brenz, *Comment. in Nehemiae (in Opp.* 2); Wdiplpius, *In Nehemiae librum commentaria* (Tigur. 1570, fol.); Strigel, *Agumentum et Scholia* (Lips. 1571, 1572, 8vo); Pilkington, *Expositio* on certain chapters (Lond. 1585, 4to; also in *Works*, page 275); Pempel, *Explanatio* [includ. Ezra and Dan.] (in *Works*, Lond. 1585); Rambach, *Adnotationes* (in his work on the O.T. 3:107); Sanctius, *Commentarii* [includ. Ruth, etc.] (Lugd. 1628, fol.); Ferus, *Erklarung* (Mayence, 1619, 8vo); Crommius, *In hist. Nehemiae*, etc. [includ. other books] (Lovan. 1632, 4to); Lombard, *Commentarius* [includ. Ezra] (Par. 1643, fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* [includ. Ezra, etc.] (Lond. 1656, fol.); Jackson, *Explanation* [includ. Ezra and Esth.] (Lond. 1657, 4to); De Oliva, *Commentarii* [includ. other books] (Lugd. 1664, 1679, 2 vols. fol.); Bertheau, *Commentary* [includ. Ezra and Esth.] (in the *Exeg. Handb.* Leips. 1862, 8vo); Barde, *Etude critique et exegetique* (Ttibing. 1861, 8vo); also, Lange's and Keil and Delitzsch's *Bible-works*. *SEE COMMENTARY*.

Nehemi'as

(Νεεμίαςv.r. Ναιμαίς), the Grsecized form (retained in the A.V. of the Apocrypha) of the name NEHEMIAH *SEE NEHEMIAH* (q.v.), namely,

(a) The contemporary of Zerubbabel and Jeshua (Esdr. 5:8);

(b) The governor, son of Hachaliah (1 Esdr. 5:40).

Ne'hiloth

(Heb. *Nechiloth'*, twlyjnæwith the art. the plur. of hlyjnæwhich, however, is not found), occurs only in the title of Psalm 5, where the A.V. renders "upon Nehiloth" (twlyjnæAla). The Sept., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translate ὑπέρ τῆς κληρονομούσης, and the Vulgate, *"pro ea quae haereditatent consequitur,"* by which Augustine understands the Church. The origin of their error was a mistaken etymology, by which Nehiloth is derived from ljn; *nachdl*, "to inherit." Hengstenberg maintains

that the title with this derivation has a mystical or spiritual meaning, "for the inheritance," or "upon the lots," i.e., of the righteous and the wicked. Other etymologies have been proposed which are equally unsound. In Chaldee lyjæ] *nechil,* signifies "a swarm of bees." and hence Jarchi attributes to Nehiloth the notion of multitude, the psalm being sung by the whole people of Israel. R. Hai, quoted by Kimchi, adopting the same origin for the word, explains it as an instrument, the sound of which was like the hum of bees, a wind instrument, according to Sonntag *(De tit. Psalm* page 430), which had a rough tone. Michaelis *(Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* page 1629) suggests, with not unreasonable timidity, that the root is to be found in the Arab. *nachala,* "to winnow," and hence to separate and select the better part, indicating that the psalm, in the title of which Nehiloth occurs, was " an ode to be chanted by the purified and better portion of the people." It is most likely, as Gesenius and others explain, that it is derived (instead of tLojæ]) from the root llij; *chalal,* "to bore, perforate," whence lylæj; *chall,* a flute or pipe (<091005>1 Samuel 10:5; <110140>1 Kings 1:40), so that Nehiloth is the general term for perforated wind-instruments of all kinds, as Neginoth denotes all manner of stringed instruments. The title of Psalm 5 is therefore addressed to the conductor of the Temple choir who played upon flutes and the like, and these are directly alluded to in <198707>Psalm 87:7, where (µylljæo, *cholelim)* "the players upon instruments" who are associated with the singers are properly "pipers" or "flute-players." *SEE FLUTE*. Others, like Aben-Ezra among rabbinical commentators, and Hitzig among living scholars, understand it to be the name of an air to which the psalm was sung, "after, or according to, the inheritance." Furst suggests that *Nehiloth* was a musical choir, having their chief seat at a town which bore a cognate name, perhaps Hilen (<130658>1 Chronicles 6:58; comp. his explanation of *Neginoth).* The use of the preposition laæ in this connection does not justify the rendering "upon," but requires us to understand that the psalm under consideration was to be chanted *in imitation* or in the style of (a *la)* the air or musical instrument in question. *SEE PSALMS*.

Ne'hum

(Heb. *Nechum',* µWjn], if genuine, i.q. *Nahum,* i.e., *consoled,* but prob. by erroneous transcription for ,Wjr], i.e., *Rechum;* Sept. Ἰναούμ, but most MSS. have Ναούμ; Vulg. *Nahum),* one of the Israelites who returned from

Babylon with Zerubbabel (<160707>Nehemiah 7:7); called REHUM *SEE REHUM* (q.v.) in the parallel list (<150202>Ezra 2:2).

Nehush'ta

(Heb. *Nechushta',* aT;v]j ni], *copper;* Sept. Νεεσθά v.r.Ναισθά; Vulg. *Nohesta),* the daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem, wife of Jehoiakim, and mother of Jehoiachin, kings of Judah (<122408>2 Kings 24:8). B.C. cir. 616.

Nehush'tan

(Heb. *Nechushtan',* ˆT;v]j ni], *of copper,* with the art.; Sept. Νεεσθάν, v.r. Νεσθάν and even Νεσθαλεί; Vulg. *Nohestan),* a contemptuous name given to the copper ("brazen") serpent which Moses had made during the plague in the wilderness (<042108>Numbers 21:8 sq.), and which the Israelites worshipped (<121804>2 Kings 18:4). *SEE BRAZEN SERPENT*. "One of the first acts of Hezekiah; upon coming to the throne of Judah, was to destroy all traces of the idolatrous rites which had gained such a fast hold upon the people during the reign of his father Ahaz.. Among other objects of superstitious reverence and worship was this singular metallic effigy, which was preserved throughout the wanderings of the Israelites, probably as a memorial of their deliverance, and according to a late tradition was placed in the Temple. The lapse of nearly a thousand years had invested this ancient relic with a mysterious sanctity which easily degenerated into idolatrous reverence, and at the time of Hezekiah's accession it had evidently been long an object of worship, 'for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it,' or as the Hebrew more fully implies, 'had been in the habit of burning incense to it' (µyrIF]qim] Wyh; *had been incense-burners).* The expression points to a settled practice. It is evident that our translators by their rendering, 'And he called it Nehushtan,' understood with many commentators that the subject of the sentence is Hezekiah, and that when he destroyed the brazen serpent he gave it the name Nehushtan, 'a brazen thing,' in token of his utter contempt, and to impress upon the people the idea of its worthlessness. This rendering has the support of the Sept. and Vulgate, Junius and Tremellius, Munster, Clericus, and others; but it is better to understand the Hebrew as referring to the name by which the serpent was generally known, the subject of the verb being indefinite — and one called it *'Nehushtan.'* Such a construction is common, and instances of it may be found in <012526>Genesis 25:26; 38:29, 30, where our translators correctly render 'his name was called,' and in <014801>Genesis 48:1,

2. This was the view taken in the Targ. Jon. and in the Peshito-Syriac, 'And they called it Nehushtan,' which Buxtorf approves *(Hist. Serp. En.* cap. 6). It has the support of Luther, Pfeiffer *(Dub. Vex.* cent. 3, loc. 5), J.D. Michaelis *(Bibel fur Ungel.),* and Bunsen *(Bibelwerk),* as well as of Ewald *(Gesch.* 3:622), Keil, Thenius, and most modern commentators." *SEE HEZEKIAH*. "The fact of the preservation of the brazen serpent till the time of Hezekiah is, as Bunsen remarks, a sufficient guarantee not only for the historical truth of the narrative in Numbers, but also for the religious significancy of the symbol; for had it been, as some have supposed. an image of Satan, it would not have been suffered by David or Solomon to remain *(Bibelwerk,* 5:217). The fact also that it is referred to by our Lord. as in some sense resembling him (⁴⁰⁰³John 3:14,15), not only vouches for the same things, but further imposes on us the duty of seeking in it a deeper significancy than that which the mere narrative of Moses would lead us to attach to it. We may, therefore, dismiss at once all the attempts of rationalists to resolve the facts of the Mosaic narrative into mere ordinary occurrences; such as that of Bauer, who finds in the cure of the Israelites by looking at the brazen serpent only an instance of the curative power of the imagination *(Hebr. Gesch.* 2:320), or that of Paulus, who thinks that the brazen serpent being at some distance from the camp, and the sight of it moving the Israelite who had been bitten to walk to it, the motion thereby produced served to work off the effects of the poison, and so tended to a cure *(Comment.* 4:1, 198 sq.); or that of Hofmann, who ingeniously suggests that the brazen serpent was the title of a rural hospital, where medicine and doctors were to be found by those who had faith to go for them. It is sad to see a man like Bunsen falling back on the old exploded rationalistic explanation of this occurrence. The fixing of the gaze on the image brought the mind to a state of repose, and so made the bodily cure possible' *(Bibelwerk,* 5:217), as if this were all! We may pass over also the notion of Marsham, according to whom the serpent of brass was an implement of magic or incantation borrowed from the Egyptians, who he says 'imprimis μαγείᾳ τινί ἐπιχωρίῳob serpentum incantationem celebrantur' *(Canon Chronicles* page 148); for this is so purely gratuitous, and so opposed to the narrative of Moses, as well as the religious principles and feelings which he sought to inculcate (comp. ³⁰²⁶Leviticus 19:26), that it must be at once rejected (see Deyling, *Obs. Sac.* 2:210 sq.). The traditionary belief of the ancient Jews is that the brazen serpent was the symbol of salvation, and that healing came to the sufferer who looked to it as the result of his faith in God, who had appointed this method of

cure." See Schachan, *De serpentts ennei significatione* (Lubec. 1713); Notting, *De serp. ten. Servatoris typo* (Jen. 1759); Huth, *Serpens exaltatus non contritionis sed conterendi imago* (Erlang. 1758). *SEE SERPENT*.

Ne'iel

[many *Ne'iel]* (Heb. *Neiel'*, לַאְיִעְנ, *dwelling* place *of 'God;* Sept. Ναοήλ v.r. Ἀνιήλ, Ἰναηλ; Vulg. *Nehiel),* a town in the territory of Asher, near the southern or south-eastern border (<06127>Joshua 19:27). Eusebius and Jerome (who call it the "village *Baetoanaea,"*Βαιτοαναιά*)* place it in the mountain (Carmel), sixteen miles east (N.T.) of Caesarea Palaestina, where medicinal springs were found *(Onomast.* s.v. Aniel, Ἀνιήλ, the reading of the Alexand. MS. of the Sept. in the above passage); a position which exactly agrees with that of the modern village *Bistan,* adjoining the spring Ain-Haud, a short distance east of Athlit (Van de Velde, *Map).* The description of the boundary is quite indistinct at this point, *SEE TRIBE*; and if we regard merely the associated names Jiphthah-el (the present Jefat) and Cabul (now Kabul), we might locate Neiel at the modern *Minar* (supposing a mere interchange of liquids in the name), a village conspicuously situated half-way between them (Robinson, *New Res.* 3:87, 103); although Beth-emek (q.v.) is mentioned immediately before Neiel, and lies much farther interior (at Amkah). Keil *(Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.) thinks that the statement of the text assigns both these latter places a position south of the border and within Zebulon; while Knobel *(Commentar,* ad loc. Joshua) is inclined to identify Neiel with the NEAH of <06913>Joshua 19:13, which, however, lay too far east. For other views, see Rosenmuller, *Scholia,* ad loc.

Neigh

(הָחָצ; *tsahal'*, prop. *to be clear* or bright; hence to emit a sharp sound, as of a *shout,* so often; spoken of the neighing of a horse [<24016>Jeremiah 8:16; 13:27; 1, 5, 8] and the bellowing of a bull [Jeremiah 1, 11]; but in both cases as indicative of lustful desire).

Neighbor

(usually רֵעַ, *rea,* elsewhere "friend;" ὁ πλήσιος, one's *nearest* dweller). This word in its general sense signifies a person near, and one connected with us by the bonds of humanity, and whom charity requires that we

should consider as a friend and relation (Deuteronomy 5:20). At the time of our Saviour the Pharisees had restrained the meaning of the word neighbor to those of their own nation or to their own friends, holding that to hate their enemy was not forbidden by the law (Matthew 5:43). But our Saviour informed them that the whole world were neighbors; that they ought not to do to another what they would not have done to themselves; and that this charity extended even to enemies. The beautiful parable of the Good Samaritan is set forth to illustrate this principle (Luke 10:29-37). *SEE CHARITY*.

Neil, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1804 in Antrim County, Ireland. His parents, emigrating to the United States, settled upon a farm in Washington County, Pennsylvania. He was early taught the great truths of the Bible, and the way of salvation according to the faith and practice of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. He was educated at Washington College, Washington, Pennsylvania; studied theology at the Associate Reformed Seminary at Alleghany City, Pennsylvania; was licensed in 1836, and in 1838 was ordained pastor of the three congregations of Mount Jackson, Centre, and Mahoning, Pennsylvania. In 1849, after laboring earnestly and faithfully for eleven years, he was released from Mahoning congregation; in 1857, on account of failing health, he also resigned Centre congregation, continuing thereafter his labors with the Mount Jackson congregation until 1860, when he became unable to preach and retired from the ministry. He died in 1861. Mr. Neil was a close student of the Scriptures. As a preacher he was more instructive than attractive. He always endeavored to make thorough pulpit preparation, and often wrote his sermons a second time before delivery. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, page 361.

Neile, John, D.D.

an English divine, flourished in the reign of king James II as dean of Ripon. He was born about the beginning of the 17th century, and was noted among his contemporaries. See Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Eng.* 2:197.

Neile, Richard, D.D.

an English prelate of considerable note, flourished in the reign of king James I, i.e., some time about the. opening of the 17th century. He was

born near the close of the 16th century, and after due educational training became a school-teacher, but afterwards took holy orders, and rapidly rose to positions of influence. He was finally elevated to the episcopate, and successively held the sees of Rochester, Lichfield and Coventry, Lincoln, Durham, and Winchester, and was then made archbishop of York, promotions which are said to have been secured by Neile by most base and unchristian conduct. He was subservient to the interests of king James at the expense of his own manhood, and is generally spoken of as the ecclesiastical courtier of king James's reign. Says Perry *(Eccles. Hist.* 1:205), "If we were to write down against this prelate all that is deliberately said of him by his metropolitan, archbishop Abbot (Collett's *State Trials*, volume 2), his character (i.e., Neile's) would be by no means a flattering one." Abbot was bid to beware of him, for that "he was ever and in all things naught. That he did all the worst offices that ever he could, and was still stirring the coals to procure to himself a reputation." "I know not," said another, "what the bishop of Lichfield does among you, but he hath made a shift to be taken for a knave generally with us." Though the friend and ally of Laud, he was yet far his inferior, and Neile is universally spoken of as "neither conspicuous for learning nor for diligence in his office. He did not preach once in twelve years,... but knew how to please both James and Charles. He was one of a class of men of whom the Church of England can never be proud." Archbishop Neile died in 1640. See Perry, *Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.* 1:191 sq.

Neill, Hugh

an American divine of the colonial period, came to this country about the opening of the last century, and labored in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In the mother country he was a Nonconformist, and labored for years as Presbyterian minister both in England and in New Jersey, where he greatly distinguished himself. He was ordained to holy orders in the Anglican establishment in 1749 by the bishop of London, and was at once appointed to missionary work. During the following fifteen years — the extent of his work in this country — his sympathies were especially directed to the negro race, whose love and confidence he gained. He died about 1770. See Anderson, *Hist. of the Ch. of Eng. in the Colonies and foreign Dependencies of the British Empire*, 3:379-81, 457; Hawkins, *Eccles. Hist.* page 126 sq.

Neill, William, D.D.

an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born near McKeesport, Alleghany County, Pennsylvania, in 1778. His parents were killed by Indians while he was yet a child, so that he was raised by friends. He was engaged in a store at Canonsburg, Pa.,when the question of duty being brought to his mind and heart he soon decided upon the ministry. He pursued his preparatory studies in the Old Academy, which afterwards became Jefferson College, Pennsylvania; graduated at Princeton College in 1803, and acted as tutor there, during which time he studied theology. In 1805 he was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery; in 1806 was ordained pastor of a Church at Cooperstown, N.J.; in 1809, of the First Church, Albany, N.Y.; in 1816, of the Sixth Church, Philadelphia, where he continued to labor until 1824, when he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, then under the control of the Presbyterians. There Dr. Neill labored for five years, when long-continued difficulties, which could not be controlled, prompted him to resign, and by the action of the trustees the college passed into the hands of the Methodists. On leaving Carlisle, in 1829, he became secretary and general agent for the Board of Education, which office he held for two years. In speaking of his duties at that time, he says, "I was their factotum, had the office in my dwelling, kept the records, wrote the letters, travelled, preached, collected funds, and prepared the reports, without even a boy to go on errands; but, harder than all, I had to contend with the American Education Society, and the prejudices of the people against all denominational boards... However, we made some progress; a few hundred dollars were collected, a few beneficiaries were registered, and the people began to come slowly under the shadow of their own standard." Finding the work too hard and incompatible with his duty to his family, he resigned, and in 1831 retired to Germantown, and there betook himself again to the duties of the pulpit. He preached until 1842, when he removed to Philadelphia, and remained without charge until his death, August 8, 1860. Dr. Neill was deemed one of the most useful ministers of his day. His preaching was clear and replete with Gospel truth, persuasive and tender. His active mind often found expression in the religious press. He published, *Lectures on Biblical History* (1846, 1855): — *Practical Exposition of the Epistles to the Ephesians* (1850): — *The Divine Origin and Authority of the Christian Religion* (1854): — *A Discourse reviewing a Ministry of Fifty Years* (1857). He also for some years edited the *Presbyterian Magazine,* and contributed papers to several

of the religious periodicals. After his death there was published a volume of his *Sermons* with his *Autobiography,* and a *Commemorative Discourse* by the Reverend Dr. J.H. Jones. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, page 102; Allibone's *Dict. of Authors,* s.v.; *American Presbyterian Reunion Memorial Volume,* 1837-1871, pages 128-133. (J.L.S.)

Neilson, John

a Scotch martyr to religious liberty, was a nobleman of considerable influence in Galloway. He had enjoyed superior educational advantages, was by nature quite talented, and enjoyed an unblemished character. But he was a Covenanter, and consequently subjected to severe persecutions on the part of the Anglican clergy. When the people of Galloway rose in self-defence, he joined them; and, notwithstanding the cruel treatment which he and his family had received from Turner, Mr. Neilson argued strenuously and successfully against the proposal of some to put the oppressor to death. As the prelates could not conceive that the persecuted Presbyterians would have dared to rise in self-defence unless there had been a widely extended conspiracy, they determined to extort a confession of the nature and extent of this plot from such of the prisoners as were certain to be acquainted with it if it existed. For this reason they resolved to put Neilson to the torture of the *boot.* In vain did they crush his leg in this fearful engine of torture; shrieking nature attested his agony, but his soul was clear of the guilt wherewith he was charged, and he would not blacken it by making a false acknowledgment of a crime of which he was innocent. When the persecutors found that they could extort nothing from him but groans and anguish, they condemned him to suffer, along with his guiltless friends, the shorter pangs of death. See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland,* page 230; Wodrow, 2:53.

Neisser Brothers

SEE MORAVIANS.

Neith

Picture for Neith

is the name of the female divinity of *wisdom* among the ancient Egyptians. Her name, which means "I came from myself," leads to the supposition that she was an impersonation of nature. She was chiefly worshipped in the

Delta, where a city was built bearing her name. Her temple, the largest in Egypt, was at Sais, the kings of which called themselves her sons. It was open to the sky, and bore an inscription, "I am all that was, and is, and is to be; no mortal has lifted up my veil, and the fruit which I brought forth is the sun." Ranking next to Ptah, the most exalted of Egyptian divinities, she is to the female deities what Ptah (q.v.) is to the male; and indeed so closely are the functions of the two commingled or confounded in some representations of them that Neith may be briefly defined as the female counterpart of the great *demiun rgus*. Ptah is the *primary paternal* element in nature, Neith the primary *conceptire* element. He is the father of the sun, she is the mother of the same luminary, and one of her titles is consequently "the great co-engenderer of the sun" (Bunsen, 1:386; Kenrick, 1:390). Ptah is the primordial fire, while Neith is the primordial space or chaos, self-producing, coeternal with him, and co-equal; or, in other words, the "feminine ether" everywhere diffused as the material basis of all forms of created existence. Neith is called also *Muth*, the universal mother and queen of heaven. Neith wears the red crown of Lower Egypt, indicating the proper seat of her worship; but her monuments are found in the upper region also. By reversing her hieroglyphic signs NT (i.e., by reading them in the European instead of the Asiatic manner), may have been formed *Athene*, the patron goddess of Athens, which city was supposed to have been founded from Sais. The owl, her favorite bird, is also found upon the coinage of the Delta; but the virgin mother of Egypt seems to have had little else in common with the Minerva who sprang full armed from the brain of Jupiter. *SEE MINERVA*. A statue of Neith is preserved in the Egyptian Room of the British Museum. Neith is generally represented in green, a sign that she was connected with the under world, and invisible to mortals; a festival of "Burning Lamps" was held in her honor. See Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in History*, volume 1; Kenrick, *Anc. Egypt under the Pharaohs*, volume 1; Rouge, in *Revue Archeologique* (huitieme annee), page 40 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 2:248 sq.; Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie*, volume 2, part 1, page 43; Trevor, *Ancient Egypt*, pages 134, 187, 152.

Neithe

is the name of a Celtic divinity who was superstitiously reverenced even in Christian Scotland. The primitive signification of the name is *to wash* or purify with water, and the name was probably given to this divinity because she is the presiding spirit of the water element. She was the goddess of

fountains, which to this day are regarded with particular veneration over every part of the Highlands. "The sick, who resort to them for health," says Brand *(Popular Antiquities of Great Britain,* 2:376), "address their vows to the presiding powers and offer presents to conciliate their favor. The presents generally consist of a small piece of money or a few fragrant flowers." *SEE HOLY WELL*.

Nekam

a Mohammedan martyr to the Christian cause, flourished near the middle of the 11th century. He was of an influential family, but, convinced of the errors of Mohammedanism, he embraced Christianity and became a Jacobite. His parents and friends forsook him, and he consequently retired to the church of St. Michael at Moctara, where, after a short stay, he was urged by the monks to retreat with them to the convent of S. Macarius. He refused to join them, on the ground of his obligation to publicly confessing Christ, especially among his former associates, in order that they too might become Christ's servants on earth. He went to Cairo, and there boldly presenting himself in the public streets, was imprisoned and condemned to death, because of his apostasy. All efforts to reclaim him, or to feign madness in order that his life might be saved, he refused as improper means, and he was consequently beheaded. The corpse was given up to his friends and buried near the church of Moctara, but the patriarch Abd-el-Messiah removed it within the building, and erected an altar in honor of the noble martyr. See Neale's *Hist. Holy East. Ch. (Patriarchate of Alexandria,* 2:215, 716).

Ne'keb

(Heb. *id.,* but only with the art., bqNhi Sept. καὶ Ναβώκ, v.r. Ναβόκ, Νακέβ *;* Vulg. *quce est Neceb),* given in our version as one of the towns on the boundary of Naphtali (Joshua 19:33 only), apparently between Adam and Jabneel. A great number of commentators, from Jonathan the Targumist and Jerome *(Vulgate* as above) to Keil *(Josua,* ad loc.), have taken this name as being connected with the preceding Adami-han-Nekeb (i.e., *Adami [of] the Cavern)* (so Junius and Tremellius, "Adamoei fossa"); and indeed this is the force of the accentuation of the present Hebrew text. But on the other hand the Sept. gives the two as distinct, and in the Talmud the post-biblical names of each are given, that of han-Nekeb being *Tsiadathah* (atdyyx *Genma, Gem Cara Hieros.* Cod. Megilla, in Reland,

Palest. pages 545, 717, 817; also Schwarz, *Palestine,* page 181). Of this more modern name Schwarz suggests that a trace is to be found in *"Hazedhi,* three English miles N. from al-Chatti." Hackett suggests *Neckev,* near Ramah, on the road to Akka *(Illust. of Script.* page 240). Both these suggestions, however, are superfluous. *SEE ADAMI*.

Neko'da

(Heb. *Nekoda',* adwqn] *distinguished;* Sept. Νεκωδά, v.r. Νεχωδά and Νεκωδάν*),* the head of a family of the "Temple servants" who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (<15048>Ezra 2:48; <16075>Nehemiah 7:50). B.C. 535. A man of the same name is mentioned in <15060>Ezra 2:60; <16062>Nehemiah 7:62, as the progenitor of certain persons who on the return from Babylon had lost their pedigree, from which it would seem that they claimed to be Israelites; but as the Nethinim are mentioned immediately before, and neither of the associated names occurs again, we may presume that they were finally determined to be descendants of the above-named non-Israelite (see Keil, ad loc.). *SEE NETHINIM*.

Nekoth

SEE SPICES.

Nelis, Corneille Francois De

a learned Belgian prelate, was born in Mechlin June 5, 1736. He was educated at the University of Louvain, and took the degree of licentiate May 6, 1760. Almost immediately he became principal of the College of Mechlin, and, in addition, the management of the library of the Academy was intrusted to him. He made himself advantageously known to the literary world by several *Dissertations* upon various points of history and philosophy. He was nominated canon of Tournay in 1765, and in 1767 vicargeneral of that city; he also held for a time the vicariate-general over the province of Tournaisis. Upon the exclusion of the Society of Jesus from the country in 1773, he was designated as a member of the royal commission for the studies instituted at Brussels. The archduke Maximilian, afterwards elector of Cologne; having appreciated his merit in a visit that Nelis made to the Belgian provinces; signalized him to the emperor Joseph II, who nominated Nelis to the bishopric of Antwerp, October 25, 1784. Although he owed his elevation to the house of Austria, his conscience was greatly alarmed by the religious innovations that the

emperor Joseph II wished to introduce; and as early as May 22, 1786, he addressed remonstrances to the government concerning the order of publishing from the pulpit the proclamations of the police and others, and several days after representations upon the suppression of societies, processions, and upon impediments that invalidate marriage. The same year he opposed the imperial edict which instituted a new form of concourse for conferring benefices; later he wrote against the suppression of episcopal seminaries. The death of Joseph II wrought some changes, and on July 19, 1793, Nelis, who had shown himself one of the most ardent enemies of France, wrote to the emperor Francis II to justify and excuse his conduct during the Brabanbonne revolution. The 21st of April following he went to Brussels, where the states were convened, and was cordially welcomed by the emperor. But the revolution advanced rapidly, and at the approach of the French army Nelis, who had everything to fear, fled in haste from Antwerp, June 28, 1794. He sought first an asylum at Breda, but could not long remain in that town, and made his way to Rotterdam, and in 1795 went over into Germany. After having sojourned several months at Gottingen and at Osnabrtick, then in Switzerland at Zurich, near Lavater, of whom he was an intimate friend, he passed to Bavaria, and shortly after to Italy, where he dwelt successively at Florence, Parma, Bologna, Rome, and Naples. He found at last a welcome hospitality in a convent of Camaldules near Florence, where he died, August 21, 1798. We have among the works of this prelate, *Eloge funebre de l'empereur Francois I* (Louvain, 1765, 4to, in Latin; Brussels, 1766, 4to, in Latin and French): — *Eloge funebre de Marie-Therese* (Brussels, 1780, 4to and 8vo). This eulogy, written in French, is considered much superior to the one composed by the abbe de Boismont: — *Belgicarum rerum Prodromus, sive de historia Belgica ejusque scriptoribus praecipuis commentatio* (Parma, 1795, 8vo). M. de Reiffenberg paid it the greatest eulogy in his edition of the *Chronique rimee de Philippe Mouskes: — L'Aveugle de la Montagne, ou entretiens philosophiques* (1789, 1793, 2 volumes, 8vo; enlarged edition, Parma, 1795, 8vo; Rome, 1797, 4to). In the collections of the Academy of Brussels, 1777, and following year, are found the following, by Nelis: *Memoire sur l'ancien Brabant; sur la vigogne et l'amelioration de nos laines; sur la pierre Brunehaut dans le Tournaisis; sur la constitution municipale et sur les privileges accordes aux villes des Pays-Bas; sur les ecoles et sur les etudes d'humanites.* We also have from Nelis numerous *Mandements* and *Lettres pastorales,* either in Flemish or in French. Among the manuscripts that he has left, two especially are of

interest, *Questionum Camaldulensium libri quatuor,* and *Europae fata, mores, disciplinae, ab ineunte saeculo X V usque ad finem saeculi XVII.* These two works were on the point of being published when death removed their author, who bequeathed them to the convent of the Camaldules, where he had found an asylum. See *Synopsis actorum ecclesiae Antwerpiensis,* etc., by De Ram; *Memoires de l'Acadmie des Sciences de Bruxelles,* passim; *Documents particuliers.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Neller, Georg Christoph, Count

a German canonist, was born at Aub (bishopric of Wirzburg) in 1710. He entered holy orders in 1748, was nominated professor of the canon law at Treves, where he received a canonicate; he next became counsellor of the elector of Treves, and was then elevated to the dignity of count palatine. He died at Treves in 1783. We have of his works, *Principia juris publici ecclesiastici Catholicorum ad statuen Germaniae accommodata* (Frankfort, 1746 and 1768, 8vo): — *De Concordatis Germaniae* (Treves, 1748): — *De Jurisprudentia Trevirorum sub Romanis* (ibid, 1752): — *De Jurisprudentia Trevirorum Belgica* (ibid 1752): — *Jurisprudentia Trevirorum ante-Romana, su Romanis, sub Francis et sub Germanis,* in the *Prodromus historiae Trevirensis* of Montheim: *Kurzer Unterricht von den alt-romischen,frankischen, trierischen und rheinlandischen Pfennigen und Hellern* (ibid. 1763): — *Dissertatio in Dagoberti diploma Horrense* (ibid. 1770) many juridical dissertations, united in one collection, published at Treves in 1776 (4to). See Mensel, *Lexikon,* s.v.; Weidlich, *Nachrichten,* volumes 2 and 4.

Nelli, Nello

an Italian painter of Pisa who flourished in the 13th century, is remembered as the author of a *Madonna* painted on panel in the old church of Tripalle at Pisa, signed *Nerus Nellus de Pisa me pinxit,* 1299. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:616.

Nelli, Suora Platella

an Italian paintress of a noble family, who devoted herself to religious as well as to secular art, was born at Florence in 1523. She became a nun in the Dominican Convent of St. Catherine at Florence, and without other assistance than a collection of designs by Fra. Bartolomeo di S. Marco, she

attained considerable excellence in painting. Her productions are generally in the style of that artist, although she also imitated other masters. Among them are a picture of the *Crucifixion,* with a number of small figures finished; a *Descent from the Cross,* said to be after a design by Andrea del Sarto in the church of her order at Florence; and an *Adoration of the Magi,* of her own composition, possessing great merit. She died in 1588.

Nello, Bernardo Di Gio Falconi

an old painter of Pisa, whose works were mostly of a religious character, flourished about 1390. He was a distinguished artist in his time, and Lanzi says he still merits consideration. He painted many picture* in the Cathedral at Pisa. He is supposed to be the same as *Nello di Vanni,* who with other Pisan artists painted in the Campo Santo in the 14th century. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:614.

Nelson, David, M.D.

an American Presbyterian minister and educator, was born near Jonesborough, in East Tennessee, September 24, 1793. He was educated at Washington College, and after graduating in Philadelphia returned to Kentucky at the age of nineteen, intending to practice medicine; but the war of 1812 having commenced, he joined a Kentucky regiment as surgeon, and proceeded to Canada. He afterwards accompanied the army of generals Jackson and Coffee to Alabama and Florida, and after the establishment of peace settled finally at Jonesborough, where he resumed his medical practice with great success. While away at war he had become estranged from his early religious convictions, and in part at least espoused infidel theories. He now became more seriously convinced of his dependence on God, and, reawakened and converted, he determined to forsake a lucrative professional career for the purpose of entering the ministry, and was licensed to preach in April, 1825. He preached for some three years in Tennessee, where he was at the same time connected with the *Calvinistic Magazine,* published at Rogersville. In 1828 he became pastor of the church of Danville, Kentucky, succeeding his brother Samuel. In 1830 he removed to Missouri, and was chiefly instrumental in establishing Marion College, of which he became the first president. In 1836 Dr. Nelson. who was a warm emancipationist, owing to a disturbance growing out of the slavery question, removed to Illinois, and at Oakland, near Quincy, established an institute for the education of young men,

especially for such as were preparing to become missionaries. Here he exhausted his pecuniary means, and died October 17, 1844. His most remarkable work is his *Cause and Cure of Infidelity* (1836 and often). The manuscript of *Wealth and Honor,* which lie intended for publication, was lost after it passed from his hands. He also wrote many occasional articles on missions, baptism, etc., which appeared in the *New York Observer* and other papers of the day. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* 4:677; *Hist. of Presbyterianism in Kentucky,* page 330. (J.H.W.)

Nelson, John (1)

an eminent Methodist lay preacher, was one of the ablest of the assistants of the Wesleys in their evangelical movement in the last century. He is generally acknowledged the chief founder of Methodism in Yorkshire, a portion of England in which it has had signal success down to our day. Nelson was born near the close of the 17th century. He was the descendant of humble but honorable parentage, and was early apprenticed to a stone-mason, a trade at which he became proficient, and at which he worked nearly all his life, even in the midst of his evangelizing labors. He was converted under the preaching of John Wesley in 1711, at Moorfields. Nelson's home was in Bristol. He had led an upright life from his youth, and had at the time of his conversion an humble but a happy home, a good wife, good wages, good health, and a stout English heart. He had long been distressed by the sense of moral wants which his life failed to meet until the light came under the preaching of Wesley. The sad and trying days of Nelson are thus narrated by his biographer: "Something he believed there must be in true religion to meet the wants of the soul, otherwise man is more unfortunate than the brute that perishes. Absorbed in such meditations, this untutored mechanic wandered in the fields after the work of the day, discussing to himself questions which had employed and ennobled the thoughts of Plato in the groves of the Cephissus, and agitated by the anxieties that had stirred the souls of Wesley and his associates at Oxford. His conduct was a mystery to his less thoughtful fellowworkmen. He refused to share in their gross indulgences; they cursed him because he would not drink as they did. He bore their insults with a calm philosophy; but having as 'brave a heart as ever Englishman was blessed with' (Southey), he would not allow them to infringe on his rights; and when they took away his tools, determined that if he would not drink with them he should not work while they were carousing, he fought with several of them until they were content to let him alone in his inexplicable gravity and

courage. He also went from church to church, for he was still a faithful churchman, but met no answers to his profound questions. He visited the chapels of all classes of Dissenters, but the quiet of the Quaker worship could not quiet the voice that spoke through his conscience, and the splendor of the Roman ritual soon became but irksome pomp to him. He tried, he tells us, all but the Jews, and hoping for nothing from them, resolved to adhere steadily to the Church, regulating his life with strictness, spending his leisure in reading and prayer, and leaving his final fate unsolved. Whitefield's eloquence at Moorfields, however, attracted him thither, but it did not meet his wants. He loved the great orator, he tells us, and was willing to fight for him against the mob, but his mind only sank deeper into perplexity. He became morbidly despondent; he slept little, and often awoke from his horrible dreams dripping with sweat and shivering with terror. Wesley came to Moorfields; Nelson gazed upon him with inexpressible interest as he ascended the platform, stroked back his hair, and cast his eye directly upon him. 'My heart,' he says, 'beat like the pendulum of a clock, and when he spoke I thought his whole discourse was aimed at me.' 'This man,' he said to himself, 'can tell the secrets of my heart; he has shown me the remedy for my wretchedness, even the blood of Christ.' He now became more than ever devoted to religious duties, and soon found the peace of mind he had so long been seeking. He records with dramatic interest the discussions and efforts of his acquaintances to prevent him from going too far in religion. They seem to have been mostly an honest, simple class like himself; they thought he would become unfit for business, and that poverty and distress would fall upon his family. They wished he had never heard Wesley, who, they predicted, would 'be the ruin of him.' He told them that he had reason to bless God that Wesley was ever born, for by hearing him he had become sensible that his business in this world was to get well out of it. The family with whom he lodged were disposed to expel him from the house, for they were afraid some mischief would come on either themselves or him from 'so much praying and fuss as he made about religion.' He procured money and went to pay them what he owed them, and take his leave; but they would not let him escape; ' What if John is right, and we wrong?' was a natural question which they asked among themselves. 'If God has done for you anything more than for us, show us how we may find the same mercy,' asked one of them. He was soon leading them to hear Wesley at Moorfields. One of them was made partaker of the same grace, and he expressed the hope of meeting both in heaven. With much simplicity, but true English determination, he adhered

to his religious principles at any risk. His employer required work to be done during the Sabbath on the exchequer building, declaring that the king's business required haste, and that it was usual in such cases to work on Sunday for his majesty. Nelson replied that he would not work on the Sabbath for any man in England, except to quench fire, or something that required the same immediate help. His employer threatened him with the loss of his business. He replied that he would rather starve than offend God. 'What hast thou done that thou makest such an ado about religion?' asked his employer; 'I always took thee for an honest man, and could trust thee with five hundred pounds.' 'So you might,' replied the sturdy Methodist, 'and not have lost one penny by me.' 'But I have a worse opinion of thee now than ever,' resumed the employer. 'Master,' replied Nelson, 'I have the odds of you there, for I have a much worse opinion of myself than you cal have.' The honest man was not dismissed, nor again asked to work on Sunday, nor were any of his fellowworkmen." Immediately after his conversion he wrote to his wife, who was in the country, and to all his kindred, explaining his new method of life, and exhorting them to adopt it. Soon after he went to visit them at Bristol, and was met with considerable opposition. But he was only the more encouraged to holy living, and faithfully studied the sacred writings to fortify himself in his new opinions. Ere long his friends were converted, and he held meetings in his house, reading, exhorting, and praying with such of his neighbors as would come to hear. The number soon increased so considerably that he was obliged to stand in his door in order to reach all who were within the house and in the yard. In a very short time the character of the community began to change; ale-houses were deserted, and six or seven converts made weekly. But not only the people had changed, Nelson himself had become another man; his sermons from being quite private had become public; indeed, he had become a preacher, and one of such power that Wesley, when hearing of the success attending Nelson's modest labors, set out at once to visit and direct him. Nelson was made one of Wesley's helpers, and the band of rustic followers one of his united societies. Thus Methodism started in Yorkshire, and thus opened the career of one of the ablest laypreachers in modern times. Nelson's labors were so successful that Wesley invited him to leave his home and assist in spreading Methodism in other parts of England, and soon he became almost as abundant in labors and sufferings as the Wesleys, and his influence over the working classes equal to that of John Wesley himself. Not even Whitefield possessed more power over the common people.

Indeed, "without Nelson and similar lay-preachers, Methodism could not have been sustained as it was. The souls which the leaders of the movement saved, were by these more carefully matured" (Skeats, pages 372, 373). Nelson's goodsense, cool courage, sound piety, and apt speech secured him success wherever he went. He spread Methodism not only in Yorkshire, but in Cornwall, Lincolnshire, Lancashire, and other counties. He was a man of such genuine spirit and popular tact that his worst opposers usually became his best friends. Like Wesley and Whitefield, he was persecuted and annoyed by the established clergy and their tools. His house at Bristol was pulled down; at Nottingham squibs were thrown in his face; at Grimsby the rector headed a mob to the beat of the town drum, and, after supplying them with beer, called upon them to " fight for the Church." Fighting for the Church meant the demolition of the house in which Nelson was living, and its windows were forthwith pulled down and the furniture destroyed (Nelson's *Journal,* page 92). But the preaching of the Yorkshire mason soon stopped all such proceedings. The drummer of Grimsby, who had been hired by the rector to beat down Nelson's preaching on the day after the riot, was one of the witnesses of its power. After beating for three quarters of an hour he stood and listened, and soon the tears of penitence were seen rolling down his cheeks. Such was Nelson's power over his audience. 'The clergy, determined to stay his influence, finally caused him to be impressed into the army, on his return to Bristol, as a vagrant, without visible means of living. Though he protested and tried to prove this charge unjust, he was yet taken and made a soldier. But even in his bonds Nelson did not cease to preach; and when he was forcibly compelled to wear the uniform, he boldly declared that he despised war, and that no one could ever compel him to enter any other service than that of the Prince of Peace, to whom he had dedicated himself. He remained a preacher even amid the din of arms, admonished his comrades against cursing and other sins, distributed tracts among them, and appointed prayermeetings. All this involved him in new sufferings and persecutions, and he finally sank in the midst of this ill-treatment; and when, in order to save his life, it became necessary to dismiss him in 1744, he again resumed evangelizing labors, but died before the close of that year. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism,* 1:136,176, 193, 205, 227, 249; 2: 153; Southey, *Life of Wesley,* chap. 14; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of Eng.* page 373; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries,* 1:453 sq.; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism,* page 43 sq. See also his own *Journal.*

Nelson, John (2), D.D.

an American Congregational minister, was born in Worcester, Mass., in 1785, and graduated at Williams College. In 1813 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Leicester, where his whole ministerial life, extending over a period of fifty-eight years, was passed. He died December 6, 1871. From 1844 he had a colleague, and for eighteen years previous to his death was an invalid. See Appleton's *Annual Cycloycdia*, 1871, page 591.

Nelson, Joseph, LL.D.

an American educator, was born about 1794, and was educated at Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., class of 1815. He was made professor of languages in 1826, but resigned this position in 1829. He was a distinguished classical scholar and teacher. During his professorship in Rutgers College he was blind, yet so thoroughly versed in his authors and so capable as an instructor that he was enabled to perform the duties of his chair with great acceptance. His other senses were remarkably acute. It is said that he could accurately tell the size of a room by the sound of the stamp of his foot upon the floor. He retired from active duty at the close of his professorship, and died in the city of New York in 1830. (W.J.R.T.)

Nelson, Matthew

a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Prince Edward County, Virgnina, April 7, 1781. In 1795 his father, colonel Ambrose Nelson, a descendant of the "old Scotch Tom," removed to Danville, Ky. Together with his brother Thomas, who was born in 1779, Matthew was converted in 1801-1802, and together these brothers were baptized while upon their knees in the Kentucky River. They exhibited such interest in the promotion of holy living that they were shortly after licensed to exhort by the Methodist Episcopal Church which they had joined, and in a very brief period were made preachers and admitted into the Kentucky Conference by bishop McKendree. Thomas preached for several years in Ohio, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee, when his health failed, and he was placed on the superannuated list. He then went South, and the time and place of his death are not known. Matthew preached until 1815, when he located. When the question of lay-representation first agitated the Methodist Episcopal Church, he took sides for the reform, and was elected delegate for Kentucky to the Baltimore Convention. He was a member of

that body when it formed the constitution of the Methodist Protestant Church, and thereafter his membership was in that branch of Methodism. He made, however, no distinction in his treatment of Methodists, and his house was the home of Methodist preachers generally. In 1837 he removed to Rutherford County, Tennesee, and there continued to be the same zealous promoter of Methodism. He died in 1856. His children joined the Methodist Episcopal Church without any opposition on his part. See McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee,* 2:134-137. Nelson, Robert, a pious and learned English divine, noted as the author of various works in practical divinity which have long been held in very high estimation, was born at London June 22, 1656. He studied at St. Paul's School, London, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was while a young man elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. He was intimate with Halley, with whom he travelled in France and Italy. While at Rome he met with and married in 1682 Lady Theophila Lucy, widow of a baronet, and daughter of the earl of Berkeley. This lady, under the influence of the celebrated French Romanist, Bossuetan intimate friend of Nelson — some time after their marriage became a Roman Catholic, to his great grief. Nelson's mind had been much occupied with the consideration of both the practical and controversial points in divinity, and his chief friends were eminent divines in the English Church, particularly Bull, Hickes, Lloyd, and Tillotson — the last was one of his most valued associates. Nelson not only employed his own powers of persuasion, both verbal and literary, but called in the aid of his friend, archbishop Tillotson; both were, however, unsuccessful, the lady continuing in the Romish communion till her death. His first work, *Transubstantiation contrary to Scripture, or the Protestant's Answer to the Seeker's Request* (1688), appears to be the substance of his considerations on this subject. He was strongly attached to king James II. He was the zealous promoter of all works of charity, having the ability as well as the disposition to give what true benevolence prompted. In helping to build churches, found schools, disseminate useful books, and enforce the laws against crime, he worked most effectually. At the Revolution he scrupled to take the oaths to king William, and remained a nonjuror till the year 1709, when on the death of Dr. Lloyd, the last survivor of the deprived nonjuring bishops, except Dr. Keen, he by Dr. Keen's advice returned to the Church of England as then established. He died Jan. 16, 1715, at Kensington, and was buried in the cemetery of St. George the Martyr by the Foundling Hospital. Robert Nelson wrote *A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England,* etc. (16th ed. Lond. 1736,

8vo). It is still one of the best works of the kind; several abridgments of it have appeared. Bickersteth praises it, but deplores the "great want of evangelical principles and unction" *(Christian Student,* p. 429), probably because Nelson espouses Bull's views on justification: — *The Practice of true Devotion in Relation to the End as well as the Means of Religion,* etc. (7th ed. Lond. 1726, 12mo): — *The great Duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice, and the Nature of the Preparation required* (5th ed. Lond. 1714, 12mo): — An *Address to Persons of Quality and Estate* (Lond. 1715, 8vo): — *The whole Duty of a Christian, by way of Question and Answer* (9th ed. Lond. 1727, 12mo): — *Instructions for them that come to be Confirmed* (Lond. 1823, 12mo). He published also a *Life of Bishop Bull,* together with the latter's works (Lond. 1714, 3 volumes, 8vo; see Debary, *History of the Ch. of England,* 1685-1717, page 346 sq.), and the works *of Kettlewell* (Lond. 1719, 2 volumes, fol.). See Secretan, *Life of Nelson;* Perry, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland,* 3:69; Palin, *Hist. of the Church of England,* 1688-1717, page 37 sq.; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2166.

Nelson, Stephen Smith

an American Baptist minister, was born in Middleborough, Massachusetts, October 5, 1772, graduated at Brown University in 1794, and was licensed to preach in 1796. After supplying the Church at Hartford for two years, he was ordained pastor there in 1798, occasionally preaching in the neighborhood, particularly at Middletown. While in Hartford he took an active part in preparing "the Baptist Petition," an address to the Legislature on the subject of the grievances of" Dissenters" from the "Standing Order," which finally severed, in Connecticut at least, the union between Church and State in 1818. He was also appointed to prepare and forward a congratulatory address to Mr. Jefferson on his election as president of the United States. In 1801 he resigned his charge in Hartford, and became principal of a large academy at Sing Sing (then Mount Pleasant), but in consequence of the war with Great Britain he removed in 1815 to Attleborough, Massachusetts, where his labors were very successful, and he afterwards had for a while charge successively of the churches in Plymouth, Massachusetts, and Canton, Connecticut. In 1825 he removed to Amherst, Massachusetts, where he continued preaching occasionally until his death, December 8, 1853 See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 6:366.

Nelson, Lady Theophila

SEE NELSON, ROBERT.

Nelson, Thomas

SEE NELSON, MATTHEW.

Nemaean Games

one of the four great festivals of ancient Greece, deriving its name from *Nemia*, where it was celebrated, as Pindar tells us, in honor of Zeus. The games consisted of horse-racing, chariot-racing, running, wrestling, boxing, throwing the spear, shooting with the bow, and other warlike exercises. 'The victors were crowned with a chaplet of olive, and afterwards of green parsley. The Nemrean games were regularly celebrated twice in the course of every Olympiad. They appear to have been discontinued soon after the reign of the Roman emperor Hadrian. *SEE GAMES*.

Nemalah

SEE ANT.

Nemar

SEE LEOPARD.

Nemeius

was a frequent surname of *Zeus*, and under it he was worshipped at Nemea, where games were celebrated in his honor. *SEE NEMEAN GAMES*.

Nemesiaci

was the name which was given to the officers of the goddess Nemesis, who presided over good fortune, and was the dispenser of faith. *SEE NEMESIS*.

Nemesis

(Νέμεσις, *vengeance)*, a female Greek divinity, is most commonly described, according to Hesiod, as a daughter of Night, though some call

her a daughter of Erebus (Hygin. *Fab.* praf.) or of Oceanus (Tzetz. *Ad. Lye.* 88; Pausan. 1:33, 3; 7:5, 1). Nemesis was a personification of the moral reverence for law, of the natural fear of committing a culpable action, anna nence of conscience, and for this reason she was mentioned together with Αἰδώς, or Shame. In course of time, when an enlarged experience convinced men that a divine will found room for its activity amid the little occurrences of human life, she came to be considered as the personification of the righteous anger of the gods, and as the power who constantly preserves or restores the moral equilibrium of earthly affairs — preventing mortals from reaching that excessive prosperity which would lead them to forget the reverence due to the immortal gods, or visiting them with wholesome calamities in the midst of their happiness. Hence originated the latest and loftiest conception of Nemesis as the being to whom was intrusted the execution of the decrees of a strict retributive providence — the awful and mysterious avenger of wrong, punishing and humbling evil-doers in particular. Nemesis was thus regarded as allied to Ate and the Eumenides. She is represented as the regulator of human affairs, disbursing at pleasure happiness or unhappiness, the goods and ills of life. She was also looked upon as an avenging deity, and as inflexibly severe to the proud and insolent (Pausanius, 1:33, 2). There was a celebrated temple sacred to her at Rhamnus, in Attica, about sixty stadia distant from Marathon; hence Nemesis was sometimes called also *Rhavsnusia* or *Rhanznusis.* In this temple there was a statue of the goddess, made from a block of Parian marble, which theaersians had brought thither to erect a trophy of their expected victory at Marathon. Pausanias says that this statue was the work of Phidias (Pausan. 1:33, 2, 3), but Pliny ascribes it to Agoracritus, and adds that it was preferred by M. Varro to all other statues which existed *(Hist. Nat.* 36:4, 3). A fragment, supposed by some to be the head of this statue, was found in the temple of Rhamnus, and was presented to the British Museum in 1820 *(Elgin and Phigaleian Marbles,* 1:120; 2:123). She was represented in the older times as a young virgin, resembling Venus; in later times as clothed with the tunic and peplus, sometimes with swords in her hands and a wheel at her foot, a griffin also having his right paw upon the wheel; sometimes in a chariot drawn by griffins. Nemesis is a frequent figure on coins and gems. The practice of representing the statues of Nemesis with wings was first introduced after the time of Alexander the Great by the inhabitants of Smyrna, who worshipped several goddesses under this name (Pausan. 7:5, 1; 9:35, 2). According to a myth preserved by Pausanias, Nemesis was the

mother of Helena by Zeus; and Leda, the reputed mother of Helena. was only her nurse (Pausan. 1:33, 7); but this myth seems to have been invented in later times to represent the divine vengeance which was inflicted on the Greeks and Trojans through the instrumentality of Helena. There was also a statue of Nemesis in the Capitol at Rome, though we learn that this goddess had no name in Latin (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 28:5). See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Ronma Biog. and Myth.* s.v.; Vollmer, *Mythologisches Wiorterbuch,* s.v.; Westcott, *Hand-book of Archceoloy,* pages 194, 195.

Nemesius

an ancient Christian philosopher of the Greek Church, noted as the author of a work entitled Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου, was, according to the title of the work, bishop of Emisa or Emesa, in Phoenicia, and he is also mentioned as such by Anastasius Nicenus *(Quaest. in S. Script.* ap. *iblioth. B Patrum,* 6:157 [ed. Paris, 1575]). The time in which he lived cannot be determined with much exactness, as the only ancient writers by whom he is quoted or mentioned are probably Anastasius and Moses bar-Cepha *(De Pazrad.* 1:20, page 55 [ed. Antw, 1569]). He has sometimes been confounded with the heathen praefect of Cappadocia, Nemesius, praised by Gregory Nazianzen, who corresponded with him. It would seem, however, from the fact that his work mentions no author posterior to the 4th century, but often Apollinaris and Eunomius, that he lived some time in the 5th century; Ritter opines about the middle of that century, as the expressions he uses concerning the union of the Logos and the human nature (page 60, ed. Antw.) resemble the views sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon. But there is no express reference to Nestorius and Eutychius, nor to the standing term of the two natures. At the same time there are evident references to the christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia, so that we may place the work at about the close of the first decade of the 5th century. The work was formerly attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, an error arising probably by a confounding of this treatise with that entitled Περὶ κατασκευῆς ὐνθρώπου. This mistake occurred the more readily from the great similarity of the views of the two writers. Yet in Nemesius the philosophical argument appears only occasionally in close connection with the Christian dogma, which, however, he always considers as decisive. He defended the theory of the freedom of the will against the doctrine of fatalism, and also held fast to some of the ancient philosophical views concerning the nature of the soul, pre-existence, and, in a certain sense, metempsychosis, while the Church rejected the doctrine of Origen. (Comp.

here, however, bishop Fell, *Annotationes,* page 20 [ed. Oxon. 1671].) After Christian theology had experienced the influence of philosophy (and especially of the eclectic Platonism of the 2d century), and thus received a scientific character, philosophy became absorbed in it without ceasing to exist, and thus we find Origen, Athanasius, and Augustine renowned both as philosophers and as theologians. But as dogmatics only attained the form of a traditional system in the 4th century, under the influx of Greek theology, there arose, besides theology, a sort of neutral ground, given up to special philosophical questions. Plato and Aristotle came again into honor. Nemesius, at least as regards method, sought to imitate the latter, but had not his power. His investigations are chiefly of a psychological nature. For him, as for Plato, the soul is an immaterial substance, involved in incessant and self-produced motion. The soul existed before it entered the body. It is eternal, like all suprasensible things. It is not true that new souls are constantly coming into existence, whether by generation or by direct creation. The opinion is also false that the world is destined to be destroyed when the number of souls shall have been completed; God will not destroy what has been well put together. Nemesius rejects, nevertheless, the doctrine of a world-soul. and of the migration of the human soul through the bodies of animals. In considering the separate faculties of the soul, and also in his doctrine of the freedom of the will, Nemesius largely follows Aristotle. Every species of animal, he says, possesses definite instincts, by which alone its actions are determined; but the actions of man are infinitely varied. Placed midway between the sensible and the suprasensible worlds, man's business is to decide by means of his reason in which direction he will turn this is his freedom. The work was extensively used by J. Philoponus, John of Damascus, Elias Cretensis, etc. The first Greek edition was published by Nicasius Ellebodius (Antw. 1565, 8vo), with a Latin translation; the next by bishop Fell (Oxon. 1671, 8vo), and the last and best by C.F. Matthaeus (Halle, 1802, 8vo). It is also published in Migne's *Patrologie Greque.* It was translated into English by George Wither (Lond. 1636, 12mo), into German by Osterhammer (Salzburg, 1819, 8vo), into French by J.B. Thibault (Paris, 1844, 8vo). and into Italian by omin. Pizzimenti (8vo). See Bitter, *Gesch. d. christl. Phil.* 2:461 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 7:549 sq.: Bayle, *Dict. Histor. et Crit.* s.v.; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosoph.;* Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1:347, 349; Alzog, *Patrologie, §* 57; Haller, *Bibl. Anat.;* Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* volume 2, s.v.; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens,* 1:245; 2:70.

Nemez, Frederic

a noted Waldensian prelate, flourished in the first half of the 15th century in Bohemia. He was consecrated priest in the convent of the Bohemian capital, September 4, 1433, by bishop Nicholas Philibert, a legate of the Council of Basle. In 1434 Nemez, together with another priest, also a Waldensian, and consecrated at the same time with himself, was sent to Basle, where the council was at open variance with the pope; and in full convention of the clergy they were consecrated bishops by prelates of the Church of Rome. It was done at the instance of the Calixtines, *SEE HUSSITES*, whom the council was anxious to propitiate and please. Thus the Waldensians in Bohemia secured the episcopal succession. Nemez died near the middle of the 15th century. See Butler, *Ch. Hist.* 2:349.

Nemine Contradicente, or Nem. Con.

is a term used in ecclesiastical councils to indicate that there is no opposition to a given measure proposed.

Nemine Dissentiente, or Nem. Diss.

"No one dissenting." This term also is very often found in journals of conventions, and other documents containing business proceedings.

Nemu'el

[according to analogy *Nem'uel]* (Heb. *Nenzuel',* לאומנ, *spread of God,* or perhaps for *Jemuel;* Sept. Ναμουήλ; Vulg. *Namuel),* the name of two Hebrews.

1. The first named of the five sons of Simeon (1 Chronicles 4:24), and progenitor of the Nemuelites (Numbers 26:12). He is elsewhere (Genesis 46:10) called JEMUEL *SEE JEMUEL* (q.v.).

2. First-named son of Eliab, of the tribe of Reuben, and brother of Dathan and Abiram (Numbers 26:9). B.C. cir. 1619.

Nemu'elites

(Heb. *Nemueli',* ילאומנ, Gentile appellative from לאומנ, *Nemntel;* Sept. Ναμουηλί; Vulg. *Namuelitae),* a family in the tribe of Simeon, descended from his first-born (Numbers 26:12). *SEE NEMUEL*.

of Bangor, in Wales, a noted British monastic, flourished in the first part of the 9th century (comp. *Historia Britonum).* Vossius *(De Historicis Latinis)* says that he lived in the early part of the 7th century, but he assigns no authority for this assertion. In the history Nennius states himself to have been a Briton, and not a Saxon, and a disciple of the holy bishop Elbodus, or Elvodug. He wrote a history of Britain, *Historia Britonum,* or, as it is sometimes styled, *Eulogium Britanniae,* which, he says at the beginning, he compiled from all he could find — "from the Roman annals and the chronicles of the fathers, as well as from the writings of the Scots and the Angli, and from the traditions of our ancestors." The history begins with a fabulous genealogy of Brutus, grandson of aEneas, who reigned in Britain. The author afterwards relates the arrival of the Picts in North Britain, and of the Scots in Ireland; and, after a brief and confused narrative of the Roman conquest and empire in Britain, he comes to the Saxon invasion and gradual subjugation of the country. The manuscript of Nennius was mutilated and interpolated by a transcriber, who signs himself "Samuel," and "a disciple of Beularius Presbyter," and who acknowledges that he left out what he thought useless in Nennius's work, and added what he gathered from other writers concerning the towns and wonders of Britain: see end of chapter 64 of Nennii Banchoriensis *Eulogium Britannice,* edited by C. Bertram, and published together with *Gildas* and *Richard, the Monk of Westminster* (Copenhagen, 1757, 8vo). Such is the common account of Nennius; but it is, to say the least, doubtful whether such a person ever existed, and whether the history ascribed to him was not the fabrication of a much later age. Though the work existed earlier, the name of Nennius is not mentioned in connection with it earlier than the 13th century. It is in any case of little value, but even that little is of course greatly reduced if it be the production of an age much later than it professes to be. The question will be found fully discussed in Mr. Wright's *Biographia Britannica Literaria* (Anglo-Saxon period), pages 137-142; the Introduction to Mr. Stevenson's valuable variorum edition of the *Historia Britonum;,* Schoell, *Diss. de Eccles. Britonumn Scotorumque Historice Fontibus,* pages 29-37. A translation of Nennius, by the Reverend W. Gunn, was published in London (1819, 8vo), and reprinted in the *Six Old English Chronicles,* published as a volume in Bohn's "Antiquarian Library" (1848). (J.N.P.)

Neo-Arians

SEE ARIANS; *SEE SOCINIANS*; *SEE UNITARIANS*.

Neo-Caesarea, Council of

(Concilium Neocesarense), was held at Neo-Caesarea, in Pontus, about the year 314, shortly after the Council of Ancyra. It was composed, for the most part, of the same bishops who assisted at the latter, and Vitalis of Antioch is believed to have presided. Fifteen canons of discipline were published. The most important acts are: 1, enjoining the degradation of priests who marry after ordinations very important measure, and of interest to the inquiring student into the history of celibacy (see Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, pages 48, 49); 2, depriving of communion, through life, women who, having married two brothers, refuse to dissolve the marriage; 6, permitting to baptize women with child whenever they will; 7, forbidding priests to be present at the second marriage of any person; 8, forbidding to confer holy orders upon a layman whose wife has committed adultery: orders that if she has committed adultery after his ordination he shall put her away, and declares that if he shall continue to live with her he cannot retain the ministry committed to him; 11, forbidding to admit any one, however well qualified, to the priesthood under thirty years of age, because the Lord Jesus Christ at that age began his ministry; 13, directing that, where both are present, the city priests shall celebrate the holy eucharist in preference to those from the country; 14, declaring that the Chorepisoopi are after the pattern of the Seventy, and permitting them to offer; 15, ordering that there shall be seven deacons in every city, as is approved by the book of Acts. See Labbe, *Cone.* 1:1480; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, pages 420, 421; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:147, 156, 318.

Neocori

*(*νεωκόροι*, temple-sweepers)* is the title which the officers bore who were attached to the pagan temples in ancient Greece. Their office was originally to sweep the temple, and perform other menial services connected with it. In course of time these duties were intrusted to slaves, and the *Neocori* came to occupy a higher position, superintending the temples, guarding the treasures, and regulating the sacred rites. In some towns there was a regular college of *Neocori*, and the office, having considerable honor attached to it, was sought by persons even of high rank. In the time of the emperors nations and cities eagerly sought the title of *Neocori*, and

counted it a special privilege to have the charge of a temple. Thus in the Acts of the Apostles we learn that the city of Ephesus was *Neocora* to the great goddess Diana. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, page 525; Broughton, *Biblioth. Historica Sacra*, s.v. *SEE DIANA*.

Neology

(from νέος, *new*, and λόγος, *doctrine)*, a term synonymous with καινοδοξία, καινοτομία, is expressive of a tendency to novelty, not from a feeling of its superiority, but simply on account of its newness. The word is not classically used, yet νεολογία would not be contrary to the analogy of language, and would be equivalent to the *nomina mutare* (as Cicero, *De Fin*, 3:5, says of Zeno: "Non tam rerum inventor fuit, quam novorum verborum"). Neology, then, is an unnecessary innovation in language, thought, or usage, and dangerous in so far as it disturbs continuity and is the result of fancy. In theology the term is used especially to designate the rationalistic theories opposed to revealed religion which have obtained such success among certain German and English theologians. These resort to the novel expedient of reducing the standard of the doctrine and facts of Scripture to the level of unassisted human reason. *SEE RATIONALISM*. (J.H.W.)

Neo-Manichaeans

was the name of a Christian sect which, like the Priscillianists and Paulicians, denied the resurrection of the flesh; and, like the Quakers and Swedenborgians of our own day, thought that after death the soul became the inhabitant of a spiritual body. In other respects the Neo-Manicheans held the views of the Manicheeans (q.v.).

Neomenia or Noumenia

(Gr. *new* moon), a festival of the ancient Greeks at the beginning of every lunar month, which was (as the name imports) observed upon the day of new moon in honor of all the gods, but especially of Apollo, who was called Νεομήνιος, because the sun is the first author of all light, and whatever distinction of times and seasons may be taken from other planets, yet they are all owing to him as the original and fountain of those borrowed rays by which they shine. This festival was observed with games and public entertainments made by the richer class, to whose tables the poor flocked in great numbers. The Athenians at these times offered solemn prayers and

sacrifices for the prosperity of their country during the ensuing month in Erectheus's temple, in the Acropolis, which was kept by a dragon, to which they gave a cake made of honey. The Jews had their Neomenia, or feast of the new moon, on which peculiar sacrifices were appointed. They made on this day a sort of family entertainment and rejoicing. Thus David tells Jonathan, "Behold, tomorrow is the new moon, and I should not fail to sit with the king at meat," etc; and Saul, we find, took it amiss that he did not attend. The most celebrated Neomenia of all others was that at the beginning of the civil year, or first day of the month Tisri. No servile labor was performed on that day; and they offered particular burnt sacrifices, and sounded the trumpets of the Temple. The modern Jews keep the Neomenia only as a feast of devotion, which any one may observe or not, as he pleases. In the prayers of the synagogue they read from Psalm 113 to 118. They bring forth the roll of the law, and read therein to four persons. They call to remembrance the sacrifice that used to be offered on this day in the Temple. *SEE NEW MOON*.

Neonomians

(from the Greek νέος, *new*, and *vopaoc*, *law)* is the appellation of those Christians who regard Christianity as a *new law*, mitigated in its requisitions for the sake of Christ. Neonomianism has many modifications, and has been held by Arminians as well as Calvinists — persons very greatly differing from each other in the consequences to which they carry it, and in the principles from which they deduce it. One opinion is that the new covenant of grace which, through the medium of Christ's death, the Father made with men consists, according to this system, not in our being justified by faith, as it apprehends the righteousness of Christ, but in this, that God, abrogating the exaction of perfect legal obedience, reputes or accepts of faith itself, and the imperfect obedience of faith instead of the perfect obedience of the law, and graciously accounts them worthy of the reward of eternal life. Towards the close of the 17th century a controversy was agitated among the English Dissenters, in which the one side (who were partial to the writings of Dr. Crisp) were charged with antinomianism, and the other (who favored those of Mr. Baxter) were accused of neonomianism. Dr. Daniel Williams was a principal writer on what was called the neonomian side. He teaches as follows:

"**1.** God has eternally elected a certain definite number of men whom he will infallibly save by Christ in the way prescribed by the Gospel.

2. These very elect are not personally justified until they receive Christ and yield themselves up to him, but they remain condemned while unconverted to Christ.

3. By the ministry of the Gospel there is a serious offer of pardon and glory, upon the terms of the Gospel, to all that hear it; and God thereby requires them to comply with the said terms.

4. Ministers ought to use these and other Gospel benefits as motives, assuring men that if they believe they shall be justified; if they turn to God, they shall live; if they repent, their sins shall be blotted out; and while they *neglect* these duties they cannot have a personal interest in these respective benefits.

5. It is by the power of the Spirit of Christ freely exerted, and not by the power of free will, that the Gospel becomes effectual for the conversion of any soul to the obedience of faith.

6. When a man believes, yet is not that very faith, and much less any other work, the matter of that righteousness for which a sinner is justified, i.e., entitled to pardon, acceptance, and eternal glory, as righteous before God; and it is the imputed righteousness of Christ alone for which the Gospel gives the believer a right to these and all saving blessings, who in this respect is justified by Christ's righteousness alone. By both this and the fifth head it appears that all boasting is excluded, and we are saved by free grace.

7. *Faith* alone receives the Lord Jesus and his righteousness, and the subject of this faith is a *convinced, penitent soul;* hence we are justified by faith alone, and the *impenitent* are not forgiven.

8. God has freely promised that all whom he predestinated to salvation shall not only savingly believe, but that he by his power shall preserve them from a *total* or a *final apostasy.*

9. Yet the believer, while he lives in this world, is to pass the time of his sojourning here with fear, because his warfare is not accomplished, and it is true that if he draw back God will have no pleasure in him. These, with the like cautions, God blesseth as means to the saints' perseverance, and these by ministers should be so urged.

10. The law of innocence, or moral law, is still so in force that every precept thereof constitutes duty, even to the believer; every breach thereof is a sin deserving of death: this law binds death by its curse on every unbeliever, and the righteousness for or by which we are justified before God is a righteousness (at least) adequate to that law, which is Christ's alone righteousness; and this so imputed to the believer that God deals judiciously with him according thereto.

11. Yet such is the grace of the Gospel that it promiseth in and by Christ a freedom from the curse, forgiveness of sin, and eternal life to every sincere believer; which promise God will certainly perform, notwithstanding the threatening of the law."

Dr. Williams maintains the conditionality of the covenant of grace; but admits with Dr. Owen, who also uses the term *condition*, that "Christ undertook that those who were to be taken into this covenant should receive grace enabling them to comply with the terms of it, fulfil its conditions, and yield the obedience which God required therein." On this subject Dr. Williams further says: "The question is not whether the first (viz., regenerating) grace, by which we are enabled to perform the condition, be absolutely given. This I affirm, though that be dispensed ordinarily in a due use of means, and in a way discountenancing idleness, and fit encouragement given to the use of means." The following objection, among others, was made by several ministers in 1692 against Dr. Williams's *Gospel Truth Stated*, etc.: "To supply the room of the moral law vacated by him, he turns the Gospel into a new law, in the keeping of which we shall be justified for the sake of Christ's righteousness, making qualifications and acts of ours a disposing subordinate righteousness whereby we become capable of being justified by Christ's righteousness." To this, among other things, he answers:

"The difference is not

(1) whether the Gospel be a new law in the' Socinian, popish, or Arminian sense. This I deny. Nor

(2) is faith or any other grace or act of ours any atonement for sin, satisfaction to justice, meriting qualification, or any part of that righteousness for which we are justified at God our Creator’s bar. This I deny in places innumerable. Nor

(3) whether the Gospel be a law more new than is implied in the first promise to fallen Adam, proposed to Cain, and obeyed by Abel to the differencing of him from his unbelieving brother. This I deny.

(4) Nor whether the Gospel be a law that allows sin when it accepts such graces as true, though short of perfection, to be the conditions of our personal interest in the benefits purchased by Christ. This I deny.

(5) Nor whether the Gospel be a law the promises whereof entitle the performers of its conditions to the benefits, as of debt.

This I deny. The difference is —

1. Is the Gospel a law in this sense, namely, God in Christ thereby commandeth sinners to repent of sin and receive Christ by a true operative faith, promising that thereupon they shall be united to him, justified by his righteousness, pardoned, and adopted; and that, persevering in faith and true holiness, they shall be finally saved; also threatening that if any shall die impenitent, unbelieving, ungodly, rejecters of his grace, they shall perish without relief, and endure sorer punishments than if these offers had not been made to them?

2. Hath the Gospel a sanction, that is, doth Christ therein enforce his commands of faith, repentance, and perseverance by the foresaid promises and threatenings, as motives to our obedience? Both these I affirm, and they deny: saying, the Gospel in the largest sense is an absolute promise without precepts and conditions, and a Gospel threat is a bull.

3. Do the Gospel promises of benefits to certain graces, and its threats that those benefits shall be withheld and the contrary evils inflicted for the neglect of such graces, render these graces the condition of our personal title to those benefits? This they deny, and I affirm," etc.

It does not appear to have been a question in this controversy whether God in his Word commands sinners to repent and believe in Christ, nor whether he promises life to believers and threatens death to unbelievers; but whether it be the Gospel under the form of a new law that thus commands or threatens, or the moral law on its behalf, and whether its promises to believing render such believing a condition of the things promised. In another controversy, however, which arose afterwards among the same people, in the Assembly of 1720, it became a question whether God did by his Word, call it law or Gospel, command unregenerate sinners to repent

and believe in Christ, or do anything else which is spiritually good. Of those who took the affirmative side of this question one party maintained it on the ground of the Gospel being a new law, consisting of commands, promises, and threatenings, the terms or conditions of which were repentance, faith, and sincere obedience. But those who first engaged in the controversy, though they allowed the encouragement to repent and believe to arise merely from the grace of the Gospel, yet considered the formal obligation to do so as arising merely from the moral law, which, requiring supreme love to God, requires acquiescence in any revelation which he shall at any time make known. The Hopkinsians of America are believed in their teachings to espouse the same views. Not only do they fearlessly set forth the extent, spirituality, and unflinching demands of the law; they think it necessary also to urge upon sinners the *legal dispensation,* if we may so speak, of the Gospel. See Watson, *Dict. of Theology,* s.v.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 2:431; Chauncey *Neonomianism Unmasked;* Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification;* Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland,* page 341 (on the anti-Neonomian side). *SEE MODERATES*.

Neophyte

(from νέος, *new,* and φυτόν, a *plant),* i.e., *newly planted,* was a word used in the Eleusinian and other mysteries to designate a person recently initiated. In the early Church it was the name given to converts to Christianity who had just received baptism. After that solemn ceremony they wore white garments for eight days, from Easter eve until the Sunday after Easter, which was hence called *Dominzica in albis,* i.e., the Sunday in white. (These garments were usually made of white linen, but sometimes of more costly materials.) They were also subject to a strict discipline or probation for a much longer period. At first they were considered unfit for the priestly office, on the grounds of ⁵⁴⁸⁶1 Timothy 3:6, where the word is rendered "novice," and explained by Gregory the Great to have been used in allusion to "their being newly planted in the faith" *(Epp.* 6, 5; *Ep.* 51). Neophytes differed from catechumens (q.v.), inasmuch as the persons were supposed to have not only embraced the doctrines of the Church, but also to have received baptism. Paul, in the passage referred to, directs Timothy not to promote a neophyte to the episcopate; and this prohibition was generally maintained. The duration of this exclusion was left for a time to the discretion of bishops, but several of the ancient synods legislated regarding it. The third council of Aries (524) and the third of Orange (538)

fix a year as the least limit of probation. Ecclesiastical history offers, however, a few instances in which this rule was departed from, as in the appointment of Ambrosius as bishop; but these exceptions were not frequent. In the modern Roman Catholic Church the same discipline is observed, and extends to persons converted not alone from heathenism, but from any sect of Christians separated from the communion of Rome. The time, however, is left to be determined by circumstances. The Roman Catholic missionaries still give the name of neophytes to the Jews, Mussulmans, or pagans who are converted to Christianity, and the Church grants them numerous privileges in order to induce others to follow their example (see Ferrari, *Biblioth. canonica,* s.v. Neophytus, No. 3). Gregory XIII established at Rome a special college for young neophytes, where they are instructed to become afterwards missionaries in their native countries; it is called the College of the Propaganda, and is one of the most richly endowed and privileged seminaries of the Roman Church. The name neophyte is also applied in Roman usage to *newly ordained priests,* and sometimes, though more rarely, to the *novices* of a religious order. See Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie,* s.v.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquits,* pages 433-435; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthumer,* 3:17 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* pages 313, 522; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology,* s.v.

Neophytus

A short but curious tract, published by Cotelerius in his *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta,* 2:457-462, bears this title: Νεοφύτου πρεσβυτέρου μοναχοῦ καὶ ἐγκλειστοῦ περὶ τῶν κατὰ χώραν Κῷπρον σκαιῶν, *Neophyti Presbyteri Monachi et Inclusi. de Calamitatibus Cypri.* It gives a brief account of the usurpation of the island by Isaac Comnenus, its conquest, and the imprisonment of Isaac by Richard Coeur de Lion, king of England, and the sale of the island to the Latins (as the writer represents the transaction) by Richard. The writer was contemporary with these transactions, and therefore lived about the close of the 12th century. He was a resident and probably a native of Cyprus. There are several MSS. in the different European libraries bearing the name of Neophytus. Of these a MS. formerly in the Colbertine Library at Paris contained thirty *Orationes,* evidently by this Neophytus; a *Catena in Canticum,* and some others on theological subjects, are of more dubious authorship, but they may be by the same author; a *Demonstratio de Plautis,* and one or two chemical treatises, are by another Neophytus, surnamed Prodromenus; and *Definitiones et Divisiones Summariae totius Aristotelis Philosophiae,* and

Epitome in Porphyrii quinque voces et in Aristotelis Orcanon, are apparently by a third writer of the same name. See Cotelerius, 1.c., and notes in col. 678, 679; Du Cange, *Glossarium Med. et Inf. Graecitatis; Index Auctorum,* page 29; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* 5:738; 8:661, 662; 11:339, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1190, 2:251 (ed. Oxford, 1740, 1742); Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Neo-Platonism

an eclectic philosophy nearly coeval in origin with Christianity, but developed in an anti-Christian and pantheistic direction. The term, taken in the wider sense, may be defined as that form or method of philosophizing which, recognising or claiming Plato as leader, incorporated with his views other, especially Oriental, conceptions, and sought by means of such composite or eclectic philosophical results to harmonize or, at the least, to reconcile the teachings of the various ancient schools of philosophy; in the narrow, and perhaps the more common acceptation, it is applied to the doctrinal system of the philosophical school founded at Alexandria, in Egypt, by Ammonius Saccas, in the first half of the 3d century after Christ, and continued by his pupils and successors not only in the city of its origin, but also in other places. Plotinus, one of the earliest and most eminent of its disciples and masters, taught at Rome, and the term *Romano-Alexandrian* is sometimes applied to it.

Many of the early Christian writers advocated the employment of the philosophical methods to elucidate and establish the doctrines of the Gospel, and were, consequently, to a greater or less extent imbued with the spirit and favored the professed objects of the Neo-Platonists, i.e., the conciliation of philosophy and religion; but the pagan school, especially during its later history, was characterized by an intense hostility to Christianity, as well as by theosophical views and theurgic practices. The influence of this form of philosophy did not disappear entirely with the suppression of its schools by Theodosius in the 6th century, but traces of it may be seen even in the scholasticism of the Middle Ages (notably in the writings of Erigena, who flourished in the 9th century); and after the revival of literature, in what are styled the modern times, the impress of this type of Platonism appears with more or less distinctness in the philosophical systems of Pletho, Ficinus, Paracelsus, and others of the 15th and 16th centuries, as well as, subsequently, in those of Gale and Cudworth, and in the speculations of Schelling and his school in regard to

the identity of subject and object. In fact. the spirit of Neo-Platonism has impregnated subsequent religious as well as philosophical thought in such a way and to such an extent as to make a careful examination of its history and doctrines an object worthy of the serious attention of those minds who are anxious to distinguish the truth which saves from the error which misleads and destroys.

I. *History*. — The rise and development of this philosophy may, for our present purpose, be sufficiently exhibited by, *first*, an outline of the causes tending to produce it, followed, *secondly*, by a brief sketch of the lives and opinions of only the most prominent characters who either, as precursors, prepared the way for its introduction and establishment, or, as founders and disciples of the school, expounded and defended its doctrines. To this we shall add a summary of its general principles (mainly abridged from Schwegler) and some observations on its relations to Christianity; and, lastly, such a list of works on the subject as will enable any one so desiring to inform himself more fully.

1. *Subjective Causes*. — Aside from the very great influence manifestly exerted by Oriental ideas in shaping the character and tendencies of the philosophy of the period in which Neo-Platonism had its birth, there were internal causes at work, growing out of the unsatisfactory results of the preceding pagan philosophies, and the want felt, especially by earnest and thoughtful spirits, of something different — something which gave better promise of satisfying the longings of the human race for a solution of the problem of its origin and destiny. Instead of giving clearer light and purer life to men groping after the knowledge of God and themselves, the development of the old philosophies had ended in scepticism and moral debasement. This result was disappointing and disheartening. Scepticism promised contentment of spirit, but, instead, produced only the opposite, viz. the necessity for an unceasing opposition to all positive assertions; and in place of the rest sought for, it gave only an unappeasable disquiet, which, in turn, begat a yearning for a condition absolutely satisfying and removed from all sceptical objections. This longing for something absolutely certain found historical expression in Neo-Platonism.

Zeller (as given in Ueberweg, page 222) says: "The feeling of alienation from God and the yearning after a higher revelation are universal characteristics of the last centuries of the ancient world. This yearning was, in the first place, but an expression of the consciousness of the decline of

the classical nations and of their culture, the presentiment of the approach of a new sera; and it called into life not only Christianity, but also, before it, pagan and Jewish Alexandrianism, and other related developments."

2. *Objective Causes*. — The conquests of Alexander the Great, extending 'from the Mediterranean to the Indus, brought the Occidental and Oriental peoples and civilizations into nearer relations with each other, and thereby opened up new fields for philosophical research to the active and inquiring Hellenic race on one side, while, on the other side, the disciples of Zoroaster and the gymnosophists of India were, in like manner, made acquainted with the opinions and speculations of the Greek philosophers. The Hebrew, whose home lay between these extremes, contributed also his share to the common stock, and enlarged thereby the common fund of relatively new ideas. The succession of the Romans to the empire of the civilized world still further increased this fund, and enlarged the sphere of philosophical activities. The results of this mutual action and reaction of the East and the West upon each other were made more permanent by Alexander's policy of planting colonies and founding cities among the nations brought under his sway. The city in Lower Egypt founded 'by and named after him, and, with masterly foresight, located on the pathway of the commercial intercourse of nations for that and succeeding ages, became naturally also the great central point of philosophical intercourse and reciprocal culture. At this focus of the intellectual activity as well as emporium of the trade and commerce of the times the natives of various lands met together, and discussed and compared philosophies and faiths. Here was the soil where once flourished the ancient wisdom and learning of Egypt, the origin of whose civilization was referred by a proud priesthood far back into the shadows of unhistorical aeras. Here were found advocates of the Greek polytheism, with its poetic conceptions of divinities peopling mountain and dale, forest and stream, land and sea, and with a ctiltus adjusted to the mercurial temperament of that race. Here also were Roman representatives of the statelier and graver character of a nation notable for its deep religious sentiment. Here, too, the Jewish scribe, proud of the antiquity of his people and of their divinely-given law, upheld the doctrine of the unity of God taught in his sacred books, and pointed to their purer teachings and sublimer truths. The Persian discoursed of his master Zoroaster, of the two principles, the good and the evil one, struggling for the mastery of the world, and of the magical knowledge possessed by the priests and philosophers of his land. The Brahmin,

wandering from the far Ganges, brought with him his ascetic mysticism and pride of caste, the doctrine of a quiescent supreme divinity, in whose repose purified souls found happiness, and of a trinity of active forces or emanations therefrom — the Creator, the preserver, the destroyer. Here too, in the appointed time, appeared the heralds of a new and diviner philosophy whose roots, planted in the soil of man's primeval home, and kept alive by Jehovah's care through all the mutations of history, were destined in the fulness of the times to grow up into that Apocalyptic tree of life whose "leaves were for the healing of the nations." In this, the cosmopolitan city of the world of that epoch, the philosophical conceptions of monism, of dualism, of monotheism, of polytheism, of magism, of mysticism, and of asceticism, found a common point of contact and a common field of combat. Out of their conflicts was evolved that type of eclectic philosophy which, under the name of Neo-Platonism, supplanted in the pagan world the classical philosophies, and, in its later periods, assuming an intensely hostile attitude to Christianity, became the representative and type of all heathen philosophy and religions, contesting with the new faith the dominion over the mind and conscience of man. With this end in view, it became a syncretism in object as well as form, and sought to array under its banners all the influences and forces of paganism to enable it to resist and turn back the aggressive movements of its despised but dreaded rival. But these supreme efforts of an effete philosophy and faith could not long withstand the onward sweep of the purer and soul-satisfying philosophy of the Gospel, and soon triumphant Christianity was relieved from this burden of conflict with the opposing powers of this world by the extinction of this last of the pagan schools. The triumph of Christianity was the triumph of the idea of monotheism, of the doctrine of the divine unity, over both dualism and polytheism and their allied conceptions and influences. Monotheism, as a world-religious idea, belonged to the Jews, to whom it was given by revelation; its triumph with Christianity was therefore the triumph "of the religious idea of the Jewish people, stripped of its national limitations, and softened and, spiritualized" (Ueberweg).

It may not be inappropriate even here to call attention to the fact that this revealed conception of God was lodged with a people whose home was near' the centre of the olden world — the pivot, so to speak, about which the movements of ancient social and religious life revolved.

3. *Biographical History*. —

(1.) The earliest in point of time, as well as one of the most important, of those philosophers whom we shall mention as among the precursors of Neo-Platonism was Philo (commonly surnamed Judzeus, to distinguish him from Greek writers of the same name), born about twenty or twenty-five years before Christ, at Alexandria, in Egypt. He belonged to an illustrious and, according to some authorities, to a priestly family of the Jewish race. Josephus *(Ant.* 18:8) speaks of him as "a man eminent on all accounts, brother to Alexander the Alabarch, and one not unskilful in philosophy." He was of the sect of the Pharisees, and, by reason of his learning and good repute, was placed by his co-religionists, when he was already advanced in life, at the head of an embassy sent A.D. 39-40 to Rome, to repel before Caligula the accusations of the Greeks of Alexandria against the loyalty of the Jews of that city, and to plead in behalf of his race for the uninterrupted exercise of their religion, and against the desecration of their holy places by setting up statues of the emperor therein. His embassy was fruitless so far as its immediate object was concerned, for the prejudiced and enraged Caligula refused to see them; but that emperor's death in the following year put a stop to the persecution he had ordered.

Philo's works are mainly commentaries, with separate titles, on the chief subjects of the Pentateuch. He employed the allegorizing method of interpreting the Scriptures which was in use by the cultivated Jews of his native city, and sought thereby to harmonize the philosophy of religion with that of Plato, Aristotle, and others. His theology, consequently, was a "blending of Platonism and Judaism." He taught that God should, be worshipped as a personal being, yet conceived of as the most general of existences: τὸ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός *(Legis Alleg.* volume 2). He is τὸ ὄν, *the existing;* is above all human knowledge and virtue, and even "above the idea of the Good" (κρείττων τε ἢ ἀρετὴ καὶ κρείττων ἢ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ κρείττων ἢ ἀυτὸ τἀγαθόν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν, *De Mundi Opificio,* 1:2); the absolute is reached not by demonstration *(*λόγων ἀποδείξει*),* but by clear insight *(*ἐναργείᾳ*).* Divinity and matter are the two first principles, existing from eternity: the Divinity is "being, real, infinite, immutable, incomprehensible to human understanding" (ὄν) ; matter is "non-existing *(*μὴ ὄν), having received from the Divinity a form and life." In creation, Deity, unwilling to come into contact with impure matter, employed as his instruments "incorporeal potencies or ideas," the highest of which, the creative one (ποιητική), is in Scripture named God (θεός); the second, the ruling one *(*βασιλική*l),* is called Lord (κύριος '):

these potencies are conceived of as independent personal beings who have appeared to men. "The highest of all the divine forces is the Logos," in which the world of ideas finds its place. The Logos is the image of God, and the type after which the world is formed, and the manifestation of the Deity, making and ruling the world, and serving as the Mediator between God and man. The conception of an incarnate Logos was, however, impossible to Philo, who regarded matter as impure. This conception forms one of the fundamental doctrines which separate Christianity from the Alexandrian theosophy. Philo refers the doctrine of ideas to Moses (Μωϋσέως ἐστὶ τὸ δόγμα τοῦτο, οὐκ ἐμόν), and has given to it a character, arising from his own religious conceptions, which has so transformed the Platonic theory as to interfere "with the correct historical comprehension of Platonism even down to our own times" (Ueberweg). Sharpe *(Hist. of Egypt*, 2:111) thinks that the writings of Philo "explain how Platonism became united to Judaism, and again show us the point of agreement between the New Platonists and the Platonic Christians."

(2.) Of the Greeks who may be classed among the forerunners in the movement tending to harmonize the doctrines of Plato with the speculations of Oriental philosophy we can notice only (i) Thrasyllus of Mendes (died A.D. 36), who arranged all the works of Plato admitted by him to be genuine into nine tetralogies, and combined with Platonism certain mystical Neo-Pythagorean speculations founded on numbers and the Chaldaean astrology; and (ii) Plutarch of Chaeronea (born about A.D. 40, and died about A.D. 120), the author of the well-known biographies. He was a pupil of Ammonius of Alexandria (not Saccas), and taught at Athens during the reigns of Nero and Vespasian. Plutarch's doctrines deviate less from pure Platonism than those taught by the Neo-Platonists proper of the school of Alexandria, yet he is regarded by some as standing "next to Philo both in age and character as a representative of Oriental tendencies in Greek philosophy." So far as the Grecian systems are concerned, while holding mainly to Plato and controverting the views of the Stoics and Epicureans, he evinced little regard for the dialectics of Platonism, and was a strong believer in the Stoic doctrine of a Providence. In regard to Oriental doctrines, while profoundly reverent of the ancient cultus of his country, and opposed to the introduction of foreign superstitions and Jewish and Syrian rites, he, from the Greek point of view, sought to reconcile the philosophy of religion with the true interpretation of the worship of Isis and Osiris. He distinguished (as did Philo) between

an absolute God whose essence is unknown to us and a creating power or energy which formed the world. Isis corresponds to the latter, and connects the creation with Osiris, the supreme and invisible one. The world is the offspring of two distinct principles, one inherently good, and the other inherently evil (the dualism of Zoroaster), whose battle-ground is the soul of man. Besides one supreme God, Plutarch recognised the divinities of the popular faiths as well as the existence of daemons, some good, some evil, as necessary mediators between the divine and human.

(3.) L. Apuleius (born about A.D. 130), a teacher of the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies at Medaura, in Numidia, was a Latin representative of the then prevailing tendency to the assimilation of Oriental and Occidental philosophy. Holding that it was derogatory to the proper conception of God to have him burdened with the superintendence of things, he assigns to him, as the ministers who direct "mundane events," hosts of daemons, whose abode is in the air, and who are the objects of the religious ceremonies both of the Greeks and the barbarians, and also of the practice of magic. He speaks of a trinity of divine faculties, immutable, eternal, viz. God himself, the divine Reason, and the World-Soul.

(4.) Numenius of Apamea, in Syria, who flourished in the latter half of the second century after Christ, showed in his writings (of which fragments only have come down to us) even a stronger tendency towards Oriental ideas, and referred the origin of Greek philosophy to Jewish, Egyptian, Magian, and Brahminical sources. Suidas (s.v.) quotes him as styling Plato the Attic Moses *(*τὶ γάρ ἐστι, Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς Αττικίζων ;). So highly was he esteemed by the Neo-Platonists of the following periods that some authors regard him as the real founder of the Alexandrian school, an honor denied him by the Alexandrians themselves because of his Syrian origin and non-residence in their midst. He further developed the conception of a trinity in the divine Being, who was incorporeal, by distinguishing therein, 1st, a perfectly intelligent, immutable, eternal, supreme God; 2d, a world-maker, or demiurgos; and, 3d, the world. These he terms father, son, and grandson (πάππος, ἔκγονος, ἀπόγονος*)*, and ascribes the doctrine to both Plato and his master, Socrates. Numenius also held that the soul is immortal and immaterial, and that its descent into the body from its former incorporeal state implies previous moral delinquency — a conception indicating an acquaintance with Jewish and Christian doctrines on the fall of man. Cronius, described by Porphyry as a friend of

Numenius, and who shared his opinions, was, according to Suidas (s.v. Ὠριγένης), the author of writings studied by the Christian Origen.

(5.) Some of the writings popularly attributed to the mythical Hermes Trismegistus treat of religious and philosophical subjects in the style and from the standpoint of Neo-Platonism, and are classed among the productions of the Egyptian Platonists. The reputed author was the Egyptian Thot or Theut, identified with the Greek Hermes, who, as the fabled author of all the discoveries and productions of the humans mind, the source of all knowledge and thought, the embodied Logos, was dignified with the title of Τρὶς Μέγιστος, *thrice greatest* (may there not be in this name a: reference to the Neo-Platonic trinity?). Some of these writings "belonged to the school of Philo, and, were known to Plutarch: others are of a much later date, and not unaffected by the influence of Christianity." The *Poimander*, one of the largest and most important of these works still extant, seems to have been composed in imitation of the *Pastor* of Hermas. It gives views of nature, the world, God, and the human soul quite in the spirit of Neo-Platonism, but with such occasional admixture of Oriental, Jewish, and Christian ideas as to show the syncretism peculiar to the philosophy of the time.

(6.) Ammonius, called: Saccas from his vocation of corn-porter (lived from about A.D. 175 to 250), is usually regarded as the founder of the Alexandrio-Roman school of Neo-Platonism. He was born of Christian parents, and by them trained in the principles of their faith, but probably apostatized when his mind became absorbed in the study of heathen philosophy. Though of humble origin, and destitute of the advantages of early culture, his enthusiastic love of knowledge and his great natural abilities enabled him to overcome the disadvantages surrounding him. and to found a school of philosophy, and to attract to it pupils whose subsequent fame as philosophers made the name of their master illustrious. Of these the most prominent were Plotinus, the two Origens, the philologist Longinus, and Herennius. Ammonius left no written record of his opinions, and we are indebted to his disciples, especially Plotinus, for what knowledge we possess of his doctrines. His aim in general was to show the agreement, if not substantial identity, of the systems of Plato' and Aristotle.

(7.) Plotinus was the first to develop and systematize in written form the Neo-Platonic doctrines. He was born at Lycopolis, a city of Upper Egypt,

A.D. 205, and was so delicate and sickly as to prevent his early training; consequently he was twenty-eight years of age before he had so far completed his preparatory education as to be able to turn his attention to philosophy. After he had tried several teachers without satisfaction, a companion took him to hear Ammonius lecture, and so pleased was Plotinus that he exclaimed, "This is the man of whom I was in search!" He attended upon the teaching of Ammonius for eleven years, when, desirous of visiting the Brahmins and the Magi to learn their philosophy, he joined the ill-fated expedition of the emperor Gordian against the Persians. After the death of that emperor Plotinus with difficulty escaped to Antioch, and thence repaired to Rome, where at the age of forty years he established himself as a teacher of philosophy, and remained in Italy until his death, A.D. 270. According to the statement of Porphyry *(Vita Plotini,* chapter 2), he had agreed with his fellow-disciples, Herennius and Origen, not to divulge the doctrines of their master, Ammonius; but Herennius having broken this promise, and being followed by Origenr, Plotinus felt himself no longer bound to silence in this respect, and made public these doctrines, at first in oral lectures, which afterwards, by the solicitations of friends, he was induced to publish in written form for the use of a few select hearers. At various times he added to the number of his written compositions, until, at his death, the whole, as edited and published by his pupil, Porphyry, amounted to fifty-four books. In this number, fifty-four, Porphyry was delighted to have the multiple of the perfect mystic numbers, six and nine; and the whole were arranged in six enneads or groups of nine treatises each. The following summary of their contents is from Donaldson (in his continuation of Muller), viz.: "The *first* comprised the moral positions; the *second,* the physical discussions; the *third,* the theory of the world; *the fourth* treated of the soul; *the fifth,* of the intellect and ideas; the *sixth,* of entity, unity, and the good. Again, the first three *enneads,* the fourth and fifth, and the last, formed three separate bodies (σώματα)." Plotinus enjoyed in an extraordinary degree the esteem, or rather reverence, of his followers, upon whom his ascetic virtues, his mysticism and enthusiasm, made the impression of a divine inspiration and participation in divinity. These feelings were doubtless intensified by the display of energy and tireless activity of a spirit encased in so frail a body as his. For this body he felt a true ascetic's contempt, as was shown by his answer to Amelius's importunate request that he would sit for his likeness. Said he, "Is it not sufficient to carry about the image which nature has placed around us, and must one. leave behind a more lasting image of this image, as though it

were something worth looking at?" (Donaldson). His asceticism and contempt for the body show the influence of Oriental ideas on his mind.

A fundamental principle of the philosophy of Plotinns is the identity of the subject and the object, of the cogniser and thing cognised. The office of philosophy should be to gain "a knowledge of the One... the essence and first principle of all things," not by a process of thought or reasoning, but by an immediate intuition. This One is variously styled by him the Being, the One, the Good (τὸ ὄν, τὸ ἀγαθόν). The three elements of being are *Unity*, or the One, described as original, pure light, pervading space; *Intelligence*, the νοῦς, emanating from the One, and contemplating it in order to comprehend it; the *World-Soul*, an emanation from the Nous. These constitute the Trinity of Plotinus. The One is exalted above the Nous, as that stands above the soul, which is immaterial and immortal. Plotinus teaches that the One "is elevated above the sphere of the Ideas;" which are emanations from the One, constituting in their unity the Nous, in which they are immanent and "substantially existent and essential parts." The Soul, being the image (εἴδωλον) and product of the Nous, "turns in a double direction towards the Nous, its producer, and towards the material, which is its own product." The souls of men, in consequence of their descent into bodies, have forgotten their divine origin, have become estranged from the Good, or One. Hence the true duty of man is to seek to return to God by means of virtue, philosophy, and especially by the ecstasy, or immediate intuition of the Deity and union with him. Porphyry states that Plotinus attained to this unification with God four times in the six years he spent with him. This Plotinian view reminds us of the Hindi philosophy. The most eminent of the disciples of Plotinus were Amelius and Porphyry.

(8.) Amelius (whose true name was Gentilianus) flourished in the latter half of the 3d century after Christ, and, according to Suidas (s.v.), was a native of Apamea, in Syria, but according to Porphyry (whose opinion is the more probable one), of Ameria or Amelia, in Umbria. Led by the study of the works of Numenius, whom he greatly admired, to embrace the principles of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonic school, he became a regular attendant on the lectures of Plotinus at Rome, and was the means of converting Porphyry to the doctrines of Plotinus, and afterwards, in conjunction with him, of inducing Plotinus to publish his writings. His principal work aimed to show the differences between Numenius and Plotinus, and that the latter could not justly be charged with plagiarism of the former's doctrines. If he did not

himself eventually become a Christian, he appears to have highly approved of St. John's definition of the Logos, and is supposed to be the Platonist referred to by St. Augustine as having declared that the beginning of the Gospel by St. John ought to be written in letters of gold, and put in the most conspicuous place in every church. After the death of his master, Plotinus, he retired to Apamea, in Syria, and died there. According to Ueberweg, "he distinguished in the Nous three hypostases, which he styled three demiurges, or three kings: τὸν ὄντα, τὸν ἔχοντα, τὸν ὁρῶντα Of these, the second participated in the real being of the first, and the third in the being of the second, enjoying at the same time the vision of the first (Prod. in *Plat. Tim.* 93 d.). Amelius maintained the theory (opposed by Plotinus) of the unity of all souls in the World-Soul (Jamblichus, *Ap. Stob. Ecl.* pages 886, 888, 898)."

(9.) Porphyry, the greatest disciple of Plotinus, and the famous opponent of Christianity, was born, according to some accounts, at Batanaea (the Bashan of Scripture), in Syria, according to others, at Tyre, A.D. 233, and died about A.D. 304, probably at Rome. His proper name was Malchus (same as the Shemitic word Melek, *a king),* which his friend Amelius changed to the corresponding Greek form, Basileus, for which latter term his master, Longinus, substituted the adjective Porphyrius *(*Πορφύριος*),* "clad in purple." He was first a pupil of Origen at Caesarea, then of Longinus at Athens, and finally, at the age of thirty, he joined the school of Plotinus at Rome. He wrote a book in opposition to the doctrines of his teacher, to which Amelius replied, and, having convinced Porphyry of his errors, secured a formal recantation of them. Porphyry henceforth was an ardent supporter of Plotinus's views, and gained so fully his confidence and esteem that he was selected by him to execute the delicate and responsible task of arranging and publishing his writings. He also wrote a biography of Plotinus, which is the source of most of our knowledge of the life of that philosopher. His claims to consideration as a philosopher rest less on any originality of thought and research than on his ability and earnestness as an expounder and defender of Plotinian doctrines, on a perspicacity of style rare in that age, and also on the extent of his learning. His doctrine was in its character more practical and religious than that of Plotinus. The end of philosophizing, according to him, is the salvation of the soul. His Syrian origin and Oriental training, as well as his temperament, made him more inclined than Plotinus to the tenets of the Neo-Pythagoreans and to the advocacy of thaumaturgy, whether he sincerely believed in it or not. His

views on these matters, however, appear to have been modified in his later years. While probably he had little faith in the old Greek polytheism, he bitterly opposed Christianity, and wrote a work in fifteen books against its doctrines, and especially against the divinity of Christ. This work, which excited vigorous opposition, and called forth numerous replies from Christian writers, was destroyed publicly by the order of the emperor Theodosius, A.D. 435. We are consequently indebted for our knowledge of its nature and merits to the notices and arguments of its opponents. From these we learn that in *the first* book Porphyry set forth what he deemed to be contradictions in the Scriptures, which he claimed were therefore not infallible; in the *third* he treated of the interpretation of Scripture, repudiating Origen's allegorical fancies; in the *fourth* he opposed the narrative of Sanchoniathon to the Mosaic history; and in the *twelfth* and *thirteenth* he maintained that the prophecies of Daniel were written after the events predicted, thus seeking to nullify their force as proofs of the inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures. It is much to be regretted by the Christian world that this work, written by one of the most learned and earnest opposers of Christianity in the age of the Council of Nice, has not been preserved. It would doubtless throw much light on the social and religious condition of the times, and give us a clearer insight into the causes then at work to promote the triumph of Christianity over paganism. Socrates *(Hist. Eccles.* 3:23) asserts that Porphyry was an apostate from the Christian faith, and wrote this work in revenge for indignities from Christians, but his statement is not generally accepted as correct.

(10.) Jamblichus (died about A.D. 330), a native of Chalcis, in Ccele-Syria, was a pupil of Porphyry, and the head of the Syrian school of Neo-Platonism, in which a fantastical theurgy was favored. He made ruse of philosophy merely to confirm polytheistic worship, and strove to justify superstition on speculative grounds. His system was elastic enough to include all the classical and Oriental divinities except the Christian, together with those of Plotinus, and many others created by his own fancy. Miracles were attributed to him by some of his disciples, who even spoke of him as "the divine," or "most divine." However, he was in fact far inferior to his master, Porphyry, and cannot be commended either for originality of thought or grace of style. The exaggerated estimate of him by the emperor Julian, viz. that he was inferior to Plato only in the age in which he lived, can be accounted for only on the ground of that emperor's partiality for those who advocated the principles of paganism. The theodicy of

Jamblichus rests, as did that of Plotinus and Porphyry, upon the principle of the multiplicity of the hypostases in the unity of the divine nature (Simon), but he assumed an absolutely first *One*, above the One of Plotinus, and wholly without attributes-an ineffable first essence *(*ἡ πάντη ἄρρητος ἀρχή*).* Next to this stands the Plotinian One. From this latter is produced the *intelligible world,* consisting of three elements; and from this in turn emanates the *intellectual world,* consisting also of three members, the Nous. Power, and the Demiurge (subdivided into seven, a favorite Pythagorean number). This triadic arrangement extends also to the sphere of psychology. He carried to "a great length the mysticism and extravagances of his age," and determined and arranged, according to a fantastical numerical scheme, the number and order of the polytheistic gods, angels, demons, and heroes recognised by him. The sensible world occupies the last place. He maintained the doctrine of a union with God (δραστικὴ ἕνωσις*),* not through the ecstasy, as did the earlier NeoPlatonists, but by means of theurgic rites and ceremonies. Of his writings only a few are extant. The most important are [1] Περὶ Πυθαγόρου αἱρέσεως, *On the Sect of Pythagoras;* and [2] Περὶ μυστηρίων, *On the Mysteries,* where, in the character of an Egyptian priest named Abammon, he replies to Porphyry's letter to Anebo, and "endeavors to refute various doubts respecting the truth and purity of the Egyptian religion and worship, and to prove the divine origin of the Egyptian and Chaldaean theology, as well as that men, through theurgic rites, may commune with the Deity" (Smith, s.v.). Jamblichus had many followers, some of whom, however, rejected the belief in magic and theurgy. One of his immediate disciples, Theodorus of Asine, drew up a still more complicated triadic system, and thus assisted in the transition to the doctrines of Proclus.

(11.) The next important character whom we have space in this sketch to mention is the emperor Julian, commonly styled "the Apostate," because, having renounced the Christian faith, in which he had been trained, he became one of its most virulent and dangerous foes, and an earnest and influential friend and patron of Neo-Platonism and the old heathen cultus. Julian (born A.D. 331; died of a wound received in battle with the Persians, A.D. 363) was a nephew of Constantine the Great, and succeeded Constantius, A.D. 361. It appears that he had secretly apostatized from Christianity some years before ascending the throne; and after that event he publicly avowed himself a convert to paganism, and put forth his best

efforts to re-establish its doctrines and worship throughout the empire over which he reigned. Aware, however, of the strong foothold which Christianity had obtained, and of the failure in the past of direct and open persecution to break its power over the minds of men or to stop its progress, he judged it prudent at first to adopt other methods, and to clothe his purpose in the garb of humanity and freedom of conscience. He accordingly proclaimed entire toleration for all parties, while he gave the whole influence of his position and patronage to the adherents of his own faith, conferring his favors equally on the old supporters of paganism and whatever proselytes he could attract to it. Without adopting fully either the unfavorable accounts of his conduct and motives given by Christian writers, or the fulsome laudations of him by heathen authors, it may justly be said that "his talents, his principles, and his deeds were alike extraordinary." Boasting of a philosophy which affected to look with complacent contempt upon Christians as ignorant worshippers of "a dead Jew," he was himself, in fact, so superstitious as to attach supreme importance to the mystic rites and juggleries of polytheistic worship. Scorning all evidence of the miracles of Christ, he lent a ready ear to the absurdest theurgic follies. How little of sincerity there was in his pretensions to impartial fairness towards all the subjects and faiths of his empire was shown by his treatment of the Christians, not stopping in the end even short of open persecution. How little reliance for success over the doctrines of the Galilaeans, as he contemptuously styled the Christians, he really placed upon the inherent superiority of his vaunted philosophy may be seen from the admissions of a modern writer, deemed to be a not unfriendly critic of his character and aims. Gibbon says: "A prince, who had studied human nature, and who possessed the treasures of the Roman empire, could adapt his arguments, his promises, and his rewards to every order of Christians, and the merit of a seasonable conversion was allowed to supply the defects of a candidate, or even to expiate the guilt of a criminal. As the army is the most forcible engine of absolute power, Julian applied himself with peculiar diligence to corrupt the religion of his troops... The holy name of Christ was erased from the Labarum; and the symbols of war, of majesty, and of pagan superstition were so dexterously blended that the faithful subject incurred the guilt of idolatry when he respectfully saluted the person or image of his sovereign. The soldiers passed successively in review; and each of them, before he received from the hand of Julian a liberal donation, proportioned to his rank and services, was required to cast a few grains of incense into the flame which burned

upon the altar... By the frequent repetition of these arts, and at the expense of sums which would have purchased the service of half the nations of Scythia, Julian gradually acquired for his troops the imaginary protection of the gods, and for himself the firm and effectual support of the Roman legions" *(Hist. of Decline,* etc., 2:430, 431 [Harper's ed. N.Y. 1852]).

Julian's work against the Christians (Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*)* shared the fate of the similar one by Porphyry, and we are indebted to the reply of Cyril for such extracts from it as are extant. The plans and purposes of Julian against the Christian faith were overruled by him who is Master alike of philosophers and kings, and later tradition reports of him that, gathering into his hand the blood flowing from his wound, he cast it into the air, with the words, Νενίκηκας Γαλιλαῖε, "Thou hast conquered, O Galileean."

Julian's successor, Jovian, proclaimed emperor on the field, responded to the acclamations of the troops by declaring himself a Christian, and that he "could not hope for divine protection, or the success of their arms, were he to take the command of men trained up in the principles of the late emperor Julian." The soldiers replied, "You shall command Christians. The oldest of us were trained by Constantine, the next by Constantius, and the reign of Julian has been too short to bind any men among us to his persuasions." Jovian soon issued an edict which "placed the Christian religion on a legal basis," and put an end to the persecution of its followers. Thus imperial power, princely learning; philosophy falsely so called, and lavish prodigality of treasure had been employed in vain to overthrow the temples of God erected in the hearts of men.

(12.) "In practical life Neo-Platonic philosophy was unable to vie with Christianity; its mission was simply the preservation of the olden learning, science, and art." When, therefore, the political direction given to it during the reign of Julian had failed to renovate "the ancient cultus and the ancient faith," its representatives applied themselves anew to scientific pursuits, especially to the study and exegesis of Plato and Aristotle. The "philosophy became again a mere matter of the school," whose seat was transferred to Athens, where Plutarch, the son of Nestorius (born about A.D. 350, and died 433), taught. This Plutarch was styled by the later NeoPlatonists "the Great," to distinguish him from the historian and Platonist who lived in the reign of Trajan. He appears to have been a Syncretist, and to have maintained, after Jamblichus, the efficacy of theurgic rites for uniting man with God. According to Proclus, he " distinguished between the One, the

Nous, the Soul, the forms immanent in material things and matter." Syrianus, his pupil and a teacher of Proclus, wrote a commentary on the metaphysics of Aristotle, whose philosophy he considered as a stepping-stone to that of Plato.

(13.) Proclus (A.D. 411-485), surnamed Διάδοχος, "the Successor," was by far the most celebrated of the later Neo-Platonists, "the Scholastic among the Greek philosophers." He was born at Byzantium, spent his youth at Xanthus, studied at Alexandria, and subsequently at Athens under Plutarch and his daughter, Asclepigenia, and Syrianus. During his travels he was initiated into the mysteries and arcana of theurgy, and was wont to say that it had been revealed to him in a dream that he was the last link of the Hermaic chain *(σειρὰ ἑ Ερμαϊκή)*, i.e., of the men consecrated by Hermes to preserve by perpetual tradition the esoteric doctrines of the mysteries. His biographer, Marinus, tells of his wonderful precocity, his quick comprehension, and extraordinary memory; of his ascetic virtues, his scrupulous observance of the mystic rites, his fastings, vigils, his profound knowledge of the Orphic and Chaldnean mysteries; and says that in several instances the gods appeared to him. In philosophy his aim was to combine, according to the principles of dialectics, the mass of transmitted philosophy, enlarged by additions of his own, into a rigidly scientific form. His theology rests on the same general principles as that of Plotinus, with the same hypostases in the same order, but differing in the particular that each hypostasis is divided into a new trinity. There is but one real principle of things, unity, from which all things emanate by triads — all reality being subject to this triadic development. That which is produced is at once like and unlike its cause; so far as it is like it is immanent in the cause, and so far as it is unlike, it is separated from it. The development is a *descending* one, from the higher to the lower. All things tend to return to their source, unity. Out of this first essence issue a plurality of unities, all " exalted above being, life, reason, and our power of knowledge, that operate in the world, and are the agents of Providence, the gods." After the unities follow "the triad of the *intelligible, intelligible-intellectual*, and *intellectual* essences," of which the second participates in the first, and the third in the second. The Intelligible or Being *(oliata)* includes three triads. The *intelligible-intellectual* sphere contains female divinities, and is subdivided into inferior triads. The *intellectual essences* "are arranged according to the number seven," by a sevenfold division of which Proclus makes up seven hebdomads of intellectual essences. Souls emanate from the

intellectual. are by nature eternal, are divine, of daemons and of men. The human soul possesses freedom of will, and is therefore responsible. Matter is neither good nor evil, but is the source of natural necessity.

(14.) Among the adherents and teachers of Neo-Platonism in the early part of the 5th century was the celebrated female philosopher Hypatia, whose life, genius, learning, beauty, accomplishments, and untimely fate have been made, by a writer of distinction recently deceased, the groundwork of an interesting and vivid picture of the social condition, the philosophical conflicts, and the religious animosities of that age *(Hypatia, or Old Foes with a New Face,* by Charles Kingsley, Lond. 1872, cr. 8vo). She was the daughter of Theon. and by him was taught philosophy and mathematics. Her learning and eloquence were such as to entitle her to the honor of presiding over the Neo-Platonic school at Alexandria, where she lectured to large audiences. Having incurred the enmity of some ignorant bigots among the Christian populace of that city, she was one day seized in the street, dragged from her carriage into one of the churches, and most cruelly murdered by a mob of fanatics headed by one Peter, a reader of one of the churches. Her tragic death made her a martyr among the pagans, while the spirit and conduct of her murderers merit the execration of Christians, whose principles were thereby grossly violated.

(15.) Boethius, the author of the *Consolation,* a work which was the most influential medium for the transmission of Greek philosophy to the West during the early part of the Middle Ages, was one of the last NeoPlatonists of antiquity. Other less conspicuous names follow in the history of the school, whose doctrines continued to be taught publicly until, in the year A.D. 529, the emperor Justinian by an edict forbade the teaching of philosophy at Athens, and confiscated the property of the Platonic school. In consequence of this edict, Damascius, Simplicius, and other teachers of the heathen philosophy, fled to the protection of Chosroes, king of Persia; but, disappointed ill their hopes of gaining new life and honors for their philosophy, they were glad to avail themselves of the terms of peace between the Persians and the Romans to return to their country again in A.D. 533. Thus ended as an organized system of doctrines this type of Hellenic philosophy, which a recent author regards "as a progressive evolution out of the combined action of Platonism, Judaism, and mysticism before the Christian era, completed by the additional forces of Christianity and Aristotelianism in the 1st and 2d centuries of the Christian aera, and

thus the result of seven centuries of growth and conflict in human thought" *(American Cyclopaedia).*

II. *Resume of General Principles. —*

1. Viewed from the stand-point of doctrine regarding the number of first principles, Neo-Platonism was a monism, as it traced all things back ultimately to the Absolute One, but its conceptions of the Deity as manifested were not monotheistic in the Jewish and Christian sense, but pantheistic. It rejected the Biblical idea of an *objective revelation* of man's relations to God, and of the means by which man could attain to a saving knowledge of him, and claimed to unite man with the Deity by a *subjective intuition,* called the ecstasy, wherein the subject, man's soul, and the object, the Absolute. or God, are so intimately united as to lose their separate identity. This unification with God is attainable by asceticism and profound contemplation, and, according to some later Neo-Platonists, by theurgic and magic rites. This conception of a mystic blending, so to speak, of the human with the divine gave to Neo-Platonism its peculiar character, in contrast with the purely Grecian systems of philosophy.

2. Closely connected with this theory of the ecstasy stands the doctrine of the three cosmical principles, the Neo-Platonic trinity. To the two hitherto admitted ones, viz. the reason and the soul, they added a third one, as the ultimate uniter of all distinctions, the primal One. This One is inexpressible and inconceivable. All things are derived from it not by division, which would diminish it, but by a radiation or flowing forth, as rays of light from the sun. This conception of the first as producer, in relation to the second, gives a basis for their doctrine of emanations.

3. The Neo-Platonic doctrine of emanations represents the world as outflowing from God in such a manner that each remoter emanation is possessed of a lower degree of perfection than its principle. Fire gives forth heat, snow causes coldness, odorous substances exhale odors, and every organism, so soon as it has reached its full development, begets something like itself. So the perfect and eternal One, in the overflow of his perfections, allows to proceed from himself (but without himself being weakened or diminished thereby) that which is also ever-enduring and, next to himself, the best, viz. the Reason or World-Intelligence, his own immediate reflection and image. The Reason is, next to the primal One, the most perfect, and contains in itself the world of ideas.

As the Reason emanates from the primal One, so the World-Soul flows forth from the Reason as its image, and in turn gives rise to sensible matter, the last and lowest of the emanations. In this way is the World Soul the plastic artist of the visible universe, which closes the series of emanations. The aim of the emanation theory is attained in a continuous process from God to the sensible world. Individual souls, like the World-Soul, partake of the life of the Reason and of the Sensible, just as a sun-ray touches alike the sun and the earth. From the world of reason, their original and proper home, they have descended, each in its allotted time, not voluntarily, but following an inherent necessity, into the corporeal world, yet without entirely forsaking the world of ideas. The soul's true vocation then, is to seek to regain its proper home, to free itself from participation in the corporeal, in order that it may ascend again into the world of ideas, and attain the ultimate aim of all its desires and efforts, immediate union with God through the ecstatic vision of the primal One, into whom it sinks unconscious and loses itself.

III. *Concluding Observations.* — Neo-Platonism and Christianity, though opposing forces in the religious movements of their age, mutually influenced the doctrinal developments of each other. This fact is apparent not only from an examination of individual writers, but much more from a comparison of the parallel history of each. The works of Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, and other Christian writers of the early ages of the Church, abound in evidences of the influence of the philosophic spirit. On the other hand, a glance at the historical development of Neo-Platonism reveals a corresponding action of Christian ideas on it. Their opposition to each other arose naturally from the relative positions occupied by each. Neo-Platonism was a merely human religio-philosophical eclecticism, seeking to found a universal religion under the form of a philosophy which readily accepted the religious conceptions of all nations, and claimed to select the wheat from the chaff of all previous systems. Christianity, as a system of revealed truth, was of necessity exclusive. It could accept no modification of its dogmas, could agree to no alliance with differing creeds. Neo-Platonism was the creed of philosophers lifted, in their conceit, above the vulgar crowd, and despising the illiterate. Christianity was open to all grades and conditions of men. In her fold the learned and the unlearned were alike welcomed as redeemed by the blood of her divine Master. The one made a fruitless effort to revive the life and vigor of the heathen past; the other labored, and not in vain, for the future,

wherein Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." The one seemed to hold itself aloof from contact with the suffering, and made no effort to elevate the lowly; the other sought alike the rich and the poor, relieved the suffering, comforted the sorrowing, and encouraged the weary by the hope of rest from their labors. From the fires of persecution the one came forth purified as gold tried in the furnace, the other vanished as the stubble. Neo-Platonism, though claiming to be eclectic, did nothing to unite men by means of its philosophy. Christianity, with its "mighty and all-embracing message," and its exhibition of love and self-sacrifice, welded together the hearts of men better than the force of power or the cold abstractions of the intellect, proving that the foolishness of the Gospel is wiser than the wisdom (philosophy) of men, and that the weak things of God are stronger than men.

IV. *Literature*. — The original sources of information embrace the works of Philo-Judeus, Plutarch, Apnleius, Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Julian, Eunapius (Βίοι φιλοσόφων καὶ σοφιστῶν), Sallustius (Περὶ θεῶν καὶ κόσμου), Proclus, Suidas, the early Christian apologists and fathers, and the Church historians — Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius. To these may be added among modern or secondary sources, several of which have been freely used-in the preparation of this article, and often without special acknowledgment: Ritter, *Hist. of Ancient Philosophy* (Morrison's transl., Lond. 1846, 4 volumes, 8vo), see Index in volume 4; Muller, *Hist. of the Literature of Ancient Greece* (continued by Donaldson, Lond. 1858, 3 volumes, 8vo), see Index in volume 3; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time* (N.Y. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), see Index in volume 2; Tennemann, *Manual of the Hist. of Philosophy* (Bohn's ed., Lond. 1852, 8vo), see Index; Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy,* volume 2; Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philosophy,* volume 2; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (3d ed. Lond. 1874, post 8vo), see Index; Schwegler, *Gesch. der Philosophie im Umriss* (3d ed. Stuttgard, 1857, 8vo; also Prof. Seelve's transl., N.Y. 1860, 12mo), pages 97-101; Fichte. *De philosophie novae Platonicae origine* (Berl. 1818); Vogt, *Neu-Platonismus und Christenthum,* part 1; *Neu-platonische Lehre* (nach Plotin) (1836); Kirchner, *Die Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1832); Ullmann, *Einfluss des Christenthums auf Porphyrius* (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854); Simon, *Hist. de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo); Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools* (1854); Barthelemy St. Hilaire, *De l'Ecole d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1845); Vaclherot, *Hist. critique de l'Ecole*

d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1846-50, 3 volumes, 8vo); Ennemoser, *Hist. of Magic* (Bohn's ed., Lond. 1854, 2 volumes, cr. 8vo), 1:443-457; Ruffner, *The Fathers of the Desert* (N.Y. 1850, 2 volumes, 12mo), 1:180-188; Mosheim, *Institutes of Eccles. Hist.* (Murdock's transl., New Haven, 1832, 3 volumes, 8vo), see Index to volume 1, s.v. Plato; Neander, *Lectures on the Hist. of Christian Dogmats* (Lond. 1858, 2 vols. 16mo), see Index; id. *Church Hist.* (Bohn's ed., 10 volumes, post 8vo), see Index; id. *Julian the Apostate and his Generations* (transl. by Cox, Lond. 12mo); Townsend, *Eccles. and Civil Hist.* etc. (Lond. 1847, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:412-419; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire* (Engl. and Amer. editions), see Index; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church* (N.Y. 1874, 8vo), pages 154, 155; and *Hist. of the Christian Church* (N.Y. 1870, 2 volumes, 8vo), see Index. Consult also Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale;* the encyclopaedias under the appropriate names and titles; and the articles in the following periodicals: the *London Quarterly*, July 1857, page 308 sq.; *Revue des deux Mondes*, May 15, 1866, page 498 sq.; *Biblical Repository*, 1834. *SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL*. (J.W.M.)

Neo-Platonists

SEE NEO-PLATONISM.

Neo-Pythagoreans

SEE PYTHAGOREANS.

Neo-Sabellians

SEE SABELLIANS.

Neo-Samosatians

SEE SAMOSATIANS.

Neostadiensium Admonitio Christiana De Libro Concordiae

quem vocant, a quibusdam theologis nomine quorundam ordinum Augustanae confessionis edito (Neostad. in Palatinatu, 1581). Under this title the Reformed theologians assembled by Johann Casimir at Neustadt published a work against the Lutheran Formula of Concord. Most of these

theologians were driven out of Heidelberg by elector Ludwig, who sided with the Lutheran party, but were well received by the zealous Calvinist John Casimir. He appointed a number of them to the gymnasium at Neustadt, which remained a Reformed seminary as long as Heidelberg continued Lutheran, i.e., from 1576 to 1583. This *Admonitio*, composed by Ursinus, and therefore also contained in the Ursini *Opera* (2:486 sq. [Heidelb. 1612]), is the most important of the Lutheran protests against the Formula of Concord, and closely connected with the *Historia der Augsburger Confession* (published at Neustadt in 1580). It consists of a lengthy introduction on the evils of party feeling, the unavoidableness of doctrinal differences, etc., and of twelve chapters, treating,

1, on the person of Christ and restoration of the true doctrine;

2, same concerning the Eucharist;

3, reply to the false accusations against our Church on account of certain dogmas;

4, on the authority of the Confession of Augsburg;

5, on the true meaning of that confession;

6, of the authority of Luther;

7, of the unjust judgment passed on our doctrine in the Book of Concord;

8, of the false assertions contained in that work;

9, of the contradictions contained in it;

10, of the conduct of the theologians concerning the Formula of Concord, and of the duty of the Christian state in ecclesiastical controversies;

11, of the evils attending the carrying out of the Formula of Concord;

12, exposition of the true and correct manner of establishing unity in the Christian Church. It is a remarkable work. Thus on page 115 we read:

"The importance of the Confession of Augsburg is sometimes greatly exaggerated, as when it is held that ally one who departs even from the

letter of it is a heretic. Besides, we do not dissent from its real meaning. The canonical books alone are divine, and form the sole rule of doctrine. All other works on doctrine may indeed possess ecclesiastical authority, but not divine, and can only be received in so far as they agree with the Scriptures. Among them are ecumenical works which no one has a right of his private authority to alter, while there are others peculiar to some churches which are less to be observed, as one can be a member of the Universal Church without endorsing them, and because other churches have the same right of drawing up particular confessions according to their requirements. They do not abolish the decisions of the Universal Church; nor do they decide on what is truth or what error, but only on what does or does not agree with the doctrines of their Church. They therefore cannot be looked upon as symbols, as is attempted to be done concerning the Confession of Augsburg and the Formula of Concord, which would then be obligatory for all Christians. It is neither possible nor advisable to impose on all churches the same formula; it is therefore better to allow every Church liberty to draw up its own confession according to its requirements and to the necessities of controversy, provided they all hold fast to the fundamental truths of Christianity. This is the case with several confessions of the present time, which are all necessary, and the Confession of Augsburg has no privilege over any other, however good it may be in itself. Neither of it nor of any other can it be said that whosoever rejects it is a heretic. It was framed in the early days of the Reformation, when light was only beginning to struggle against papal obscuration, and many points were yet imperfectly defined. It were both wrong and absurd to forbid learned teachers, and even the framers of the confession themselves, from making the doctrines profit by their increased experience, or even establishing them in a clearer and better manner. Besides, this confession is only the work of a few, and flamed under the pressure of circumstances amid a disturbed Diet; consequently under fear of danger, and the necessity of dealing most gently with papal abuses. It is therefore neither as full nor as explicit as many would desire, and requires subsequent improvements."

This extract suffices to show that the *Admonitio Neost.* is yet worthy of a careful perusal. The chapter on the authority of Luther is especially remarkable for its true evangelical character, but it is least read by those whom it may benefit most. The party of the Formula of Concord attacked the *Admonitio*, and it was defended by the opponents of the formula, particularly by Ursinus himself (Opp. volume 2). See Herzog, *Real*

Encyklopdaie, 10:263 sq.; Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology,* page 288 sq.

Neot, St.

a learned English monastic of the Anglo-Saxon period, noted as the preceptor as well as kinsman and friend of king Alfred, was born towards the middle of the first half of the 9th century. He is believed to have been first bred for a soldier's life, but while yet a youth to have grown tired of the world, and retired to the abbey of Glastonbury, about 850, for a solitary and devoted life. He studied assiduously, and it is said that even there he became eminent for his literary attainments, and that the fame of his learning drew to Glastonbury a great number of scholars eager to profit by his instruction. The Anglo-Saxon *Life of Neot* seems to indicate that at this period of his life he made several visits to Rome. After a residence of some years at Glastonbury, Neot was seized with an eager desire to live in greater solitude, and he quitted his abbey, accompanied by a single attendant named Barius, to seek a place suitable to his purpose. At length he settled among the woods of Cornwall, in a beautifully retired spot, near a village previously known by the name of Ham-Stoke, but afterwards called from him Neot-Stoke, and in more modern times distinguished by the simple appellation of St. Neot's. He there built himself a hermitage, and remained in it with his single companion during seven years, at the end of which period he began again to conceive the idea of returning to the world. His biographers tell us that he went to Rome to consult with the pope, by whose advice he returned to his once solitary dwelling, and founded there a small monastic house, into which he gathered some monks, and was himself constituted their first abbot. According to his biographers, he at this time received frequent visits from his kinsman king Alfred, who held him in the highest respect, and he urged his royal relative to turn his mind from the vanities of the world. It is pretended that it was by his advice that Alfred re-endowed the English school at Rome and sent offerings to the pope, and that his influence with the pope procured for Alfred many apostolic favors. Some writers of very suspicious authority have gone still further, and asserted that not only did St. Neot originate the idea of the foundation of the University of Oxford, which they affirm was first laid by Alfred, but that he and Grimbald were the first two professors there. If we can put any faith in the stories told by the biographers. Neot must have died in or a little before the year 877; but all our information relating to him is extremely uncertain. His festival was kept on the 31st of July. He

was buried at St. Neot's in Cornwall, where his bones remained in peace until 974, when they were carried away by stealth to the newly-founded monastery of St. Neot's in Hutingdonshire, and were there deposited in a handsome chapel. The old bibliographers (Bale, Pits, etc.) attribute to Neot several writings, as *Annals of the Earlier Part of Alfred's Reign: — Sermons and Exhortations: — A Letter to Pope Martin on the Subject of the English at Rome:* — and a book of *Exhortations to King Alfred.* We may observe that there is less authority for making him the author of these writings than for making him professor at Oxford. St. Neot is described as "humble to all, affable in conversation, wise in transacting business, venerable in aspect, severe in countenance, moderate even in his walk, upright, calm, temperate, and charitable." Two towns in England bear his name. His attributes are the pilgrim's staff and wallet. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome October 28th. There are several lives extant of St. Neot, but they are all filled more or less with legendary matter. The one on which the others were probably based was composed towards the beginning of the 11th century. The most ancient of the lives now extant is a sketch in Anglo-Saxon, which has been printed in the Reverend G.C. Gorham's *History and Antiquities of Eynesbury and St. Neot's* (Lond. 18201824, 2 volumes, 8vo). This is the most valuable of any remains regarding St. Neot. See also Wright, *Biographia Britannica Literaria* (Anglo-Saxon period), pages 381-383; Clement, *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art,* page 233. (J.H.W.)

Nepa(u)l

Picture for Nepaul

an independent kingdom of India, comprising a portion of the southern slope of the Himalayas, bounded on the N. by Thibet, on the S. and W. by British India, and on the E. by Sikkim, a protected state, is situated in long. 800 15'-880 15' E. It is 500 miles in length by about 100 miles in average breadth, covers an area of 50,000 square miles, and has a population estimated at 2,000,000. The kingdom is separated from the plains of India by the long, narrow strip of land, resembling an English down, but unhealthy, called the Terai, which extends along the whole southern border. North of this, and running parallel with it, is the great forest of Nepaul, from eight to ten miles broad. North of this strip is a tract of hilly country, and above that are two tracts of greater elevation, the first of which may be called mountainous, while the second might appropriately be

called Alpine, if it did not comprise among its mountains peaks which, like Mount Everest and Dhawalagiri, attain almost twice the elevation of Mont Blanc. The principal rivers are the Kurnalli, the Rapti, the Gunduk with its great tributaries, and the Sun KIosi. The climate, most unhealthy in the Terai, is healthy and pleasant in the hilly and mountainous districts, suggesting that of Southern Europe. In the *Valley of Nepaul* — the district surrounding the capital — the heat of Bengal, which is felt in the hollows, may be exchanged for the cold of Russia by ascending the slopes of the hills which enclose it. The soil is extremely rich and fruitful. Barley, millet, rice, maize, wheat, cotton, tobacco, sugar-cane, pine-apple, and various tropical fruits are cultivated. Gold has not been found, but iron and copper mines are worked. The capital of the country is Khatmandu. The inhabitants consist of a variety of races, but the dominant people are the Ghurkas, a tribe of Mongol origin, Hinduis in religion, who conquered the country about the close of the 18th century. Their chief occupation is war. Many Hindus from Chiton settled in Nepaul at the time of the Mohammedan invasion, and some of them have preserved their blood pure to the present time, while others have intermarried with Chinese and Tartars. The Hindus are found chiefly in the west; the east is populated by aboriginal tribes, among which are the Newars, Magars, Gurungs, Jariyas, Dhenwars, Buteas, Mhanjas, and Bhanras. The most important of these are the Newars, who constitute the agriculturists and artisans of the country. They are ingenious and peaceable, though excessively dirty; of middle size and great strength, with round flat faces, small eyes, broad noses, and open countenances. They are Buddhists, but have a priesthood of their own, and reject the Thiibetan model of Buddhism as it prevails among the other aboriginals of Nepaul. They as well as others of the aborigines practice polyandry to some extent. Thirteen dialects are spoken in Nepaul, but only two of the dialects possess any literature, and they are the dialects of the two most prominent tribes — the Newars and Ghurkas.

Of the history of Nepaul little is known until the invasion of the Ghurkas (1768); it seems never to have been subject to the Mogul or any other great Asiatic conquerors. A war in which it became involved with Thibet in 1790 led to hostilities with the emperor of China, who, regarding himself as the protector of the lamas, in 1792 sent an army of 70,000 men against the Nepaulese, and checked the extension of their territory to the northward. A treaty of commerce was concluded with the British in 1792, and from 1802 to 1804 Katmandu was the residence of a representative of the British

government. Repeated encroachments of the rajah upon the East India Company's territories led the British to declare war in 1814, and they consequently invaded the country on the western frontier, where their troops met repeated losses, and their commander, Genesis Gillespie, was slain. In the following year, however, the campaign under Sir David Ochterlony was attended with very different results. The victory of Malome, the capitulation of the famous Nepaulese commander Amir Singh, and finally the rapid advance of the victor towards Katmandu, obliged the Nepaulese monarch to make peace, and a treaty in March, 1816. Throughout the mutiny of 1857 the Nepaulese cultivated the friendship of the British, and the prime minister, Jung Bahadtir, defeated the last remnant of the rebels in December 1859. The policy of the government towards foreigners, however, is exceedingly exclusive. Much valuable information concerning the country is contained in the work on *Nepaul and Thibet*, by B.H. Hodgson, formerly British minister at Katmandu (1874). See also Oliphant, *A Journey to Katmandu* (1852); Col. Kirkpatrick, *Account of the Kingdom of Nepauil* (Lond. 1811); *Edinburgh Review*, July 1840, art. 1; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1852, part 2, page 86; 1860, part 1, page 509; and the article Gorkhas in the *American Cyclopcedia*.

Nepenthe

(from Gr. νή, *not*, and πένθος, *grief)*, is the name of a magic potion mentioned both by Greek and Roman poets, which was supposed to make persons forget their sorrows and misfortunes. It was the juice or infusion of a plant now unknown. Homer says it grew in Egypt, and that Helen learned its use from the Egyptians. According to Theodorus Siculus the Theban women also knew the secret of making it.

Nephalia

(Gr. νηφάλιος, *sober)* were festivals and sacrifices of the ancient Greeks, but more especially of the Athenians, and received their name from the circumstance that no wine was offered, but only milk, mead, and other mild liquors. The vine, the fig-tree, and the mulberry were prohibited from being used in the Nephalia because they were looked upon as symbols of drunkenness. See Broughton, *Bibliotheca Historica Sacra*, 2:162.

Ne'pheg

(Heb. *id.* gpn, *sprout;* Sept Ναφέκ, <02621>Exodus 6:21; Ναφήγ, <10515>2 Samuel 5:15; Ναφέγ, <13307>1 Chronicles 3:7; Ναφάγ v.r. Ναφάθ, <31406>1 Chronicles 14:6), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The second named son of Izhar, a Kohathite of the tribe of Levi (<02621>Exodus 6:21). B.C. cir. 1760.

2. The ninth-named son of David. born at Jerusalem (<10515>2 Samuel 5:15; <13307>1 Chronicles 3:7; 14:6). B.C. cir. 1020.

Nephes Ogli

(i.e., *Son of the Holy Spirit)* is a title given in the East to certain persons who are supposed to be born after an extraordinary manner, e.g. of a mother that is a virgin. We are told that there are Turkish young women who live in certain retired places where they never see a man. They go but seldom to the mosques, and when they come thither they stay there from nine till twelve at night, and accompany their prayers with so many distortions of the body and cries that their strength is quite exhausted, and they often fall to the ground in a swoon. If from that time they find themselves with child they pretend it is by the favor of the Holy Spirit; and for this reason the children they bring forth are called *Nephes Ogli.* The Nephes Ogli thus pretended to be miraculously born are looked upon as persons who have the gift of working miracles, and it is claimed that their hair or pieces of their garments cure all sorts of diseases. See Broughton, *Bibliotheca Historica Sacra,* 2:162; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* page 295.

Nepheth

a word occurring only in the phrase tpeNhi tv,l v] *three of the height,* i.e., *the triple height* (<061711>Joshua 17:11). The name seems to refer to the three places just mentioned-Endor, Taanach, and Megiddo which were elevated above the plain; comp. *Tricollis; Tremont* (Gesenius, s.v.). But the Targum renders *tres regiones,* "three countries," which is followed by the Auth. Version. The Latin (after the Sept. τὸ τρίτον Νοφέθ) has *tertia pars urbis Nopheth,* "the third part of the city Nopheth," and is followed by Luther. Schwarz *(Palest.* page 149), with less probability, gives "the three Nepheth, meaning three places of the same name in the neighborhood of

Dor," and finds a village *Naphatha* two miles and a half south-east of Dor (comp. <06123>Joshua 12:23). See Keil, ad loc.

Nephew

is used in the old English sense of *grandson* as a rendering dk,n,*(neked,* <181819>Job 18:19; <231422>Isaiah 14:22; *progeny,* especially a "son's son," as rendered in <012123>Genesis 21:23), and E'cyoioi, a *descendant* (<540504>1 Timothy 5:4). *SEE KINDRED.*

Ne'phi

(Νεφθαεί v.r. Νεφθάς; Vulg. Nephi), the name given by many *(*παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς) to the substance otherwise called (2 Macc. 1:36) NAPHTHAR (q.v.).

Nephilim

(μylæpinæ) occurs only in the plural form, and in the two passages (<010604>Genesis 6:4; <041333>Numbers 13:33) where it is rendered in the English version "giants." This meaning is given by all the old versions (Sept. γίγαντες*;* Aquila, ἐπιπίπτοντες*;* Symm. βιαῖοι*;* Vulg. *gigantes;* Onk. aY;rbG]; Luther, *tyrannen),* and is demanded by the latter passage. "The word is derived either from hlP;br alP;(=-'marvelous'), or, as is generally believed, from lpn; either in the sense to throw down, or *to fall* (= fallen angels [Jarchi]; comp. <231412>Isaiah 14:12; <421018>Luke 10:18), or meaning ἣρωες, *irruentes* (Gesen.), or *collapsi* (by euphemism, Bottcher, *De Inferis,* page 92); but certainly not because men fell from terror of them (as R. Kimnchi). That the word means *giant* is clear from <041332>Numbers 13:32, 33, and is confirmed by alypæn]æthe Chaldee name for 'the aery giant' Orion (<180909>Job 9:9; 38:31; <231310>Isaiah 13:10; Targ.) unless this name arise from the *obliquity* of the constellation *(Genesis of Earth,* page 35). We now come to the remarkable conjectures about the origin of these *Nephilim* in <010601>Genesis 6:1-4. (An immense amount has been written on this passage. See Kurz, *Die Ehen der Sohne Gottes,* etc. [Berlin, 1857]; Ewald. *Jahrb.* 1854, page 126; Govett's *Isaiah Unfufi1lled;* Faber's *Many Mansions [J. of Sac. Lit.* October 1858], etc.) We are told that 'there *were* Nephilim in the earth,' and that afterwards (Sept. καὶ μέἐτ ἐκεῖνο*)* the 'sons of God' mingling with the beautiful 'daughters of men' produced a race of violent and insolent *Gibborim (*μyrBoGæ). This latter word is also

rendered by the Sept. γίγαντες, but its meaning is more general. It is clear, however, that *no statement* is made that the Nephilim themselves sprang from this unhallowed union. Who, then, were they? Taking the usual derivation (lpn), and explaining it to mean 'fallen spirits,' the Nephilim seem to be identical with the 'sons of God;' but the verse before us militates against this notion' as much as against that which makes the Nephilim the same as the Gibborim, viz. the *offspring* of wicked marriages. This latter supposition can only be accepted if we admit either (I) that there were two kinds of Nephilim — those who existed before the unequal intercourse, and those produced by it (Heidegger, *Hist. Patt.* 11), or (2) by following the Vulgate rendering, *postquam enim ingressi sunt*, etc. But the common rendering seems to be correct, for is there much probability in Aben-Ezra's explanation that ˆkAyrej}ai ('after that') means lwbmh rja (i.e., 'after the deluge'), and is an allusion to the Anakims." We may remark, however, that the Hebrew word *Nephilimi* may rather be taken in an active sense =*those who fell* upon others, i.e., the violent tyrants of those days (Aquila, ἐπιπίπτοντες*);* and this agrees with the evident lawlessness of the times. *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS*.

Ne'phis

(Νιφίς, v.r. Νηφὶς, Φινίς; Vulg. *Liptis)*, given (1 Esdr. 5:21) as one of the heads of the families that returned from Babylon, in place of NEBO *SEE NEBO* (q.v.) in the Heb. list (<150228>Ezra 2:28), perhaps by some confusion with the MAGBISH following.

Ne'phish

(<130519>1 Chronicles 5:19). *SEE NAPHISH*. Nephish'esim (<160752>Nehemiah 7:52). *SEE NEPHUSIM*. Neph'tali (Tob. 1:2, 4, 5). *SEE NAPHTALI*. Neph'thalim (Tob. 7:3; <400413>Matthew 4:13, 15; <660706>Revelation 7:6). *SEE NAPHTALI*.

Nephthys

the sister and wife of Typhon, the evil god of the ancient Egyptians. To Osiris she bore Anubis, who is represented with the head of a dog. Nephthys belongs to the third order of deities, as classified by Sir J.G. Wilkinson in his *Materia Hieroglyphica*. In Egyptian theogony she personified the unfruitful earth, and was therefore the symbol of sterility.

Nephthys also represented the ocean, and hence it is possible that the god of the classic nations, Neptune, was derived from the Egyptians.

Nephto'ah

[some *Neph'toLh]* (Heb. *Nephto'ach,* jwTpj, *opened;* Sept. Ναφθώ v.r. Μαφθώ*;* Vulg. *Nephthoa),* the name of a spring (ˆyqe A . ". fountain," "well"), and apparently a streamlet (µyame A.V. " water," " waters") issuing from it (or perhaps a watering-place for cattle), on the border between Judah and Benjamin. Its position is described with considerable minuteness. From the valley of Hinnom the northern boundary of Judah was drawn to the top of the hill on the west, that is, in the direction of the Convent of the Cross; and the border was drawn from the top of the hill *unto the fountain of the water of Nephtoah,* and thence to Kirjathjearim (<06158>Joshua 15:8, 9). A similar description of the southern boundary of Benjamin is given in <06814>Joshua 18:14-16; and the name is not again mentioned in Scripture. Its site appears to have been unknown to Jerome and Eusebius; they do not mention it in their *Onomasticon.* From the above passages it might be inferred that the waters of Nephtoah lay somewhere in or near a direct line between Jerusalem and Kirjathjearim. Nephtoah was formerly identified with various springs, especially *A in Karim,* or Fountain of the Virgin of mediaeval times (Doubdan,*Voyage,* page 187; see also the citations of Tobler, *Topographie,* page 351; and Sandys, 3:184), and even the so-called *Well of Joab* in the Kedron valley *(Mislin,* 2:155); but these, especially the last, are unsuitable in their situation as respects Jerusalem and Kirjath-jearim, and have the additional drawback that the features of the country there are not such as to permit a boundary-line to be traced along it. Schwarz *(Palest.* page 268 sq.) finds a large spring near the castle of Al-Burak, the water of which was once carried by an aqueduct to Jerusalem, in which openings were made in order that passers-by might draw water; and that it was thence called *Me Nephto'ach,, the opened water.* But this is fanciful. Recent geographers have pretty generally agreed to identify Nephtoah with *Ain Lifta,* a fountain near the village of that name, two and a half miles north-west of Jerusalem (Barclay, *City of the Great King,* page 544; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung,* page 202; comp. *Topographie,* page 343 sq.; Stewart, *Tent and Khan,* page 349). The spring-of which a view is given by Dr. Barclay is very abundant, and the water escapes in a considerable stream into the valley below. This, however, cannot be reconciled with the statement in <09102>1 Samuel 10:2,

that Rachel's sepulchre lay near the border of Benjamin, and it is nearly three, miles south of the valley of Hinnom. Consequently, from the top of the hill on the west of Hinnom the border must have turned southward, *SEE TRIBE*, and we must look for the waters of Nephtoah on the south or south-west of Jerusalem. About a mile and a half from Jerusalem, on the road to Rachel's tomb, and close to the convent of Mar-Elyas, is an old well, which some have identified with Nephtoah *(Narrative of Mission to Jews,* June 13). It is, however, a mere well. A much more probable site is *A in Yalo,* in Wady el-Werd, three miles south-west of the city. It is a small fountain, whose waters flow into a large pool, and are drawn off to irrigate some gardens. Its water is esteemed at Jerusalem, whither it is conveyed in skins on the backs of donkeys (Porter, *Hand-book,* page 232; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:265). In front of the fountain are some ruins. There is another larger and much more beautiful fountain a mile farther down the valley, called *Ain Haniyeh,* said by tradition to be the fountain in which Philip baptized the eunuch (Barclay, page 548). It is ornamented with a niched fagade and Corinthian pilasters. See Porter, *Handbook for Palestine.*

Nephu'sim

(Heb. *Nephusai',* μysæWpn], so the marg.; but the text has *Nephisim',* μysæpæn]; *expansions;* Sept. Νεφουσίμ v.r. Ναφεισών*;* Vulg. *Naphusim),* the head of a family of "Temple servants" who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 22:50). B.C. cir. 535. The parallel text (<160752>Nehemiah 7:52) has (less correctly, it would seem) NEPHISHESIM (Heb. *Nephishesim,* μysæyæpæn], g marg.; but text has *Nephushesim',* μysæxWpn]; Sept. Νεφωσάς, v.r. Νεφωσασεί, Νεφωσαείμ, Νεφωσασείμ*;* Vulg. *Naphussim). SEE NETHINIM*.

Nepindi

SEE NEGOMBO.

Nepomuk, John

SEE JOHN OF NEPOMUK.

Nepos

an Egyptian bishop, who flourished in the first half of the 3d century, was a believer in Chiliasm and in the literal interpretation of Scripture, and

consequently an opponent of Origen's system. He wrote a work, Ἔλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν, now lost, which was at the time considered by his party in Egypt as an incontrovertible argument in favor of Christ's earthly kingdom. This, like all similar works, was undoubtedly based on the Apocalypse, but we possess no particulars as to the manner in which he represented the millennium. Gennadius says that he separated the resurrection of the just from that of the unjust, which is to occur only at the end of the millennium, accompanied by all the circumstances described in Revelation 20, probably because he everywhere understood it in a literal sense. Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria complained that many neglected the Scriptures for this work of Nepos, in which they believed they discovered great secrets. He found himself even obliged, after the death of Nepos, to convene at Arsinoe an assembly of presbyters and teachers for the purpose of examining into the doctrines of the work. The meeting lasted three days, and ended in all renouncing the Chiliast doctrine. Still Dionysius, in view of the reputation of Nepos and of his work, thought it necessary to refute the doctrines therein contained, and he wrote for that purpose his Περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν, which, from its being a general refutation of Chiliasm, was by Jerome considered as directed against Irenmeus, and by Theodoret as against Cerinthus. The fragments of this work contained in Eusebius are the sources of our knowledge concerning Nepos and his party. It reproved the doctrine of Nepos in a very gentle manner, and in nowise justifies the representation that Nepos was formally condemned, as has been asserted in later times *(Libell. synod.* in Mansi, *Coll. cone.* 1:1017). According to Fulgentius. (in *Pint. Arian.* c. 2), who also considers Nepos a heretic, his party still counted adherents in the 6th century. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:24 sq.; Gennadius, *De Dogm. Eccles.* c. 55; Tillemont, *Mem.* 4:261 sq. (ed. Venet.); Walsch, *Ketzerhistor.* volume 2; Schupart, *De chiliasmo Nepotis* (Giessen, 1724); Walsch, *Einleitung in die Religionstreitigkeiten der luth. Kirche,* 2:559; Neander, *Church Hist.* 1:652; Guericke, *Ancient Chur/ch Hist.* page 196. (J.N.P.)

Nepotism

is a word invented in ecclesiastical language to express a peculiar characteristic of many high ecclesiastics in Roman Catholic countries, and more particularly of popes, a propensity, namely, to aggrandize their family by exorbitant grants and favors conferred on members of it; literally on nephews (Latin *nepotes).* Many of the highest and wealthiest families of the Roman nobility owe their elevation entirely to this species of patronage.

Nepotism was first practiced, and that to a very considerable degree, by pope Nicholas III (q.v.), towards the close of the 13th century; reproachfully he was called the patriarch of papal nepotism. In the 15th century it found most prominent practice under Sixtus IV (q.v.), and he may be said to have carried nepotism to its highest pitch, and to have given rise to much scandal in the Romish Church. Alexander VI (q.v.) is only second to the preceding pope (see Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:129, 132; Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.* Page 45). Alexander V had no relations on whom to lavish his friendship, but he found an opportunity to practice nepotism towards the order to which be belonged prior to his elevation to the papacy. As early as the 16th century strong efforts were made to stay this evil practice. Pope Pius IV and his successors labored for this end. But nepotism was not successfully circumscribed until the 17th century by popes Innocent XI and XII, the latter of whom subjected, by a bull under date of July 28, 1692, all cardinals to an oath against the practice of nepotism. See Leti, *II Nepotismo di Roma* (Amst. 1667; in Latin, entitled *Nepot. Rom.* [Stuttg. 1669]); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy;* Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom,* 1:561; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity,* 6:141, 530; 7:272, 302; 8:171; Cartwright, *On Papal Conclaves,* pages 180-183; Wessenberg, *Gesch. der Kirchenversammlungen* (see Index in volume 4).

Neptunalia

is the name of a festival anciently celebrated at Rome in honor of Neptune (q.v.) on the 23d of July. Little information is accessible as to the manner in which this festival was kept, but it would appear that huts were wont to be erected with the branches and foliage of trees, where people probably feasted and amused themselves in various ways.

Neptune

Picture for Neptune

an ancient Roman god of the waters. It is doubtful whether he was originally a marine deity, for the old Italians were the very opposite of a maritime people, yet his name is commonly connected with *nato,* to swim; hence at an earlier period he may have borne another designation, afterwards forgotten. When the Romans became a maritime power, and had grown acquainted with Grecian mythology, they, in accordance with their usual practice, identified him with the Greek god whom he most resembled. This was *Poseidon,* also *Poteidan* (connected with πότος, *a*

πόντος;, *the sea;* and ποταμός, *a river).* Poseidon appears in his most primitive mythological form as the god of water in general, or the fluid element. He was the son of Cronos (Saturn) and Rhea, and a brother of Jupiter. On the partition of the universe among the sons of Cronos, he obtained the sea as his portion, in the depths of which he had his palace near Egee, in Euboea. Here also he kept his brazen-hoofed and golden-maned steeds, in a chariot drawn by which he rode over the waves, which grew calm at his approach, while the monsters of the deep, recognising their lord, made sportive homage round his watery path. But he sometimes presented himself at the assembly of the gods on Olympus, and in conjunction with Apollo built the walls of Troy. In the Trojan war he sided with the Greeks; nevertheless he subsequently showed 'himself inimical to the great sea-wanderer Ulysses, who had blinded his son Polyphemus. He was also believed to have created the horse, and taught men its use. The symbol of his power was a trident, with which he raised and stilled storms, broke rocks, etc. According to Herodotus, the name and worship of Poseidon came to the Greeks from Libya. He was worshipped in all parts of Greece and Southern Italy, especially in the seaport towns. The Isthmian games were held in his honor. Black and white bulls, boars, and rams were offered in sacrifice to him. Neptune was commonly represented with a trident, and with horses or dolphins, often along with Amphitrite, in a chariot drawn by dolphins, and surrounded by tritons and other sea-monsters. As befitted the fluctuating element over which he ruled, he is sometimes figured asleep or reposing, and sometimes in a state of violent agitation. See Vollmer, *Mythologisches Worterbuch,* s.v.; Westcott, *Hand-book of Archaeol.* pages 166, 167.

Nepveu, Francois

a French ascetic author, was born April 28, 1639, at St. Malo. Admitted in 1654 into the Society of Jesus, he was professor of the humanities, rhetoric, and philosophy, and afterwards occupied different positions; at the time of his death. which occurred in February 1708, he was rector of the college of Renues. All his works treat of practical religion or morality; they have frequently been reprinted even in our day, and translated into several languages. The principal are, *De l'Amour de Jesus-Christ* (Nantes, 1684, 12mo; 5th ed. Paris, 1756, 12mo): — *Exercices interieurs pour honorer les mysteres de Jesus-Christ* (Paris, 1791, 2 volumes, 12mo; Lyons, 1836, 12mo): — *Retraite selon l'esprit et la methode de St. Ignace* (Paris, 1687, 12mo): — *Maniere de sep reparer a la mnort* (Paris, 1693,

1697, 12mo): — *Pensees et reflexions Chretiennes pour tous les jours de l'annee* (Paris, 1695, 4 volumes, 12mo, and 1850, 8vo); transl. twice into Latin (Ingolstadt, 1727. and Heidelberg, 1774, 4 volumes, 8vo); into Flemish (1837, 1839, 4 volumes, 4to); twice into German (1752 and 1829); and twice into Italian (1715 and 1842): — *L'Esprit du Christianisme, ou la conformite du Chretien avec Jesus-Christ* (Paris, 1700, 12mo): — *Conduite Chretienne* (Paris, 1704, 12mo): — *Retraite spirituelle* (Paris, 1708, 12mo). Nepveu is also the author of the philosophical theses maintained in 1679 by Louis de la Tour d'Auvergne, prince de Turenne, and remarkable not only for their extent and solidity, but still more because they are ornamented with symbols, inscriptions, and vignettes, due to the good taste of J. Charles de la Rue. See Moreri, *Grand Dictionn. Histor.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Nequiti

is the name of a secret association among the natives of Congo, who celebrate their mysteries in dark and sequestered places, where none but the initiated are allowed to enter.

Ner

(Heb. *id.* רנֵר *light;* Sept. Νήρ), a Benjamite, according to 1 Chronicles 8:33, father of Kish and Abner, and grandfather of king Saul. B.C. cir. 1140. Abner was, therefore, uncle to Saul, as is expressly stated in 1 Samuel 14:50. But some confusion has arisen from the statement in I Chronicles 9:36, that Kish and Ner were both sons of Jehiel, whence it has been concluded that they were brothers, and consequently that Abner and Saul were first cousins. The explanation of this, however, is that there was an elder Kish, uncle of Saul's father, or, rather, Ner's grandfather. *SEE SAUL*. "The name Ner, combined with that of his son Abner, may be compared with Nadab in verse 36, and Abinadab, verse 39; with Jesse, 1 Chronicles 2:13, and Abishai, verse 16; and with Juda, Luke 3:26, and Abiud, Matthew 1:13." Gesenius, misled by 1 Samuel 9:1, gives the following genealogy *(Thesaur.* page 9):

Picture for Ner

Nereids

Picture for Nereids

*(*νηρεΐδες*)* was the name of the Greek seanymphs. They were fifty in number, and were daughters of *Nereus,* the old man of the sea. They were generally represented as very beautiful maidens, and sometimes as half woman and half fish. The Nereids were regarded as favorable to sailors. They were worshipped in several parts of Greece, but more especially in seaport towns.

Nereus

(Gr. Νηρεύς*)*, a marine divinity in classic mythology, was represented as a wise and prophetic old man, and was believed to dwell at the bottom of the sea with his beautiful daughters the *Nereids.* He was regarded as ruling principally over the iEgean Sea, and was believed occasionally to appear to men in different shapes, predicting what should befall them in the future. The poets feigned that he could assume various forms like Proteus, and would only reveal the future when, having exhausted his powers of transformation, he was reduced to his original shape. Nereus yielded his place to Poseidon, and gave him his daughter Amphitrite. His attribute was the trident. He frequently appears in ancient works of art.

Ne'reus

(Νηρεύς), a Christian at Rome to whom, with his sister, .the apostle Paul sent his salutation (<5165>Romans 16:15). A.D. 55. "The name may be of Hebrew origin, rn or yrn; or it may be, as Grotius suggests, from the Sabine *Nerio,* a word, according to Aulus Gellius, signifying 'virtus et fortitudo' *(N.A.* 13:2), and with which *Nero* and *Nerienes,* the wife of Mars, stand allied." " Origen conjectures that he belonged to the household of Philologus and Julia. Estius suggests that he may be identified with a Nereus who is said to have been baptized at Rome by St. Peter. A legendary account of him is given in Bolland, *Acta Sanctorum,* May 12; from which, in the opinion of Tillemont *(H.E.* 2:139), may be gathered the fact that he was beheaded at Terracina, probably in the reign of Nerva. His ashes are said to be deposited in the ancient church of SS. Nereo ed

Archilleo at Rome. There is a reference to his legendary history in bishop Jeremy Taylor's sermon, *The Marriage-ring*, part 1."

Nereus, ST.

a martyr of the early Christian Church, was a eunuch and servant of St. Domitilla (q.v.). Refusing to abjure his faith, he was, with his mistress, banished by Domitian into a little isle on the coast of Terracina, called Pontia. Afterwards, amid the persecutions under Trajan, Nereus suffered martyrdom with his mistress. The ancient Church kept a festival in memory of these faithful ones, and St. Gregory the .Great thus alludes to the great solemnity: "These saints, before whose tomb we are assembled, despised 'the world and trampled it under their feet, when peace, plenty, riches, and health gave it charms." St. Nereus is commemorated in the Church of Rome May 12. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 2:311, 312.

Ner'gal

Picture for Nergal 1

(Heb. *Nergal'*, לגרנ [in pause לגרנ]; Sept. Ἐργέλ v.r. Νηργέλ; Vulg. *Nergel)*, one of the chief Assyrian and Babylonian deities (2 Kings 17:30), seems to have corresponded closely to the classical *Mars*. He was of Babylonian origin, and various derivations of the name have been suggested. Furst traces it to גרנ, *to break in pieces*, with ל added; Gesenius identifies it with the Sabian *Nerig*, the *I* being appended as the mark of a diminutive, which was a sign of endearment; Von Bohlen compares the Sanscrit *Nrigal*, *man-destroyer*, spoken of a fierce warrior, and corresponding to *Merodach;* and Rawlinson says the name "is evidently compounded of the two Hamitic roots*air*, a man, and *gula*, great; so that he is *the great man*, or *the great hero" (Ancient Monarchies*, 1:171; 2:256). "His monumental titles are — 'the storm-ruler,' 'the king of battle,' 'the champion of the gods,' 'the male principle' (or 'the strong begetter'), 'the tutelar god of Babylonia,' and 'the god of the chase.' Of this last he is the god pre-eminently; another deity, *Nin*, disputing with him the presidency over war and battles. It is conjectured that he may represent the deified Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord from whom the kings both of Babylon and Nineveh were likely to claim descent. *SEE NIMROD*. The city peculiarly dedicated to his worship is found in the inscriptions to be Cutha or Tiggaba, which is in Arabian tradition the special city of

Nimrod. The only express mention of Nergal contained in sacred Scripture is in the above passage, where 'the men of Cutha,' placed in the cities of Samaria by a king of Assyria (Esar-haddon?), are said to have 'made Nergal their god' when transplanted to their new country — a fact in close accordance with the frequent notices in the inscriptions, which mark him as the tutelar god of that city. Nergal's name occurs as the initial element in *Neryal-shar-ezar* (<243903>Jeremiah 39:3 and 13); and is also found, under a contracted form, in the name of a comparatively late king-the *Abennerigus* of Josephus *(Ant.* 20:2, 1). Nergal appears to have been worshipped under the symbol of the 'Man-Lion.' The Shemitic name for the god of Cutha was *Aria,* a word which signifies 'lion' both in Hebrew and Syriac. *Nir,* the first element of the god's name, is capable of the same signification. Perhaps the habits of the lion as a hunter of beasts were known, and he was thus regarded as the most fitting symbol of the god who presided over the chase. It is in connection with their hunting excursions that the Assyrian kings make most frequent mention of this deity. As early as B.C. 1150, Tiglath-pileser I speaks of him as furnishing the arrows with which he slaughtered the wild animals. Assuur-dani-pal(Sardanapalus), the, son and successor of Esar-haddon, never fails to invoke his aid, and ascribes all his hunting achievements to his influence. Pul sacrificed to him in Cutha, and Sennacherib built him a temple in the city of Tarbisa. near Nineveh; but in general he was not much worshipped either by the earlier or the later kings (see the *Essay* of Sir H. Rawlinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:631-634)." The rabbinical commentators believe that this idol was in the form of a cock, since the somewhat similar word, l/gn]r]Ti, *tarnegol,* in the Talmud, means a cock (Selden, *Dii Syr.* 2:8, page 317 sq.; Schwarz, *Palest.* page 80). In curious coincidence with this tradition Layard gives two figures of a cock on Babylonian remains, showing its ancient worship by that peo*ple (Nineveh and Bablon* n. 158). Norberg, Gesenius, and other inquirers into the astrolatry of the Assyrians and Chaldaeans, conclude that Nergal is the same as the Sabian name for the planet Mars. Both among the Sabians and Arabians it means *ill-luck, misfortune;* and it was by no means peculiar to the mythology of the West to make it the symbol of bloodshed and war. The Sabian Mars was typified as a man holding in one hand a drawn sword, and in the other a human head just cut off; his garments were also red, no doubt from the hue which the body of the planet presents to the eye. Among the southern Arabs his temple was painted red; and they offered to him garments stained with blood, and a warrior (probably a prisoner), who was cast into a pool. It is related of the caliph Hakim that in

the last night of his life, as he saw the planet Mars rise, he murmured, " Dost thou ascend, thou accursed shedder of blood? then is my hour come ;" and at that moment the assassins sprang upon him from their hiding place (Mohammed Abu-Taleb; ap. Norberg, *Onomast.* page 105; *Bar-Hebrceus,* p. 220). See Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 913, and *Comment. zu Jesa,* 2:344; Nork, *Bibl. Mythol.* 1:60 sq.; Lanci, *Paral. alla illust. del. Sac. Script.* 1:284; Wichmallshausen, *Diss. de Nergal. Cuth. Idolo* (Viteb. 1707).

Picture for Nergal 2

Ner'gal-share'zer

(Hebrew *Nergal'-Sharets'er,* ' rx;a,r]v'Alg"r]ne; Sept. Νηργελσασασάρ, Vat. MS. Νεριγλισσάρ v.r. Μαργανασάρ, Μαργαννασάρ, Νηργελσαρασάρ; Ναγαργᾶς v.r. Νηργέλ, all in <243903>Jeremiah 39:3; also Νηργέ καὶ Σαρασάρ, ver. 13; Vulg. *Neregel et Sereser),* the name apparently of two persons among the "princes of the king of Babylon," who accompanied Nebuchadnezzar on his last expedition against Jerusalem, B.C. 588. The first part of the name is the god *Nergal* (q.v.), and Sharezer is supposed from the Zend to mean *prince of fire* (Gesen.).

1. The first of these is mentioned only in <243903>Jeremiah 39:3, without any other designation or notice.

2. "The other has the honorable distinction of Rabmag (gm;Ab r]), and it is to him alone that any particular interest attaches (<243903>Jeremiah 39:3). In sacred Scripture he appears among the persons who, by command of Nebuchadnezzar, released Jeremiah from prison (<243913>Jeremiah 39:13); profane history gives us reason to believe that he was a personage of great importance, who not long afterwards mounted the Babylonian throne. This identification depends in part upon the exact resemblance of name which is found on Babylonian bricks in the form of *Nergal-shar-uzur;* but mainly it rests upon the title *Rubu-emga,* or Rab-mag, which this king bears in his inscriptions, and on the improbability of there having been, towards the close of the Babylonian period when the monumental monarch must have lived two persons of exactly the same name holding this office. *SEE RAB-MAG*. Assuming on these grounds the identity of the scriptural 'Nergal-Sharezer, Rab-mag,' with the monumental *'Neergal-shar-uzur, Rab-emga,'* we may learn something of the prince in question from profane authors.

There cannot be a doubt that he was the monarch called *Neriglissar* or *Neriglissoor* by Berosus (Josephus, *c. Ap.* 1:30), who murdered Evil-Merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and succeeded him upon the throne. This prince was married to a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, and was thus the brother-in-law of his predecessor, whom he put to death. His reign lasted between three and four years. He appears to have died a natural death, and certainly left his crown to a young son, Laborosoarchod, who was murdered after a reign of nine months. In the Canon of Ptolemy he appears, under the designation of *Nerigassolassar,* as reigning four years between Illoarudamus (Evil-Merodach) and Nabonadius, his son's reign not obtaining any mention because it fell short of a year. A palace built by Neriglissar has been discovered at Babylon. It is the only building of any extent on the right bank of the Euphrates. *SEE BABYLON*. The bricks bear the name of Nergal-shar-uzur, the title of Rab-mag, and also a statement — which is somewhat surprising — that Nergal-shar-uzur was the son of a certain 'Belzikkar-iskun, *king of Babylon.'* The only explanation which has been offered of this statement is a conjecture (Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:518) that Bel-zikkar-iskun may possibly have been the 'chief Chaldnean' who (according to Berosus) kept the royal authority for Nebuchadnezzar during the interval between his father's death and his own arrival at Babylon. *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*. Neriglissar could scarcely have given his father the title of king without some ground; and this is at any rate a possible ground, and one compatible with the non-appearance of the name in any extant list of the later Babylonian monarchs. Neriglissars office of RAB-MAG will be further considered under that word. It is evident that he was a personage of importance before he mounted the throne. Some (as Larcher) have sought to identify him with Darius the Mede; but this view is quite untenable. There is abundant reason to believe from his name and his office that he was a native Babylonian — a grandee of high rank under Nebuchadnezzar, who regarded him as a fitting match for one of his daughters. He did not, like Darius Medus, gain Babylon by conquest, but acquired his dominion by an internal revolution. His reign lasted from B.C. 559 to B.C. 556."

Ne'ri

(Νηρί), the son of Melchi and father of Salathiel, according to Luke's genealogy of Jesus (3:27, 28); probably identical with the NERIAH *SEE NERIAH* (q.v.) of the O.T. (Jeremiah 51:59). *SEE GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD*.

Neri, Filippo De, St.

the founder of the Congregation of the Oratory, was born of a noble family at Florence, July 22, 1515. His character, even in boyhood, foreshadowed the career of piety and benevolence to which he was destined, and he was commonly known among his youthful companions by the name of "good Philip." On the death of his parents he was adopted by a very wealthy uncle, with whom he lived for some time at San Germano, near Monte Cassino, and by whom he was recognised as his destined heir. But he relinquished all these prospects for a life of piety and charity; and, after having considerably advanced in his studies at his native place, he decided to set out for Rome, where he hoped to have greater opportunities for charitable labors. He went to the Italian capital in 1533, and there arduously devoted himself to philosophical and theological studies in the Augustine schools. But he by no means confined himself to his intellectual improvement. He won the esteem and reverence of all by his extraordinary devotion to the Church and to the poor and needy and forsaken. He abounded in charitable labors, instructing children who had no teachers, caring for the sick, reclaiming vicious persons, and engaging in all manner of enterprises requiring a benevolent disposition and a pious soul. (The particulars of his life, some of which are very curious, have been fully narrated by his biographers Bacci and Gallonio.) In the pursuit of these objects he displayed a sincerity and a single-heartedness which naturally enough exposed him to the sneers and the slanders of the worldly, the prudish, and the sticklers for outward decorum. But he cared little for the opinion of such people, and went on unmindful of all opposition or want of interest. Neither money nor labor did he spare to accomplish his purposes. Thus he founded an asylum for poor and sick strangers, and other houseless or helpless persons, in which they were sheltered until they were able to return to their home. Realizing his need of closer alliance with the Church, he decided finally to take holy orders, and or May 23, 1551, was ordained priest in the church of the Lateran. The year previous to his admission into the priesthood he had exerted himself for the conversion of several associates of his, and he succeeded with Salviati, a brother of the cardinal of that name, and Tarugio, who afterwards became a cardinal, and Baronius, so celebrated in ecclesiastical history as a writer, and some others. No sooner had their zeal been enlisted in the interests of the Church than he banded them together in a confraternity for the care of poor pilgrims visiting Rome, and other houseless persons, as well as of the sick

generally, which still subsists, and which has numbered among its associates many of the most distinguished members of the Roman Catholic Church. This confraternity is noteworthy, moreover, as having been the germ of the far more celebrated Congregation of the Oratory (q.v.), which was founded by St. Philip in concert with these friends. Besides 'the general objects above indicated, and the spiritual duties designed for the personal sanctification of the members, the main object of this association was the moral instruction and religious training of the young and uneducated, who were assembled in chapels or oratorios, for prayer and for religious and moral instruction. The personal character of Neri, the unselfish devotedness of his life, his unaffected piety, his genuine love of the poor, his kindly and cheerful disposition, and, perhaps, as much as any of the rest, a certain quaint humor, and a tinge of what may almost be called drollery which pervaded many of his sayings and doings, contributed to popularize his institute. Besides being a man of education and general information, he could readily enter into the spirit of the respective pursuits of all whom he sought out for his assistance, and thus so greatly endeared himself to every one who was brought in contact with him. Many and peculiar were the means are used to further his purpose. Thus, e.g., indirectly Neri became the founder of the *Oratorios* (q.v.). As a further means of withdrawing youth from dangerous amusements, sacred musical entertainments (thence called by the name of *oratorio)* were held in the oratory, at first consisting solely of hymns, but afterwards partaking of the nature of sacred operas or dramas, some of which were written by distinguished writers, such as Zeno and Metastasio, except that they did not admit the scenic or dramatic accompaniments of these more secular compositions; the parts were sung, like those of an opera, with this difference, that the singers were stationed in a gallery of the chapel. The chapel being called in Italian "Oratorio," i.e., a place of prayer, came to be applied to the performance, and the congregation or order constituted by Neri hence took the name of *Fathers of the Oratory.* Besides the musical entertainments, religious and literary lectures also formed part of his plan, and it was in the lectures originally prepared for the Oratory that, at the instance of Neri, the gigantic *Church History* of Baronius had its origin. But though Neri's great characteristics were simply charity and a cheerful piety, the people, who greatly revered him, believed him to be a more than commonly endowed saint, and he was by them said to have the power of working miracles and curing possession. He no doubt wrought miracles in freeing people from the possession of evil spirits, for, as he himself said,

the idea of being possessed of evil spirits was not to be too readily received, and its best remedy is cheerfulness, as it often arises only from melancholy. These precepts he carried into practice to such an extent that, having been accused of allowing and even encouraging worldly pleasures, such as dancing, etc., among his disciples, he was suspended from his functions as confessor and preacher; he was even complained of to the pope as trying to found a new sect. The accusation, however, did not prevail, and he was soon after restored. In 1570 the nocturnal meetings of his society, held simply for devotional and charitable purposes as above spoken of, were made the ground of new accusations, yet he became but the more confirmed in his peculiar views. Some have accused him of triviality, but it is more likely that he meant his practices as a check to the sanctimonious, pharisaical gravity and decorousness which prevailed in Rome after 1560. Though pressed on several occasions to accept the office of cardinal, he steadily declined. Theiner relates that when Henry IV, of France, joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1593, the pope refused to revoke the excommunication pronounced against the prince; a total separation of the French from the Roman Church seemed unavoidable, but Baronius having occasion to confess the pope, Neri forbade his granting him the absolution unless he promised to grant it in turn to the king. This plan succeeded, and Henry IV rewarded the order by munificent donations. The Brotherhood of the Oratory was regularly organized by the pope in 1575; according to its regulation the members are all equal, and have to perform in turn all the menial duties necessary in the community. (They show yet an inscription said to have been traced by the hand of the great Church historian: "Caes. Baronius, cocus perpetuus.") All the affairs of the communities were to be decided by the majority of votes. Neri, more prudent than other founders of ascetic organizations, did not suffer the members of the Oratory to bind themselves by perpetual vows as do the monks, preferring that the spirit of charity and sacrifice should alone unite them, and for this end each member had to pay a monthly fee for the expense of the house, as the lodgings alone were free. The institution was approved by Gregory XIII in 1575, and it soon spread over Italy, France, and other countries. The congregation "De l'Oratoire" has produced many distinguished men, Baronius and Massillon among others. Study, preaching, and the education of youth are the chief occupations of its members. Being bound by no vows, any member of the Oratory can at any time withdraw with all his property. The present Oratory, Sta. Maria at Vallicella (Rome), was the residence of Neri after 1583. It has a good

library, and the oratorios continue to be performed, especially from All-saints' Day (November 3d) to Palm Sunday. Neri resigned the office of superior of the community in favor of Baronius, and died a few years afterwards, May 25, 1595. He was canonized in 1662 by Gregory XV. Some of his letters, and his *Ricordi*, or advice to youth, have been published, as well as two sonnets out of many which he composed. The regulations he left for the guidance of his order were published in 1612. Neri was an amiable, virtuous, and religious man, and his example had a great influence on the clergy of Rome. See Gallonio, *Vita beate Phil. Nerii* (Rome, 1600); *Vita Phil. Nerii* (Munich, 1610); *Vide y Hechos de S. Filipe Neri* (1613); Bacci, *Vita di S. Filippo Neri* (1622); Vasquez, *S. Filipe Neri Epitome de sua Vita* (1651); Manni, *Raggionamenti sulla vita di F. Neri* (1786); *Vie de St. Philippe de Neri* (1847); Faber, *Spirit and Genius of St. Phil. Neri* (1850); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:323-367 sq.; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* page 462. *SEE ORATORY, CONGREGATION OF THE*.

Neri'ah

(Heb. *Neriyah'*, הָיְרֵנ *Jehovah* is *my lamp*, or *lamp of Jehovah*, also [Jeremiah 36:14, 32; 43:61 in the prolonged form *Neriya'hu*, הָיְהָרֵנ Sept. Νηρίας [v.r. Νηρί in Jeremiah 43:3]; *Vulg: Nerias*, but *Neri* in Jeremiah 22:12), the son of Maaseiah, and father of Seraiah (Jeremiah 51:59) and Baruch (Jeremiah 32:12, 16; 36:4, 8, 14, 32; 43:3, 6; 45:1). He appears to be the same with NERI *SEE NERI* (q.v.) in our Lord's maternal ancestry (Luke 3:27, 28; see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, page 17). B.C. cir. 620.

Neri'as

(Νηρίας), the Graecized form (Bar. 1:1) of the name of NERIAH *SEE NERIAH* (q.v.), the father of Seraiah and Baruch (Jeremiah 45:1; 51:59).

Another Nerias or Neriah is mentioned by Josephus *(Ant.* 10:9, 6), and also by the Jewish record *Seder Olam*, as a high-priest, son of Uriah and father of Odeas or Hosaiah; but the reference is probably to AZARIAH, 15 (2 Chronicles 31:10). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

Nero

Picture for Nero 1

a Roman emperor, celebrated in the history of the world as a tyrant and a debauchee, figures in ecclesiastical annals chiefly because of the intolerant and persecuting spirit which he manifested towards the followers of Jesus in the Eternal City. His full name was *Nero Claudius Caesar Drusus Germanicus* (originally *Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus).* He was the son of Domitius Ahenobarbus and of Agrippina, daughter of Germanicus, and was born in 37 at Antium. After the marriage of his mother, in third nuptials, with her uncle, the emperor Claudius, Nero was adopted by that prince, and Nero's name changed as above given. His education was carefully looked after. He was placed under the tuition of the philosopher Seneca (q.v.), and appears to have improved his opportunities. He is said to have persevered in his studies, and to have made great progress especially in the Greek language, of which he exhibited a specimen in his sixteenth year by pleading in that tongue the rights or privileges of the Rhodians and of the inhabitants of Ilium; but he possessed little oratorical skill (Suetonius, *Nero,* c. 7; Tacitus, *Annales,* 12:58). Nero was so much trusted by Claudius that he finally married him to his daughter Octavia. When he was about seventeen years of age Nero's abandoned mother poisoned her husband, Claudius, and by means of her criminal favors succeeded in raising her son to the throne (A.D. 54), over whom she expected to exercise the most absolute control. Nero himself shortly after disposed of the rightful heir, Britannicus, by poison, and thus became sole and undisputed ruler. For the first few years his public conduct, under the control of Burrhus and Seneca, was unexceptionable; in private, however, he disgraced himself by the most odious vices, and his mother endeavored to retain her influence by shamefully complying with his inclinations. But after a time, even with all her efforts, she perceived her hold to slacken, and noticed how he disregarded her advice and refused her requests. Gradually the two became estranged from each other. Nero was accused of criminal love for AEtia, a woman of low birth, and of improper relations with Poppnea, the wife of Otho, who succeeded Nero on the throne. This maddened his mother, and she frequently abused him with the most contemptuous language; reminded him that he owed his elevation to her, and threatened that she would inform the soldiers of the manner in which Claudius had met his death. Nero was thus kept in constant dread of revolt

and assassination, and finally, in A.D. 59, he caused this detestable woman to be murdered. Now, fearing no rival in power, he gave full scope to the darkest traits of his character. The low servility into which the Roman senate had sunk at this time may be estimated from the fact that it actually issued an address congratulating the hateful matricide on the death of Agrippina. Nero himself, on the other hand, confessed that he was ever haunted by the ghost of his murdered mother. The affairs of the empire were at this time far from tranquil. In A.D. 61 an insurrection broke out in Britain under queen Boadicea, which was, however, suppressed by Suetonius Paulinus. The following year saw an unsuccessful war against the Parthians in Armenia. At home matters were not much better. The emperor was lampooned in verse; the senate and priesthood, alike venal, were also satirized by audacious malcontents; his most valued friend Burrhus died; and Seneca, disgusted with the licentiousness of the court, had quitted the capital. And the worst was yet to come. In June, A.D. 64, a terrible conflagration broke out in Rome, and for six days and seven nights the fire raged with the greatest fury; even after it was supposed extinguished it broke forth again and continued for two days longer. A vast territory experienced the results of this conflagration. Out of the fourteen districts into which the city was divided, three were totally destroyed, and in seven of the others it left only a few half-ruined houses. Not only the temples and public buildings, as well as private houses, but also monuments of all kinds, masterpieces of art, and libraries were destroyed, and a great number of lives lost. Although the emperor remained at Antium during the early part of the conflagration, and only returned to Rome when the fire approached his palace, the people generally accused him of having purposely set fire to the city, and preventing its being put out, in order to build up a finer one on its ruins. In compliance with his orders the sufferers were relieved, and such as built again were aided by the state; but this did not allay the general suspicion, as he was said to have ascended the tower of Msecenas during the fire, and there recited verses on the downfall of Troy. All the processions and sacrifices which he commanded for the purpose of appeasing the gods, as well as the vast sums he squandered among the people, did not allay the suspicion. Indeed Dion and Suetonius expressly accuse him, but these writers, it is well known, were always inclined to favorably receive any scandal. Tacitus *(Ann.* 15:38) thinks the matter doubtful, or at least all his efforts to determine Nero's part in the case failed to convince of guilt. So doubtful was Nero's character that the belief of his guilt was general at the time, and ever since the world has been

inclined to judge him the perpetrator of the crime. Church historians thus treat him. Even the liberal-minded Renan, who in his *L'Antichrist* (Paris, 1873) has furnished the latest, fullest, most spirited, and probably most accurate delineation of Nero and his time, believes this emperor to have caused the conflagration, in order to rebuild the city in greater splendor and more artistic form, and thus give renown to his reign. Says Renan: "Rome, above all things, preoccupied his [i.e., Nero's] thoughts. His project was to rebuild it from top to bottom, and to name it afresh — Neropolis. For a century past it had been one of the wonders of the world. In size it rivalled the ancient capitals of Asia, and its edifices were fine, strong, and solid. But its streets appeared mean to the taste of the day: for that taste tended more and more to vulgar and decorative construction, it aspired to broad effects such as rejoice the heart of gaping sightseers, and it condescended to a thousand tricks unknown to the ancient Greeks. At the head of the whole movement was Nero. The new Rome which he imagined was something like the Paris of our own day — one of those artificial cities, built to order, in planning which the great point aimed at is to catch the admiration of visitors from the country and of foreigners" (pages 136-143). To remove all suspicion from himself, Nero spread the report that the Romans should regard the Christians as the authors of the fire-that mysterious sect who like the Jews in the Middle Ages, were generally hit upon as the cause of all otherwise inexplicable calamities; and, as if Nero himself believed them guilty of this crime, he now inaugurated a series of persecutions which have made his name a byword for cruelty and inhumanity. *SEE NERONIAN PERSECUTIONS*. But while busy persecuting the Christians, Nero found time to carry forward his scheme for the embellishment of Rome. He rebuilt in great magnificence the burned districts, and reared for himself on the Palatine Hill a splendid palace, called, from the immense profusion of its golden ornaments, the *Aurea Domus*, or Golden House; and in order to provide for this expenditure, and for the gratification of the Roman populace by spectacles and distributions of corn, Italy and the provinces were unsparingly plundered. In A.D. 65 a powerful conspiracy was formed for the purpose of placing Piso upon the throne, but it was discovered by Nero, and the principal conspirators were put to death. Among others who suffered on this occasion were Lucan and Seneca; but the guilt of the latter is doubtful. In the same year Poppeea died, in consequence of a kick which she received from her husband while she was in an advanced state of pregnancy. On the death of Poppaea Nero wished to marry Antonia, daughter of the emperor Claudius, and his sister

by adoption, but she refused, and was in consequence put to death. He however married Statilia Messalina, having first caused her husband Vestinus to be killed. Nero also executed or banished many persons highly distinguished for integrity and virtue. His vanity led him to seek distinction as a poet, a philosopher, an actor, a musician, and a charioteer, and he received sycophantic applauses, not only in Italy, but in Greece, to which, upon invitation of the Greek cities, he made a visit in 67. But in 68 the Gallic and Spanish legions, and after them the Prsetorian Guards, rose against him to make Galba emperor, and Nero was obliged to flee from the city and conceal himself in the house of a freedman, Phaon, about four miles distant. The senate, which had hitherto been most subservient, declared him an enemy of his country, and the tyrant ended his life by suicide, June 11, 68, just as the Roman soldiers were approaching his hiding-place (Dion. Cas. 61-63; Tacit. *Ann.* 13-15; Sueton. *Nero).* Nero was a lover of arts and letters. The Apollo Belvedere is supposed by Thiersch *(Epochen der bildenden Kunst unter den Griechen,* page 312) and some other writers to have been made for this emperor. He also possessed much taste as a poet and histrionic performer. But he was, notwithstanding these accomplishments, a licentious voluptuary, and scrupled not to commit any crime that would tend to gratify his lunt or strengthen his power. Yet, as Rnan has well observed, "one cannot absolutely say that the wretch was without a heart, nor deficient in a certain sentiment of the good and the beautiful. So far from being incapable of friendship, he often showed himself a good comrade; and it was precisely this that rendered him cruel. He was determined to be loved and admired for his own sake; and was irritated against those who did not manifest towards him these feelings" (pages 126-132). The words of Suetonius, "Elatus inflatusque tantis velut successibus, negavit quenquam Principum scisse quid sibi liceret" *(Nero, §* 37), we think, sum up in most admirable conciseness the character and work of this strange ruler. It was during Nero's reign that the war commenced between the Jews and Romans which terminated subsequently in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and the overthrow of the Jewish polity. According to the *personnel* given by Renan *(L'Antechrist,* page 173), "Nero had a bad face, lowering looks, blue eyes, chestnut hair dressed in rows of curls, a terrible lip, and the air (wicked and stupid at the same time) as of a great silly doll, supremely self-satisfied, puffed up with vanity." Although repeatedly alluded to, he is not expressly named in the text of the New Testament (see <442511>Acts 25:11, etc.; <501012>Philippians 1:12, 13; 4:22); but in the subscription

(probably spurious) to the Second Epistle to Timothy he is called *Ccesar Nero (*Καῖσαρ Νέρων). Many authors refer to Nero the prophecy by John (⁴⁶³¹Revelation 13:11-18) of the beast with two horns, and interpret the 18th verse as referring to the Hebrew name of Nero, rsqe^/r2@n., which amounts numerically to 666, the number there given; since, written more nearly in Roman style, rsqewon, it amounts to 616, which Irenaeus testifies was the number found in many manuscripts in his day (see Stuart, *Apoc.* 2:457 sq.; Benary, *Zeitschrift fuir Speculative Theologie,* 1836, volume 1, part 2; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1843, page 332 sq.; 1844, page 84 sq.). *SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF*. Nero was the emperor before whom Paul was brought on his first imprisonment at Rome, A.D. 56-58; and in the persecution of the Christians by Nero in the year A.D. 64 the apostles Peter and Paul are supposed to have suffered martyrdom. All the authorities furnishing facts in Nero's life are collected by Tillemont *(Hist. des Empereurs,* volume 1). See the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* pages 95, 97; and compare also Renan's *L'Antechrist,* and the original authorities quoted there; Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire;* Diderot, *Essai sur les Regnes de Claude et de Neron;* and the Church historians quoted in the article on NERONIAN PERSECUTIONS. (J.H.W.)

Picture for Nero 2

Nerol, Tobijja, ha-Kohen

was born at Metz in 1652. After the death of his father, who had held the office of rabbi, in 1659, Nerol went to Worms, thence to Padua, where he studied medicine. He then moved to Constantinople, where he was introduced as physician to the sultan Achmet III. At the beginning of the 18th century Nerol went to Venice, thence to Palestine, and died at Jerusalem in 1729. He is the author of an encyclopaedical work entitled hYbæf hcqjmn 8se divided into three parts: the first part, which is called ^fq;µlwq , treats of metaphysics, physical sciences, astronomy, and natural philosophy; the second part, which is called vdj;µlwq , treats of geography, physiology, pathology, therapeutics, anatomy, and surgery; the third part, which is called. hYpcæh;µlwq, treats of the different diseases. This valuable work was first published at Venice in 1707, and often since. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:2829; Carmoly, *Histoire des Medecins Juifs,* 1:247-

251; *L.B.d.: Orients* (1850), c. 579; *Leipziger Acta Eruditorum* (1721), page 533; *Unschuldige Nachrichten zum Jahre* (1722), page 531. (B.P.)

Neroni, Bartolomeo

called *Maestro Riccio,* a distinguished Italian painter, who devoted himself especially to sacred art, flourished about 1573. He studied under Giovanni Antonio Razzi, whom he assisted in his works, and whose daughter he married. Lanzi says that Neroni, after the death of the four great pillars of the Sienese school, sustained its reputation and probably educated one of its restorers. His pictures unite the style of Razzi with a certain resemblance to the manner of Vasari in the distribution of his tints. He had excellent abilities in perspective, especially in representing scenery; Andreani has engraved a specimen. He was also greatly skilled in architecture, and had a pension from the magistrates of Lucca for his assistance in the public works. In Siena, at the Osservanti, is a *Crucifixion* by him, with a great number of figures; and in the church of the Derelitte a *Descent from the Cross* entirely in the style of Razzi. See Spooner, *Biographical History of the Fine Arts,* 2:614.

Neronian Persecutions

were really the first severe trials which the Christians of Rome had to endure. They occurred in A.D. 64, and were instigated by Nero (q.v.) himself. Although we possess no positive information as to the manner in which the first Christian community was established at Rome, it appears certain that it was not originally instituted by the apostles. It is more probable that the frequent intercourse of the Roman Jews with Palestine and Jerusalem led at an early time to the introduction of the new doctrines, the believers still remaining connected with the synagogues. They became gradually more numerous; and the frequent controversies which here, as in other cities, arose among the Jews, partly on their own tenets, partly concerning the person and the coming of Christ, led at last to open disturbances, and gave occasion to the emperor Claudius to publish in 41 a strict edict banishing *all* the Jews, including those who acknowledged Christ. The edict, however, did not receive a very severe execution, only the leaders, such as Aquila, whom we find mentioned in the N.T., being banished. As to the others, there was probably some alleviation made in the decree; but while allowed to remain at Rome, they were not permitted to assemble in the synagogues until a new edict, promulgated about the end of

the same year, again restored them this privilege also, and guaranteed the Jews religious liberty throughout the empire. This temporary closing of the synagogues, however, led the Christians to organize places of worship for themselves, and to form an independent community. Their number now increased so rapidly that St. Paul, who had been informed of their position by Aquila at Corinth, expressed in his Epistle to the Romans the desire to visit them, which he fulfilled three years later, when he was led as a prisoner from Cesarea to Rome, remaining there a while, and laboring for the new religion with such success that Tacitus speaks of the Christians of Rome as "an *immense* multitude." The rapid increase of the Christians made them of course unpopular at Rome. Suetonius, in his *Nero* (chap. 16), speaks of them as a "*dangerous* sect." They were mistrusted because they abstained from participation in the sacrifices and other heathen ceremonies, and were hated because they were believed secretly at work against the peace of Roman citizens. They were accused of misanthropy, and were suspected of all manner of crimes. But no open intent to persecute them manifested itself until Nero ordered ceremonies after the great fire, and the Christians failed to participate. They were now accused as the authors of the conflagration; first, probably, by friends of the court, in order to turn public animosity from Nero, who was by many believed to have favored the burning of Rome. *SEE NERO*. The emperor himself took up the public rumor, and acted upon it as a verity. "He inflicted," says Tacitus, "the most exquisite tortures on those men, who, under the vulgar appellation of Christians, were already branded with *deserved* infamy," and a vast multitude, or as Tacitus has it, "ingens multitudo," were put to death in the most shocking manner. Indeed, it appears from the detailed accounts of Tacitus that Nero's proceedings were quite different from mere capital executions according to the Roman law; for the Christian martyrs were not simply put to death, but their execution was made to gratify the bloodthirstiness of the tyrant, and to serve as an amusement to the people. Says Renan:

"Though persuaded that the conflagration was the crime of Nero, many serious Romans saw in this *coup* a means of delivering the city from an intolerable pest. Tacitus, notwithstanding some qualms of pity, was of this opinion ; and as to Sletonius, he reckons among the meritorious acts of Nero the punishment which he had inflicted on the partisans of a new and mischievous superstition. Yet these punishments were something absolutely frightful. Never before had such refinements of cruelty been

witnessed. Almost all the Christians who were arrested were of the humble class; and the usual punishment of such unfortunates, when treason or sacrilege was laid to their charge, was to be thrown to wild beasts, or to be burned alive in the amphitheater, with an addition of cruel scourgings. One of the most hideous characteristics of Roman manners was that they converted punishments into a fete, and public executions into a public entertainment. Persia, in moments of fanaticism and terror, had used frightful forms of torture; and on more than one occasion had tasted a somber kind of pleasure in inflicting them. But never before the establishment of Roman dominion had these horrors been made a public diversion, a subject for peals of laughter and applause. The amphitheatres had become the regular places of execution, and the tribunals of justice furnished materials for the sport. The roads that converged to Rome were crowded with the criminals of the whole world, to provide victims for the circus and amusement for the populace... But, this time, to the barbarity of the executioner was added a touch of derision. The victims were reserved for a fete, to which (no doubt) an expiatory character was attached. Roman annals had known few days so extraordinary. The *ludus matutinus,* usually devoted to combats of animals, saw today an unheard-of procession. The condemned persons, sewn up in skins of wild beasts, were thrust out into the arena to be torn by dogs; others were crucified; others again were clothed in tunics dipped in oil, pitch, or rosin, and then found themselves attached to stakes, and reserved to illuminate the nocturnal festivities. When dusk came on, these living torches were set on fire. Nero offered for the spectacle his magnificent gardens beyond the Tiber, on the site of the modern Borgo and in the precincts of the Church of St. Peter" (pages 163-165).

But physical suffering was not enough to satisfy the infernal malice of the heathen world against these pure and patient servants of the Crucified One. Moral tortures, mental anguish, brutal and Satanic invasions of all that a Christian holds most sacred and most inviolable, must be undergone by them ere the baptism of blood was complete, ere the infant Church could be (like her Master) " made perfect through sufferings." The pen almost refuses to write, the brain almost refuses to conceive, the atrocities which followed. The heart and conscience of the reader can do no more, even now at the distance of 1800 years, than cry to heaven, with the souls of the slain under the Apocalyptic altar, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost

thou not judge and avenge this blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Revelation 6:10).

"Women, and even virgins, were mixed up with these horrible sports; and nameless indignities were inflicted on them, as part of the festivities. It had become an established usage under Nero to force condemned persons to play in the amphitheatre mythological scenes which involved at least the death of the actor. These hideous operas, to which the application of ingenious mechanism lent an astonishing effect, were the novelties of the day. Greece would indeed have recoiled with surprise had such attempts been suggested to her, to supplement aesthetics by ferocity, to make torture minister to art! The unhappy wretch was introduced into the arena richly dressed as a god or a hero destined to death. He then represented by his sufferings some tragic scene of pagan myth, consecrated by the works of poets and sculptors. Sometimes it was Hercules, frantic and burning on Mount Oeta and madly tearing from his flesh the tunic of blazing pitch. Sometimes it was Orpheus torn in pieces by a bear Daedalus thrown from heaven and devoured by beasts, Pasiphae undergoing the attacks of the bull, or Attys put to death... Nero, no doubt, was present at these spectacles. As he was nearsighted, he used to wear a concave emerald in his eye to serve as an eye-glass for watching the combats of gladiators. He loved to make a parade of his knowledge as a connoisseur in sculpture... Worthy of a connoisseur like him must have been the plastic forms and the colors presented by a human frame palpitating under the teeth of beasts; by a poor timid maiden with chaste gestures veiling her nudity, and then tossed by a bull and torn in pieces on the pebbles of the arena! Yes, he was there, in the front rank, on the *podium,* supported by vestals and curule magistrates" (pages 157-173).

So great were the sufferings of the tormented that even the pagan historian is forced to confess that "pity arose for the guilty, though they deserved the severest punishment, since they were put to death, *not for the public good, but to gratify the cruelty of one man" (Annales,* 15:44). But even the cruelty of Nero is not generally adjudged sufficient ground for all these executions, and it is believed by some that the powerful Poppsea Sabina, proved by Josephus *(Ant.* 20:8) to have been a convert to Judaism, mainly instigated the severity of this persecution. It is thought by some that the apostle: Paul lost his life on this occasion. Wieseler *(Chronol. Synopse der vier Evangelien* [1843], page 531) places the execution of Paul in the beginning of the year 64, and the crucifixion of Peter in the Neronian

persecution, therefore some months later. Tradition places the death of both apostles in the Neronian persecution, and some witnesses, as Jerome and Gelasius, put both martyrdoms on the same day; but others, as Arator, Cedrenus, Augustine, separate them by an interval of one year or less. That Paul suffered first, before the outbreak of the persecution properly so called, seems to be indicated by the easier mode and the locality of his death; for in the persecution itself his Roman citizenship would hardly have been respected; and the scene of that persecution was not the Ostian Way, but the Vatican across the Tiber, where Nero's gardens and the circus lay (comp. Tacitus, *Ann.* 14:14; and Bunsen, *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.* 2:1, page 13 sq.). At the same time, this persecution, notwithstanding the statement of Orosinu, does not seem to have extended through all the provinces, but rather to have been restricted to Rome and the surrounding country.

Shortly after the death of Nero, July 11, 68. the belief commenced to gain adherents among the people that he was not dead. They expected him to return from the East as a great conqueror, and this induced several adventurers to assume his name and create insurrections. As for the Christians, the remembrance of that terrible persecution, their manner of interpreting the Book of Revelations, and still more the Sibvlline Oracles, led them for several centuries to believe that Nero was still living, and even that he would appear at the latter day as the Antichrist or with him. Says Schaff: "The report arose first among the heathen that Nero was not really dead, and would come forth again from his concealment; according to Tacitus *(Flist.* 2:8), ‘Sub idem tempus Achaja atque Asia falso exterrite, velut Nero adventaret, vario super exitu ejus rumore, eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque.' Among the Christians this rumor took the form that Nero would return as Antichrist, or (according to Lactantius) as the forerunner of Antichrist. That such an expectation arose, at least afterwards, in the Church, though merely as the private opinion of individuals, is plain from Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, lib. 20, cap. 19, where he says that by the 'mystery of iniquity' (2 Thessalonians 2:7) some understood Nero, and then proceeds: ' Unde nonnulli ipsum (Neronem) resurrecturum et *futurum Antichristmrn* suspicantur. Alii vero nec eum occisum putant, sed subtractum potius, ut putaretur occisus; et vivum occultari in vigore ipsius setatis, in qua fuit, quum crederetur exstinctus, donec suo tempore reveletur et restituatur in regnum. Sed multum mihi mira est haec opinantium tanta praesumptio.' Lactantius mentions a similar

opinion *(De mort. persec.* c. 2) with a reference to a passage in the Sibylline Oracles (lib. 4, page 525, ed. Ser. Gallaeus), which, however, refers not at all to Antichrist, but probably to the appearance of the pseudo-Nero in the time of Titus (comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* 1:2) as to a past fact, as Thiersch has shown *(Kritik der N.-Test. Schriften,* 1845, page 410 sq.) against Bleek. Altogether erroneous is the view of Ewald, Liucke, and others, who charge this superstition respecting Nero as the future Antichrist upon the author of the Apocalypse; taking the beast, which ' was, and is not, and yet is' (17:8, 11), to be Nero. This betrays an exceedingly low, unworthy view of this holy book" *(Hist. Apostol.* Ch. page 347). Yet very recently this "low and unworthy view" of the Apocalypse has found general favor in England, and in France also. Not only has the rationalistic Renan espoused it, but several of the British conservative reviews, in notices of *L'Antechrist,* commend Mr. Renan's researches as to the authorship and object of the Apocalypse. The *name* of the Antichrist is believed by Renan to be found in chapter 13:18, which (number of the beast) amounts to precisely 666, and signifies, if to each Hebrew letter is given its numerical value, Νέρων Καῖσαρ, or rsq ˆwrn, well known in that form by sight to all the provincials on their coin and standards and inscriptions (comp. *Edinburgh Review,* October 1874, art. 8; and see under NERO, above). See Pauly, *Real-Encyklopadie d. Klass. Alterthumnswissenschaft,* part 5, pages 576-591; Kortholt, *De persecutioni. bus ecclesice primitivce sub imperatoribus ethnicis* (Kilon. 1689); Walch, *)e Romanorum in tolerandis diversis religionibus disciplina publica* (in the *Nov. Commentt. Soc. Reg.* [Gott. 1733, volume 3]); Lehmann, *Studien* z. *Gesch. d. apost. Zeitalters* (Greifw. 1856, 4to); Masson, *Histoire critique de la Republique des lettres,* 8:74, 117; 9:172, 186; Toinard, *Ad Lactant. de Mortibus Persequutorum,* page 398 (ed. Du Fresnoy); Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs,* 1:564; Baratier, *De successione Romanor. Pontificum,* cap. 5, page 60; Mosheim, *Commentaries,* 1:97, 120; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church,* page 395; id. *Hist. of the Christian Church,* 1:162, 305; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* (1st cent. in volume 1); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:94; Leckey, *Hist. Europ. Morals,* i, 274, 326, 456; Burton, *Eccles. Hist.* pages 190, 195, 200, 203, 231, 237,242, 322; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:56 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy,* 1:5 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* January 1875, pages 127-131; *Christian Quarterly,* April 1874, pages 275-277; *Journal of Sacred Literature,* volume 26.

Nerses

is the name of three great dignitaries who have become much distinguished in the history of the Armenian Church.

1. NERSES I, THE GREAT, was a great-grandson of Gregory Photistes, the apostle of the Armenians, and was born at Vagharchabad about 310. In the year 364 he was elected bishop, and in 366, at the Council off Walarsckapat, the clergy of the country appointed him as their catholicos, or patriarch. At that time it was also decided that in future the patriarchs of Armenia should no more be consecrated by the archbishop of Caesarea, but that their own bishops should appoint and consecrate them. In his position as patriarch Nerses exhibited his great talents, especially with regard to Church discipline, his care for the poor, and other matters pertaining to his office. Twice Nerses went to Constantinople in behalf of the Armenian king Arsaces, who had revolted against the emperors Valentinian and Valens. He succeeded in appeasing the former, while the latter banished him. Theodosius the Great, Valens's successor, recalled Nerses from his banishment, and retained him a short time at Constantinople, in order to be present at the second oecumenical council in the year 381. He then returned to Armenia, where he died in 384, being poisoned by the young king, Para. His son was Sahak the Great (q.v.). See Lequien, *Oriens Christianus,* 1:1375.

2. NERSES KLAJETST, i.e., *Klajeman* (called also *Nerses IV,* catholicos of Armenia, and *Shnorhali,* i.e., “the Pleasant,” because of his oratorical talents), was born between 1098 and 1100. He was the son of an Armenian prince, who destined him for the clerical order. In connection with his brother Gregory he was at first educated by the catholicos Gregory Wkajaser, i.e.μαρτυροφίλος, and afterwards by Stephanus, the abbot of the "red monastery" (Karmir Wankh), who, when Nerses was ready to enter into holy orders, consecrated him as deacon, and shortly afterwards as priest. By the unanimous desire of the clergy, Nerses accepted in 1166 the high dignity of bishop, in which position he remained until his death in 1173. When, in 1165, he accidentally met with the son-in-law of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (q.v.), he took the opportunity to address a letter to the emperor, in which he showed that there was no real dogmatical difference between the Armenian and Greek churches, and that the Armenian Church, when speaking of *one* nature of Christ, takes the word in the sense of person; the same also can be said of the liturgical and

ritual differences in both churches. This letter gave rise to a correspondence between the two churches, which aimed at the union of both. The emperor sent the philosopher Theorianus, who held a disputation with the Armenian abbot, John Uthman, the result of which was. a mutual acknowledgment of their agreement in dogmatical as well as liturgical and ritual points. This disputation was first published by John Leunclavius (Basle, 1578), in Greek and Latin, and republished more fully by Angelo May in his *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* (Romae, 1822), volume 6. Nerses, however, died before he received the consent of all the Armenian bishops to those points which the emperor, in a letter dated December, 1172, had made the basis of the union, viz., 1, to excommunicate all those who accept *one* nature in Christ Eutyches, Dioscurus, Severus, Timothy the hunchbacked, and the like; 2, they should acknowledge two natures in Christ, as well as two wills and two energies *(*ἐνέργειαι*)*, but *one* person; 3, they should omit the words *qui crucificus es* in the Tersanctus; 4, to celebrate the Greek festivals — the annunciation of Mary, March 25; the birth of Jesus, Dec. 25; his circumcision on the 1st and his baptism on the 6th of January; his presentation in the Temple, Feb. 2; and all the festivals of the Lord, the Blessed Virgin, of John the Baptist, the holy apostles, etc.; 5, the myron should be prepared with olive-oil; 6, to use at the communion leavened bread, and wine mixed with water; 7, to allow the laity as well as the clergy, with the exception of the penitents, during divine service and communion to remain in the church; 8, to acknowledge the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh oecumenical councils; and, 9, that the catholicos should only be appointed by the Greek emperor. Nerses was a fruitful writer and a learned theologian. Of great importance for the history of the Church and doctrines are his epistles, which he wrote as bishop and catholicos with reference to theological disputes and ecclesiastical questions, and which were published' at Constantinople (1825) and Venice (1858), where also (in 1833) a Latin translation by Capelletti was published. Nerses excelled, too, as a poet, and he is said to have introduced rhyme into Armenian poetry. The Armenians regard him as their Homer. His greatest poem is *Jesus the Son,* a poetical epitome of the Old and New Testaments in 3825 verses; and the *Word of Faith,* an epitome of the four Gospels in 1502 verses. His spiritual songs are found in the hymn-books of the Armenian Church. In 1824 an edition of his poems and works was published at Venice. See Monike, in Ilgen's *Zeitschriftfur hist. Theologie,* 1:87 sq.; Lequien, *Oriens Christianus,* 1:1399; Galanus, *Conciliatio,* volume 1, chapter 19.

3. NERSES LAMBRONENSIS (originally *Sembat),* a relative of Nerses IV, and son of the duke of Lambron, was born in 1133. He was very talented, and when sixteen years old he was appointed abbot of the monastery of Skyrra, near Constantinople. When he heard of this appointment he concluded to retire into the desert. He was prevented from doing this by his mother, who took him to Hromkla, that he might be consecrated by his uncle Nerses, which the latter did, giving him at the same time his name, Nerses. Shortly afterwards he retired into the monastery on the Black Mountain, where the learned Stephanos became his teacher. Nerses's oratorical talents were soon discovered by the monks, and he was obliged to preach in the church at Lambron, which he did with such satisfaction that. although only eighteen years of age, he was offered the abbacy of the monastery of Skyrra and the bishopric of Lambron. All these honors, however, he declined, and in order to give himself entirely to his studies he went with his teacher into the desert. In the year 1176 Nerses was appointed archbishop of Tarsus and Lambron, and also abbot of the monastery of Skyrra. In the year 1179 he was delegated by the catholicos Gregory to open the synod which was to convene at Hromkla for the purpose of bringing about the union between the Armenian and Greek churches, by an acceptance of the Confession of the Council of Chalcedon (q.v.) and the doctrine of two natures. This union which was about to be consummated was, however, frustrated by the death of the emperor in 1180. In the midst of the ensuing revolts, wars, and troubles of the time, the whole matter was entirely forgotten. The hatred of the Greeks against the Armenians was again renewed, especially when the latter connected themselves with the Latin crusaders. In order to justify himself as well as his people against the Greeks, who represented them to the Latins as Eutychians (q.v.), the catholicos Gregory, in 1184, sent a delegation to pope Lucius III, who in return answered the letter by sending the insignia of the patriarchate, together with a Roman liturgy and epistle, which Nerses translated; the latter also consented to some changes which the Roman clergy had proposed, especially that the main ecclesiastical festivals should be celebrated with the other churches at one and the same time, which caused great dissatisfaction among the Oriental-Armenian clergy. Nerses died in 1192, and was buried in the monastery of Skyrra, whose abbot he was, and is commemorated in his Church on July 17. He wrote, *Explanation of the Ecclesiastical Orders and Liturgy of the Mass* (Venice. 1847): — *Address at the Opening of the Council at Hromkla* (ibid. 1784; in a Latin transl., ibid. 1812, 1838, and in a German by Neumann, Leips.

1834): — *Commentaries on different Books of the Bible*: — *Biographies of the Fathers, especially the Anchorites, Addresses, and Homilies* (Venice, 1838): — *Explanation of the Nicene Symbol* (Constant. 1736): — *A Panegyric on Nerses Klajensis* (St. Petersburg, 1782; Madras, 1810; Constant. 1826); besides translations from the Latin, Syriac, and Greek. See Lequien, *Oriens Christianus,* 1:1345. See also Herzog, *Real-Encklopadie,* 19:85 sq.; 20:210 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon,* s.v.; *Biography of the Saints,* volume 5; Neumann, *Fersuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur* (Leips. 1836), page 148; Tchamtchenang, *Hist. of Armenia* (Venice, 1783-4, 3 volumes), 3:58 sq.; Gieseler, *Church History* (Smith's transl.), 2:617; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch d. Kirchengeschichte* (Mitau, 1874), pages 190, 214; Jicher, *Allgemeines Gelehrtean-Lexikon,* s.v. Nierses; Cave, *Historia literaria scriptorum ecclesiasticorum,* page 591, 596; Malan, *Life and Times of St. Gregory the Illuminator,* with Introd. on the *Hist. of the Armenian Church,* page 35 sq.

Nerva, Marcus Cocceius

Picture for Nerva

the thirteenth Roman emperor, noted for his kindness to the early Christians, was born at Narnia, in Umbria, in A.D. 27, according to Eutropius (8:1), or in A.D. 32, according to Dion (68:4). His family originally came from Crete; but several of his ancestors rose to the highest dignities in the Roman state. His grandfather, Cocceius Nerva, who was consul in A.D. 22, was a great favorite of the emperor Tiberius, and was one of the most celebrated jurists of his age. We learn from Tacitus that he put an end to his own life *(Ann.* 6:28). Marcus Cocceius Nerva is first mentioned as a favorite of Nero, who bestowed upon him triumphal honors in A.D. 66, when he was praetor elect. The poetry of Nerva, which is noticed with praise by Pliny and Martial, appears to have recommended him to the favor of Nero. Nerva was employed in offices of trust and honor during the reigns of Vespasian and Titus, but he incurred the suspicion of Domitian, and was banished by him to Tarentum. On the assassination of Domitian, September 18, A.D. 96, Nerva succeeded to the sovereign power, chiefly through the influence of Petronius Secundus, commander of the Praetorian cohorts, and of Parthenius, the chamberlain of the palace. The mild and equable administration of Nerva is acknowledged and praised by all ancient writers. and formed a striking contrast to the sanguinary rule of his predecessor. He discouraged all informers, recalled the exiles from

banishment, relieved the people from some oppressive taxes, and granted toleration to the Christians. Many instances of his clemency and liberality are recorded by his contemporary, the younger Pliny. Nerva allowed no senator to be put to death during his reign, and practiced the greatest economy in order to relieve the wants of the poorer citizens. But his impartial administration of justice met with little favor from the Preetorian cohorts, who had been allowed by Domitian to indulge in excesses of every kind. Enraged at the loss of their benefactor and favorite, they compelled Nerva to deliver into their hands Parthenius and their own commander Petronius, both of whom they put to death. The excesses of his guards convinced Nerva that the government of the Roman empire required greater energy both of body and mind than he possessed, and he accordingly adopted Trajan, who possessed both vigor and ability to direct public affairs, as his successor, and associated him with himself in the government. By this action Nerva evinced clearly that he possessed good sense and a noble character. He died January 27, A.D. 98, after a reign of sixteen months and nine days (Dion, 68, 4). Though he had set at liberty those who had been condemned under the intolerant reign of Domitian because they had apostatized from the pagan faith and adopted the new religion, Nerva yet failed to secure to his Christian subjects any lasting benefits, since their religion was not recognised by any public act as a *religio licita,* and hence the severe persecutions under Trajan may easily be explained. Christianity having been diffused peacefully under Nerva, had spread considerably; no sooner was Trajan on the throne than the fury of its enemies, which had been held in check, broke forth with increased violence. *SEE TRAJAN*. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:163; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* page 38; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:96; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Harper's ed., Index in volume 6); Burton, *Eccles. Hist.* pages 279, 284, 298, 299; Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. d. ersten drei Jahrhunderte,* chapter 7; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emnpereurs,* volume 2; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.* vol 2:2, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Nervet, Jean

a French prelate, was born in 1442 at Evreux. He early joined the Order of St. Augustine. Louis XI, having found talent in Nervet, attached him to his person in the capacity of almoner (1474), and selected him afterwards for confessor. His virtues and his rare prudence attracted towards him many people of consideration at the court, where he remained until the accession of Charles VIII. Nervet became successively prior of Sainte-Catherine-la-

Couture of Paris, counsellor of state, abbe of Juilly, and bishop of Megara *in partibus.* He was educated at the University of Paris, and cultivated letters; he was one of the protectors of the Hellenist Cheradame. Nervet died November 2, 1525, and was buried in the cloister of Juilly. See Desfontaines, *Jugement sur les ecrits nouveaux,* 8:168; Archon, *Hist. eccles. de la chapelle des Rois de France* 2:416; Dom Tolssaint du Plessis, *Catalogue des abbes de Juilly; Gallia Christiana,* 4:787, and 8:1677.

Nescient Philosophy

SEE PHILOSOPHY.

Nesher

SEE EAGLE.

Nesmond, Francois de

SEE NESMOND, HENRI DE.

Nesmond, Henri de

a French prelate and academician, was born at Bordeaux about 1645. He descended from a family originally from Ireland, and was the son of a president in the Parliament of Bordeaux. Henri was afforded superior educational advantages, and early entered upon an ecclesiastical career. The success of his preaching caused him to be made successively abbe of Chezy (May 26, 1682) and bishop of Montauban (September 3, 1687). The differences which existed between the court of France and the holy chair delayed the papal bulls of his appointment until October 13, 1692. Intrusted with the government of a diocese in which were a large number of Protestants, he succeeded by his instructions, and still more by the mildness of his zeal and his exemplary manners, in bringing many of them into the Church. He was received as counsellor in the Parliament of Toulouse April 26, 1695, was transferred to the archbishopric of Alby August 15, 1703, and became abbe of the Mas-Garnier in 1715, and archbishop of Toulouse November 5, 1719. In this capacity he was called upon to address Louis XIV and Louis XV in the name of the province of Languedoc. The former of these princes loved to hear him and called him the finest speaker of his kingdom. Mede Nesmond succeeded Flechier in the French Academy June 30,1710. Nesmond died at Toulouse, May 27, 1727. All his wealth he left to the poor and to the hospitals. His *Discourses*

and Sermons. etc., were collected and published (Paris, 1734; 12mo). One of his cousins FRANCOIS DE NESMOND, who made him his heir, was born at Paris, Sept. 21, 1629; became bishop of Baveux August 9, 1661; and died June 16, 1715, dean of the bishops of France, in his diocese, where his memory is held in great veneration through the benefits which he has conferred. See D'Alembert, *Hist. des membres de l'Acad. Frank.* 4:347; *Gallia Christiana* volume 13;

Nessa

is the name of an intercalary month introduced by the ancient Arabians to bring the lunar, every third year, into conformity with the solar year. The use of this month was forbidden by Mohammed in the Koran.

Nesse, Christopher

an English divine, was born December 26, 1621, at North Cowes (Yorkshire), and was educated at St. John's College, University of Cambridge. He took holy orders, and obtained a benefice at Cottingham, in the vicinity of Hull, as well as the lectureship in the parish of Leeds.. Rejected by the established Church for non-conformity in 1662, he went to London, and took charge of. a dissenting congregation in Salisbury Court, Fleet Street, with which he remained connected for thirty years. He died at London, December 26, 1705. Nesse is the author of a large number of theological: and other works; but he has made himself known principally by the work entitled *History and Mystery of the Old and New Testaments, logically discussed, and theologically improved* (Lond. 1690-96, 4 volumes, fol.); to this work Matthew Henry is thought to owe much of his most valuable material for his *Exposition.* Other works of Nesse's of value are, *The Christian's Walk and Work on Earth*: — *The Christian's Crown and Glory: — Church History, from Adam*: — *Antidote against Popery*: — *A Divine Legacy*: — *A Discovery ofthe Person and Period of Antichrist* (Lond. 1679, 8vo): — *The Reigns of Times* (1681, 4to): — *Life of Pope Innocent XI.* John Dunton tells us that this book was written for him, and that the whole impression was sold in a fortnight. See Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenting Churches;* Granger, *Biog. Hist. of Enqland,* 5:78 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* 2:1408, 1409; Hook, *Eccles. Biography,* 7:400. (J.H.W.)

Nessus

the god of a river in Thrace which bore the same name.

Nest

(ˆqe*ken*, from ˆnq; *to build;* κατασκήνωσις , lit. a *tent-dwelling).* The law in <05216>Deuteronomy 22:6, 7 directs that if one falls in with a bird's-nest with eggs or young, he shall allow the dam to escape, and not take her as well as the nest. The reason Maimonides *(Moreh Nebuchim)* gives for this is, "The eggs on which the dam is sitting, or the young ones which have need of her, are not, in general, permitted to be eaten; and when the dam is allowed to escape she is not distressed by seeing her young ones carried off. It thus frequently happens that all are untouched, because that which might be taken may not be lawfully eaten." He adds, "If the law, then, be thus careful to prevent birds and beasts (for he had been alluding to the instances of this humanity of the law) from suffering pain and grief, how much more mankind!" *SEE LAW OF MOSES*.

The ingenuity with which a bird's-nest is constructed, its perfect adaptation to its intended purpose, its compactness, its hollow form, its warmth, the different materials of which it is composed, its lining, the industry and perseverance with which it is collected and put together, the art with which it is concealed-all these and other points render it impossible to look on the more elaborate specimens of birds'-nests without strong admiration. It is true there are very numerous gradations in the perfection of what we may call *art* in these structures — from the shallow cavity scratched in the ground by the partridge, to the purse of the oriole, exquisitely woven of horse-hair, and suspended from a twig, or the tiny cup of the humming-bird compactly felted of silk-cotton, and ornamented with lichens; but this endless variety is only the more admirable, because we see that each form is perfect in its kind, and answers its own purpose better than any other could have done. Various as are the materials selected by birds for the formation of their nests, they are generally chosen for one prominent quality, namely, the warmth of the young (<18918>Job 29:18).

The eagle is remarkable for the jealousy with which its domestic economy is removed far from human intrusion. Jehovah alludes to this in his contest with his servant Job (<18927>Job 39:27, 28): "Doth the eagle mount up at thy command, and make her nest on high? She dwelleth and abideth on the rock, upon the crag of the rock, and the strong place: from thence she

seeketh the prey, and her eyes behold afar off." The loftiness of the eagle's nest was proverbial, it was "among the stars" (<3010004>Obadiah 1:4); and "to make his nest as high as the eagle" was a phrase by which the prophets reproved the pride and ambition of man (<2409616>Jeremiah 49:16 ; <3502009>Habakkuk 2:9). *SEE EAGLE*.

Another bird remarkable for the inaccessible localities in which it incubates is the rock-dove. *SEE DOVE*. Clefts in lofty precipices, deep holes in beetling cliffs, and shelves in dark caverns, are chosen by this bird. The narrow passes between towering rocks that cleave the elevated region on both sides of the Dead Sea are perforated with clefts and caves, which are numerously tenanted by blue rock-doves. The prophet Jeremiah takes occasion from this derisively to exhort Moab, in the prospect of his desolation by the Chaldaean king, to imitate the rock-dove: "O ye that dwell in Moab, leave the cities, and dwell in the rock, and be like the dove that maketh her nest in the sides of the hole's mouth" (<2408828>Jeremiah 48:28). It was doubtless the resemblance in habit between the rock-dwelling inhabitants of Idumsea and the rock-dove, both of whom were probably full in view from the summit of Pisgah, that suggested the metaphor which Balaam used of the Kenite, "Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock" (<0042421>Numbers 24:21). *SEE KENITE*.

The *gallinacae* usually lay their eggs in great numbers, often in a nest carelessly made on the ground, and with very little precaution against accidents or interferences from others of the same species. Hence they frequently fail in incubation, or even desert their nest. This seems to be the point of the allusion of the prophet Jeremiah: "As the partridge sitteth on eggs, and hatcheth them not so he that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end shall be a fool" (<2401711>Jeremiah 17:11). Such a nest we may suppose to have been in the mind of the prophet Isaiah, in the self-gratulatory soliloquy which he puts into the mouth of the conquering king of Assyria: "And my hand hath found as a nest the riches of the people; and as one gathereth eggs that are left, have I gathered all the earth: and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped [piped]" (<2301014>Isaiah 10:14). A nest *on the ground,* containing *many eggs,* from which the chicks emerge *active* and *fledged,* and in which they can utter their feeble *piping,* is the figure here, and suits some gallinaceous species.

Most birds, however, resort to trees for the fabrication of their nests; and in Palestine the thick foliage of the cedars would afford peculiar advantages of shelter and concealment. The dominion exercised over the surrounding nations by the great empire of Assyria is symbolized by Ezekiel under the figure of a lofty and far-spreading cedar in Lebanon, in whose boughs all the fowls of the heaven made their nests (<26313>Ezekiel 31:3-6), and a like comparison indicated to Nebuchadnezzar his royal power (<27021>Daniel 4:21). Jeremiah apostrophizes the inhabitants of Lebanon, as "making their nests in the cedars" (<24223>Jeremiah 22:23); and in the beautiful picture of nature in Psalm 104, the cedars of Lebanon which God hath planted are brought before us as the place "where the birds make their nests;" while "as for the stork, the ir-trees are her house" (verse 17); perhaps the flat summits of old trees, a more exposed situation than in the cedar forest. *SEE STORK*.

The propensity of the swallow to affix its nest to human edifices. and of the sparrow to bring up its young in the haunts of men, is elegantly glanced at by the Psalmist, when he contrasts their familiarity with his own exile from the sanctuary (<19842>Psalm 84:2, 3). *SEE BIRD*.

Nesterfield, Ecclesiastical Council Of

(Concilium Neesterfeldense), was held about the year 703, under Bertwald, archbishop of Canterbury, in which Wilfred of York was a second time deposed; he appealed to Rome, and his case was considered in a council held there in that year. See Inett, *Orig. Anglicane,* 1:133. *SEE WILFRED OF YORK*.

Nestor, or Letopis Nesterova

the Russian Venerable Bede, the most revered name in the whole compass of his country's literature, was born in 1056. At the age of seventeen he entered the convent of Peczerich, at Kiew, where he remained until his death, about 1116. But little is known of his personal history. In the Palericon of his convent there is this beautiful testimony to his life: "Nestor labored industriously on his annals, thought of eternity, served and pleased his Creator, and died at a good old age peacefully." His *Chronicle of Russia,* which is his life-work, comes down to 1115; it has been continued by Sylvester, a monk of Kiew, afterwards bishop of Perejaslaw, and others, to 1206. There are several manuscript copies of it, and they differ somewhat from each other, so that they have become the subject of many

interesting investigations both to Russian and foreign historians. They were published by Radziwill or Konigsberg at St. Petersburg (1767, 4to), from a manuscript found at Konigsberg, and considered by the critics as the most trustworthy extant. The first critical edition, however, was published in Germany, with a German translation by Schlozer (Gott. 1802-1809, 5 volumes, 8vo), carrying the work up to the year 980; a German translation of the whole work was brought out at Leipsic in 1774, but it is faulty. The latest and best edition, entitled *Chronicon Nestoris textus, versio Latina et glossarrum* (ed. Miklosisch); was brought out at Vienna (1860 sq.). This *Chronicle* is highly prized by the Russians as the oldest annals of their history. Nestor wrote also a *Patericum Peczericum,* which is a sort of biography of some of the abbots and saints of the convent of Kiew, and very valuable as the oldest document treating of Russian ecclesiastical history. Though interspersed with many absurdities and superstitions, it was first published in 1661, and has been reproduced since in divers forms. Nestor was a very learned man in his time. He understood perfectly the Greek language, and read the Byzantine historians, from whom he translated many passages, and inserted them in his *Chronice.* His information he obtained from contemporaneous traditions (probably also from still more ancient Latopisses), and he derived great advantage from the recollections of his brother in the cloister, the monk Jan, who died in 1106, at the age of ninety-one years, and who was born consequently in 1015, i.e., one year previous to the death of grand-prince Waldimir. Much, however, of Nestor's work consists of what he was enabled to record as a contemporary and an eye-witness. Truth shines evidently in all his writings. His style is equal, and resembles the Biblical books. The persons whom he mentions are made to speak in the language of the historical books of the Old Testament. He frequently interweaves sentences taken from Holy Writ, and subjoins pious moral reflections. His illustrious editor, Schlozer, says of him: "Without this brother of the cloister, what should we ever have known about the entire history of the Upper North down to the 11th century? But this *Chronicle* is still more important in relation to the people for which it was written; who, by following the example of its author, acquired a taste for reading and writing, and never lost those arts again through all the melancholy times and centuries of actual barbarism that followed." See Karamsin, *Gesch. des russichen Reiches,* volume 8; Strahl, *Gesch. des russichen Staates,* 1:458 sq.; id. *Beitrage z. russ. Kirchengeschichte* (Halle, 1827), 1:90 sq.; *Gottinger gel. Anzeigen,* 1807, p. 263 sq.; Schlozer, *Proben russicher Annalen,* page 27 sq.; and the

biography in his edition of Nestor, 1:9 sq.; Piper, *Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie,* § 95; Stanley, *Lect. Hist. East. Church,* page 388; Otto, *Hist. of Russian Literature,* page 300 sq. (J.H.W.)

Nestorian Monastics

Picture for Nestorian Monastics

are a class of devotees among the Nestorians (q.v.), claiming to be of the Order of St. Anthony, though they do not strictly adhere to the rules of that or any other order, and are but insignificant in number. They probably were quite powerful as a monastic body at one time, for there are a large number of monasteries now extant in the Nestorian country which these devotees named and supported. Most of these monasteries are now deserted, especially those upon the River Tigris; the rest have but few inmates except that of Ormuz, which is the most considerable, and in that there are only about fifty monks. This monastery is the residence of the patriarchs, and takes its name from Hormisdas, one of the Nestorian saints.

There are some other monasteries in Persia, the most considerable of which is that near Tauris. They have about twenty double convents, that is, both for monks and nuns, who have separate habitations, though but one common church. While the monks are employed in bodily labor the nuns prepare their victuals. The religious Nestorians eat no fish, drink no wine. Their Lents are six in number; viz., the grand Lent of the universal Church; that of the Apostles, which begins fifteen days before the festival of St. Peter; that of the Assumption of Our Lady; that of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, each of fifteen days; that of Elias, or the Ninevites, which lasts eight days; and that of Christ's Nativity, which continues twenty-five days. The Nestorian monks are habited in a black gown tied with a leathern girdle. They wear, instead of a capuche. a blue turban. The nuns are habited after the same manner, excepting that they tie a kind of black veil about their heads and under their chins. They must be forty years old before they take the monastic habit. If a monk desires to quit his convent to marry, he asks leave of the pasha, and the bishop is obliged to consent to it for fear the monk might turn Mohammedan. See Brunel, *Histoire des Clerges Seculier et Regulier,* 2:44-47.

Nestorians

a sect of early Christians, so called after Nestorius (q.v.), are generally regarded as the Protestants in Eastern Christianity, they having always opposed the regard for Mary as more than woman, and having in many other respects preserved the orthodox doctrines and authorized usages of the early Church of Christ. As a sect they claim to be of earlier origin than the age of Nestorius, and date their conversion back to the preaching of the apostle Thomas, hence some of them are called *Thomas Christians* (see below). There is besides a tradition prevalent among the Nestorians which makes them of Jewish descent, and claims for their ancestry Ur of the Chaldees, and Abraham, the patriarch; hence they sometimes call themselves *Chaldceans* (see below). But though these claims may have no foundation, it is yet to be conceded that the Nestorians are probably the oldest, as they certainly are the purest, of the Oriental churches, although, as we shall presently see, they are guilty of more or less Christological heresy, and hold some absurd superstitions, and maintain, as a sect, a service which is little more than mere formalism.

I. *Doctrinal Position*. — In the article NESTORIUS is set forth the controversy which agitated the Eastern Church in the 4th and 5th centuries regarding the person and nature of Christ, arising out of the use of ambiguous *terms* — ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον, *SEE HYPOSTASIS*, and how peace was finally restored between the Syrian and Egyptian churches by the confession drawn up by Theodoret. It remains now to point out how the opposition organized in order to sustain Nestorius in his course, after deposition from the patriarchate, finally developed such strength as to prove a formidable antagonism to the Cyrillites, making necessary further action on the part of the emperor, who finally caused the expulsion of all Nestorians from the Roman empire, and by this action only gave development to Nestorianism in the East, by an independent and new sect, as is generally believed in the West, or by auxiliarizing an already existing sect of like tendency, as the Nestorians of today generally claim.

It will be seen in the article on Nestorius that, notwithstanding his deposition, his devoted and persistent adherents favored the doctrines Nestorius had taught, Including the diocesan synods and the schismatical assemblies, there were not less than nineteen or twenty meetings during the first twenty years of the controversy. Mercator gives them in order: he makes out that there were four at Rome, at Alexandria, and

Constantinople; two at Ephesus; two at least held by the Orientals; and others at Antioch, Beroea, and elsewhere. Most of these we treat under their respective titles. The second at Constantinople, held October 25, 431, was for the election of Maximin in succession to Nestorius; and the third, which was rather a consultation of bishops with the emperor, was for considering the best means of re-establishing the peace of the Church. The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) was assembled to condemn the opposite heresy. that of Eutyches. It not only did so, but incidentally confirmed the decision of the Council of Ephesus, and expressly adapted the term θεοτόκος. Two years later a council at Constantinople, among other things, comdemned a letter of Ibas of Edessa that had renounced the term θεοτόκος. Gelasius, bishop of Rome (A.D. 492-496), also synodically condemned the Nestorians. But whatever their favor or condemnation at papal Rome, so troublesome did these faithful Nestorians become to the government that the emperor saw himself obliged to second the efforts of the special Church council which he had called, to settle this great Christological question advisedly and finally by the expulsion from his dominions of all who failed to accept the Ephesian decision. It was thus that Nestorianism was transplanted to Assyria, and especially to Persia, where it has ever since maintained its ground, finding immediately upon its appearance there protection from the government such favors being prompted, probably, by political opposition to Constantinople.

This colonization of Nestorianism, however, was not begun by the emperor's illiberal policy. It had taken rise much earlier. Presbyter Ibas (q.v.), for the simple purpose of giving the Persian Christians an intelligent account of the controversy, had written a letter to Mares, bishop of Hardoshir, in Persia, shortly after the union of patriarch John of Antioch and of Cyril, in which he clearly established the merits of the controversy, condemning what was amiss in Cyril, and commending only what he believed worthy of support in Nestorius, but yet evincing greater sympathy for the latter. So much moderation did Ibas exhibit in his letter, and so earnestly did he plead for peace in the Church, that the missive was not without influence. He had besides furnished Syriac translations of the works of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodore of Mopsuestia; and thus having an opportunity to examine for themselves into the merits of the controversy, the Assyrian and Persian Christians were numerously won over to Nestorius. Further strength was given to Nestorianism, especially in Persia, by the expulsion of the teachers from Edessa, where Nestorius's

views had found willing and enthusiastic exponents. Among those whom the Persians gained over for their own Church by this intolerant policy of bishop Rabulas of Edessa we notice particularly Barsumas, who, as bishop or metropolitan of Nisibis (A.D. 435-489), contributed in no small degree to the propagation of Nestorian views in Persia and the reduction of the Cyrillites. Supported by Nerses (q.v.) the leper, also driven out of Edessa, Barsumas founded a new theological school at Nisibis. He also used his influence with the king of Persia to have him confirm the Persian Christians in their aversion to the Cyrillian *Coun*cil of Ephesus, and in their adhesion to *the* Antiochian and Nestorian theology; and he even so far controlled king Feroze that this monarch expelled those Christians who had espoused the Cyrillian views, and set Nestorians in their place, putting them in possession of the principal seat of ecclesiastical authority in Persia, the see of Seleucia, which from that time to our own day has always been filled by the patriarch of the Nestorians. Indeed, such was the zeal and success of Barsumas that the Nestorians who still remain in Chaldsea, Persia, Assyria, and the adjacent countries, consider him really their parent and founder. He certainly contributed much, not only to the upbuilding of Nestorianism in Persia, but to its spread into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and China, whence went his theological Students from the school at Nisibis. "The Nestorians," says Mosheim *(Eccles. Hist.* 1:93), "after they had obtained a fixed residence in Persia, and had located the head of their sect at Seleucia, were as successful as they were industrious in disseminating their doctrines in the countries lying without the Roman empire. It appears from unquestionable documents, still existing, that there were numerous societies in all parts of Persia, in India, in Armenia, in Arabia, in Syria, and in other countries, under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Seleucia during this (the 6th) century." Of the 7th century he says *(ibid.* 1:499), "The Christian religion was in this century diffused beyond its former bounds, both in the Eastern and Western countries. In the East, the Nestorians. with incredible industry and perseverance, labored to propagate it from Persia, Syria, and India among the barbarous and savage nations inhabiting the deserts and the remotest shores of Asia. In particular, the vast empire of China was enlightened by their zeal and industry with the light of Christianity." In A.D. 498 a Church council convened at Seleucia, and by this body the Nestorian doctrine was made the faith of the Persian Church. The dogmas then adopted amount to what follows: 1. That in the Saviour of the world there were two hypostases, or persons, of which the one was divine, or the Eternal Word, and the other human, or the man Christ Jesus;

2. That these two hypostases had only one outward appearance; 3. That the union between the Son of God and the Son of Man was formed in the moment *of* the Virgin's conception, and is never to be dissolved; 4. That this union was not of nature or person, but of will and affection; 5. That Christ was to be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in him as in a temple; 6. That Mary was to be called the mother of Christ (Χριστοτόκος), and not the mother of God (θεοτόκος). How far Nestorius himself maintained these views will never clearly appear, as his own expositions of Christology are only extant in fragments, and they even are full of contradictions; but certainly the doctrine as here laid down by the Council of Seleucia involves a denial of the unity of Christ's character. " The Nestorian Christ," says Dr. Shedd, in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, " is two persons — one divine, and one human. The important distinction between a 'nature' and a 'person' is not observed, and the consequence is that there are two separate and diverse selves in Jesus Christ. Instead of a blending of the two natures into only one self, the Nestorian scheme places two selves side by side, and allows only a moral and sympathetic union between them. The result is that the acts of each nature derive no character from the qualities of the other. There is no divine humiliation, because the humanity is confessedly the seat of humiliation, and the humanity is by itself, unblended in the unity of a common self-consciousness. And there is no exaltation of the humanity, because the divinity is confessedly the source of the exaltation, and this also is insulated and isolated for the same reason. There is God, and there is man; but there is no God-man."

II. *Ecclesiastical History*. — When the Sassanidae, by restoring the Zoroastrian mode of worship, had overthrown the empire of the Parthians, the previous good understanding came to an end, as they required theirs to be not only the predominant, but the only religion of the empire. Yet the later rulers of this dynasty appear to have cared more for politics than for religion, and the Christians, i.e., the Nestorians, were left in peace, except in times of war against the Greek emperors. Pherozes (or Feroze or Firui), as we have seen above, had been well disposed by Barsumas in favor of the Nestorians, but he had bitterly opposed the Roman Catholics, and persecuted them. Cavades, or Cobad, his successor (448-531), after he came back from the land of the Huns, whither he had fled out of prison, commenced against the Greek empire a war which lasted four years, and which led to a persecution of the Christians. (He had commanded the

community of women. This led to an insurrection of the nobility, and Cavades was thrown into prison, whence his sister managed to help him escape and flee the country. His brother, Jamapes, who was appointed in his place, recalled the obnoxious law; and as it had probably had also a demoralizing effect on the Christians, Badaeus, then patriarch of the Nestorians, with the assent of this new and more liberal ruler, held a synod to remedy the evil.) According to Barhebraeus *(Bibl. Or.* 2:409), Cavades reascended the throne with the aid of the Greeks, and sought to force the Nestorians to unite again with the Romish Church. This, however, does not appear trustworthy. About the end of Cavades's reign a schism took place among, the Nestorians, which is said to have lasted twelve years, and during this time two patriarchs, Nerses and Elisaeus, were elected by the opposing parties, each of Which in turn appointed bishops from among his followers. After Nerses had died in prison and Elisseus had been deposed, by a synod, the bishops elected Paulus, who however filled the office but a few month's, and was succeeded by Mar Aba I, or “the Great" (536-552), a Magian converted to Christianity. He translated the liturgy of the Nestorians from the Greek into Syriac; and this version continues in use at the present day among the Nestorians. Mar Aba I showed also great activity in restoring order and discipline in the Church, visiting the different dioceses, sending pasaoral addresses to distant churches, and holding in 544 a synod in which it was declared that neither patriarchs nor bishops should thenceforth be allowed to marry — a regulation which has ever since been observed in the Nestorian Church. He also confirmed the former canons, and ordered that, while adhering strictly to the Nicene Geed, the system of Theodore of Mopsuestia should form the basis of the Scripture exegesis. On account of the previously mentioned schism, when there were often two bishops appointed to the same see, Mar Aba I deposed the unworthy, dignitaries; and in cases where two equally deserving filled the office, he retained the oldest, and the other bad to return to his former condition until the office became vacant again. Patriarch Ezechiel (577-580), as soon as he entered into office, held a synod (February 577), whose principal result was the promulgation of an edict against the Messalians. As the Monophysites had made great progress in Persia under Cavades, and especially under Chosroes I (531-579), *SEE KHOSRU*, Jacob Baradseus appointed as cecumenical metropolitan, in the place of the imprisoned patriarch, a metropolitan of the East, Achudemes, whom Barhebrneus considers as the first maphrian (q.v.) of the East. Chosroes, according to popular tradition, became a Christian in the latter part of his life, and

recommended his successors to avoid war with Greece. As for himself, he seems to have been often at war with that country, and to have on those occasions persecuted the Christians. His son, Hormuzd IV, as also Chosroes II, proved more friendly to the Nestorians, especially the latter, who compelled all Christians in the empire to join them. He afterwards, however, persecuted them on account of their having elected Gregorius: as patriarch against his will; and after Gregorius's death, in 608, he forbade, their appointing another. The office remained, vacant for twenty years, until Shiruje (Siroes), the son of Chosroes II, ascended the throne. He proved favorable to the Christians of all denominations. His successors also left them in peace, being too weak and too much occupied in preserving their position and life to do otherwise.

Under the caliphs the Nestorians were seldom persecuted; on the contrary, they claim that they received several charters, the authenticity of some of which, however, is doubted. The first, they say, was obtained by patriarch Jesujab of Gadala (628-647), who saw the last Persian kings. He went himself to Mohammed, and asked him for it. It was printed by Gabriel Sionita (Paris, 1630). Indeed, Mohammed is supposed to owe his imperfect knowledge of Christianity to a Nestorian monk, Sergius; and it is therefore but natural to suppose that from him the sect received many privileges, so that it obtained great consideration among the Arabians, and exerted an influence upon their culture, and thus upon the development of philosophy and science in general. The words of the world's savant, Alexander von Humboldt, in the second volume of his *Kosmos* (Stuttg. and Tubing. 1847, page 247: sq.), on the connection of Nestorianism with the culture and physical science of the Arabians; are worthy of notehire: "It was one of the wondrous arrangements in the system of things that the Christian sect of the Nestorians; which has exerted a very important influence on the-geographical extension of knowledge, was of service even to the Arabians before the latter found their way to learned and disputatious Alexandria; that Christian Nestorianism, in fact, under the protection of the arms of Islam, was able to penetrate far, into Eastern Asia. The Arabians, in other words, gained their first acquaintance with Grecian literature through the Srians, a kindred Shemitic race; while the Syrians themselves scarcely a century and a half before, had first received the knowledge, of Grecian literature through the anthematized Nestorians. Physicians who had been educated in the institutions of the Greeks, and at the celebrated medical school founded by the Nestorian Christians at Edessa, in Mesopotamia,

were, as early as the times of Mohammed, befriended by him and by AburBekr, in Mecca." Jesujab also obtained another charter from Omar, together with complete exemption from. taxes for himself, his brothers, servants, and followers, which it is said. lasted until the beginning of the 14th century. Ali gave Maremes, a follower of Jesujab, then bishop of Nisibis, on account of his having supplied his army; with food, a recommendation for all his followers to spare the Christians. Similar securities were given to their patriarchs by Muktedir-billah, Kader-billah, and their successors, and Jesujab of Adiabene (650-660) was able to write to Simeon, metropolitan of Persia, that the Arabs were not only not opposed to Christianity, but held it in high respect, showing great regard, to the priests and people, and even supporting the churches and convents. As the Nestorians were distinguished for their learning and activity, many of them held high official positions. They were especially renowned, as we have already learned from Humboldt, as physicians and as secretaries to the. caliphs, and so tightly and favorably were these regarded that no election of patriarchs or other important ecclesiastical .veynt to a place without their being consulted. In this; manner the Nestorians acquired great preponderance, qover the other Christian sects, and the caliphs Kajirn-beamr-illah and Muktedir-billah declared officially that the patriarch Sabarjesu (surnamed Zanibhr) and Ebedjesu should have authority not only over the Nestorians, but also over the Roman Catholics, or Melchites (q.v.), and the Jacobites (q.v.). With the exception of a short persecution under Harfn-al-Raschid, we find but two during that entire period: the first, chiefly directed against the Nestorians, by Mutewekkil, was occasioned by his physician, Bochtjesu, having displeased him; the second, by Hakim-beamr-illah, was directed with great vigor against all Christians, and even against the Jews, but it of course did not extend beyond his own dominions of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. The power of the physicians and secretaries also proved injurious at length, as they went so far as to arbitrarily appoint and depose patriarchs, making the caliphs confirm their action. (Christianity, it may be stated here, had been introduced into Arabia at a very early period. Both the Nestorians and the Jacobites sought this field to propagate their own doctrines, and the former proved successful in that undertaking. Under the caliphs they spread not only in Arabia, but through Syria and Palestine, and under Mar Aba II [patriarch 742-752] a bishop had to be appointed for the Nestorians distributed throughout Egypt. This bishop was subject to the see of Damascus; in later times they had also a metropolitan of Egypt. The bishops of the different parts of Arabia were at

first subject to the metropolitans of Persia, to whose diocese belonged also the East Indies, the western shores of which, at least, were still Christian in the early part of the 7th century.)

After Bagdad had been built and become the abode of the caliphs, the patriarchs selected it also as their residence in A.D. 762. They were elected there, but ordained at Seleucia. Ananjesu II was the first patriarch elected at Bagdad. The patriarch was called *yazelich,* i.e., catholicos, and in the 13th century the yazelich had no less than twenty-five metropolitans under his supervision. Says an ecclesiastical historian: "The Nestorians had now become widely extended. They occupied, almost to the exclusion of other Christian sects, the region which forms the modern kingdom of Persia, in all parts of which they had churches. They were numerous in Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia. They had churches in Syria and in the island of Cyprus. They had churches among the mountains of Malabar in India. They had numerous churches in the vast regions of Tartary, from the Caspian Sea to Mount Imaus, and beyond, through the greater part of what is now known as Chinese Tartary, and even in China itself. The names of twenty-five metropolitan sees are on record, which of course embraced a far greater number of bishoprics, and still more numerous societies or churches." Mar Aba II resided at Wasit, and after the building of Sermeura by Mutasim, in the year 220 of the Hegira, some of the patriarchs chose it as their residence. When Hulagu Khan took Bagdad, in 1258, patriarch Machicha caused the Christians of all sects to assemble in a church, and saved them by stratagem from the hands of the Mongols. Hulagu and most of his followers were not badly disposed towards the Christians, and particularly towards the Nestorians, partly because of a common enmity against the Mohammedans, and partly because their religion, Buddhism, had borrowed so much of its form from Nestorianism, and also because a large number of their wives were at least nominal Christians, and some of their leaders too. This was especially the case in the land of the Kerait, or Krite-Tartars, where, according to divers accounts, Nestorianism had been flourishing since the 11th century, and whose rulers seem to have embraced it. Their title, Ung(h), or Bang Khan, could readily be derived from a perversion of the name John, and thus have given rise to the tradition of the presbyter or priest John, *SEE JOHN, PRESTER*, being a mighty king, which afterwards, when its fictitious character was recognised, was transferred to the (until then unknown) Christian king of Ethiopia (see Gould, *Myths of the Mid. Ages,* page 30 sq.; Mosheim,

Historia Tartarorum Eccles. [Helnst. 1741]; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* 5:84 sq.). Zenghis Khan himself took to wife a daughter of his vanquished enemy Bang Khan, Toghrul, and his son Jaghatai, according to Marco Polo, became a Christian. The family of the Bang Khan of Tenduch remained also allied to the imperial family down to the days of Marco Polo; and the chief of the Minorites, John of Monte Corvino, succeeded in inducing a prince of that country, successor of the Bang Khan, whom he calls George, together with a large number of his followers, to become reconciled with the Romish Church in 1292. This union, however, was of but short duration, as his son in 1299, with all his adherents, returned to Nestorianism. The same John of Monte Corvino (q.v.) built the first Christian church at Peking, with the assent of Kublai Khan, and baptized six thousand people, for which he was by the pope appointed *Archiepiscopus Cambaliensis.* Assemani gives the names of a number of Christian princes or rulers of the family of Zenghis Khan. Arghun Khan, who reigned after the return of the family to Mohammedanism, promised to become a Christian after taking Jerusalem. Kaigatu, son of Abaga, was a Christian, according to Haytho. Cassan was at first in favor of the Mohammedans, who had aided him in ascending the throne, and his general, Neuruz, persecuted the Christians, but he changed afterwards, and greatly favored them. Chodabende, second son of Arghun, called by the Tartars Oldshaitu, was led by his mother to become a Christian, like her, and was baptized under the name of Nicholas, but after her death he returned to Islamism, and took the name of Mohammed Ghaiath-ed-din; his son, Abu Said, surnamed Behadur Khan, was probably of the same religion, as were also his followers, under whom the empire was divided between several dynasties. It remained thus divided until Timur reunited it. After him the Turcomans ruled over Mesopotamia, Chaldea, Media, and Persia. His successors founded the Mongol empire in India and the Turkish empire in Western Asia.

The long and uninterrupted peace enjoyed by the Christians under the rule of the Arabs and Mongols had led to a great expansion of Nestorianism in Eastern Asia. Hulagu had (according to Haytho) given to Christians the command of camps and of whole states, and appointed a palace in Bagdad for the residence of patriarch Machicha. Abaga Khan confirmed this gift, but Machicha was obliged to leave the town on account of a disturbance he had himself occasioned (by causing a Christian renegade to be thrown into the Tigris), and retired to Arbela. The return of Achmed Khan,

Chodabende, and their successors to Islamism put an end to the favor of the Christians, but we find no evidence of their being really oppressed until the reign of Timur, who persecuted both Christians and Mohammedans. Communications with the distant East were now broken up, and the churches there gradually died out. Islamism, on the contrary, gained ground daily, and destroyed the Christian communities in Tartary and India. The same was subsequently done in Persia by the fanatical Shiites. and in other parts of Asia by the Mohammedan dynasties. To these causes must be added that the popes, especially since the appearance of the Mongols, who showed themselves favorable to the Christians, maintained an active correspondence with their princes, and sent missionaries who opposed the Nestorians, till, with the single exception of a few communities scattered through India, and now known as *Thomas Christians,* they were almost entirely confined to the wild mountains and the valleys of Kurdistan and to Armenia. Here, under the Turkish dominion, they remain to this day, with a separate patriarch, who from 1559 till the 17th century resided at Mosul, but has since dwelt in an almost inaccessible valley on the borders of Turkey and Persia. They are very ignorant and poor, and have been much reduced by war, persecution, disease, and want.

III. *Nestorians of the Church of Rome*. — A portion of the Nestorians, especially those in cities, united from time to time, under the ;name of *Chdldceans,* with the Roman Church, subject to a patriarch of their own. He resided first at Bagdad, and afterwards at Mosul; but a division arising among them, in 1551 the patriarchate became divided, at least for a time, and a new patriarch was consecrated by pope Innocent IX, whose successors fixed their residence in the city of Ormuz, in the mountainous parts of Persia. where they still continue, distinguished by the name of *Simeonites.*

It is difficult to determine the early relation of the Christians of Persia to the see of Rome, yet without a brief review of their early history it is not well possible to understand the progress of Romanism in the Nestorian country, and we therefore insert here as much as is essential for the purpose of affording the reader a complete history of Nestorianism. It is very likely that Christianity was introduced into Persia as early as the days of the apostles, but the whole history of the empire at that time is so uncertain that it is impossible to arrive at. any definite statements as to its progress. Under the Arsacides, who were thoroughly indifferent in

religious matters, it is likely that the Church was permitted to spread unmolested, and Barhebraeus and others only mention one persecution of short duration. Trajan, however, persecuted the Christians as far as his power extended throughout the provinces during his wars. The bishop of the chief town of Seleucia-Ctesiphonl gradually became the head of the Christian Church in Persia and the more remote Eastern countries. Yet when Papa, bishop of Seleucia, sent Simeon and Shadost as his representatives to the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), we still find a John, bishop of Persia, sent also to the same assembly as representative of the churches of Persia and the East Indies. And although Jaballaha, archbishop of Seleucia, in the synod of A.D. 420, invested the bishops of Persia with the office of metropolitans, it is only Jesujab of Adiabne (654-660), his pupil and successor Georgius (660-680), or, finally, Timotheus (778-820), who brought them into absolute subjection to the see of Seleucia. But as the frequent wars with the Romans rendered the journey difficult and sometimes impossible, it was at last neglected, and Shachlupha, who died in 182 (according to Amru in 244; see Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* 4:42), was the first who was ordained at Seleucia. They thus acquired a certain degree of independence. Papa, the successor of Shachlupha, received the title of archbishop; subsequent ones took that of patriarch, and claimed the same rank as those of the Western Church. This, Assemani states *(Bibl. Or.* 3:427; 4:80), was first done by Babeus (498-503) at a synod held in 499. He calls him the first Nestorian bishop of Seleucia, and asserts that his three predecessors-Dadjesu, Babamus, and Acacius-remained true to the Roman Catholic doctrine, and to their obedience to the see of Antioch. Yet Dadjesu already held a synod (430-465), in which it was declared that no complaints or accusations could ever be brought against the bishop of Seleucia, to whom all owed unquestioning obedience. In the Arabic *Synodicon* and *Nemocanon* it is further stated that it is not allowable to complain of him to the Western patriarchs, nor to appeal to them from his decisions: this is by Assemani considered as a later Nestorian interpolation. But Babaeus and Acacius must have been weak prelates, for it appears from the canons of the times that the morals of the clergy became very lax under their rule; and Acacius, who formerly belonged to the school of Edessa. and therefore held the Nestorian doctrines, being sent to Constantinople as Persian ambassador, joined there in anathematizing Nestorius, but after his return never acted against the Nestorians. He complained also, according to Barhebrseus (see Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* 3:383, note), that Xenajas, monophysite bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis), known by

the Greek name of Philoxenus, as the translators of the N.T. into Syriac called him, denominated him and his adherents "Nestorians," while he had no knowledge whatever of Nestorius nor of his heresy (!). This seems, then, to be the origin of the name. They called themselves "Chaldaeans," a name which now is used only for the Nestorians reconciled with the Romish Church; they claim that the appellation of Nestorians is wrong, as Nestorius never was their patriarch, and they do not even understand his language, and that, moreover, he is posterior to them. Although these early patriarchs did not venture to break openly with the see of Rome, Babaeus — originally a layman, and, as such, married who filled the see of Seleucia after a two-years' vacancy, — was the first to act towards it in a fearless manner. He held a synod in which it was declared,

1, that all that had passed between Barsumas and Acacius (who had excommunicated each other) should be forgotten, and their correspondence destroyed;

2. that the patriarch, bishops, priests, and monks should be allowed to marry one wife (not several, as had previously been sometimes the case; see Assemani, *De catholicis seu patriarchis Chaldcorum et Nestorianorumn Commentarinss* [Rome, 1775, 4to], page 18).;

3, that the patriarch of Seleucia was entitled to absolute obedience;

4, that the bishops should meet their metropolitan every two years instead of yearly, and the patriarch every four instead of every two years, to consider Church matters, and that in the month of October, the patriarch having the privilege of calling the meeting earlier. Barhebrmus says, in reference to the second canon, that Babseus commanded his successors to marry under penalty of interdict, and ordered also the bishops and presbyters to marry again after their wife's death, which is evidently an erroneous statement (see *Bibl. Or.* page 429). His successors were of the same opinions: all the episcopal sees were filled by Nestorian bishops, and they all sought to increase their party. Besides them there labored also for the same object a number of writers, and particularly the monks of numerous convents which they established in Assyria, and among whom we must notice as the most ancient and most renowned those of Nisibis. They produced not only learned theologians and efficient priests, but also distinguished physicians and philosophers; they translated the Greek classics, namely, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Galen; they were in that age of darkness the only depositaries of learning, and the teachers of the

surrounding barbarians. They had schools in many parts of the country. Besides the school at Nisibis, there was founded at about the same time, by LEacius, also from Edessa, a school at Seleucia. It was revived in 530, and was in existence as late as 605. A school was also established at Dorkina in A.D. 585. At Bagdad were two schools in 832, and two others were in its neighborhood. Schools existed besides at Terhana, Mahuza, Maraga, and Adiabene, in Assyria, and at Maraga, in Aderbijan. There were also schools in Elam, Persia, Korassan, and Arabia. The school at Nisibis had a three-years' course of study. The studies, to a great extent, were theological; but to the study of the Bible there was added in the schools generally the study of grammar, rhetoric, poetry, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, medicine, etc. (comp. Anderson, *Oriental Churches*, 1:168).

The first among the Nestorians who embraced Roman Catholicism was the metropolitan Sabaduna, who was sent by Siroes, king of Persia, as ambassador to the court of Byzantium, together with the newly elected patriarch, Jesujab of Gadala, in 628. Shortly afterwards king Heraclius took a journey to Assyria, and invited many Nestorians and Monophysites to join the Romish Church. Sahaduna, declared free by patriarch Maremes, was excommunicated by his successor Jesujab of Adiabene for having three times openly professed Nestorianism, and as often recanted again. Their second reunion with the Romish Church was merely fictitious. Pope Innocent IV had sent some bishops with an address to Rabban Ara, vicar of the East (not "patriarch," as Raynaldus has it), who was a Nestorian. Ara answered with true Oriental devotion in 1247, and recommended to the pope the archbishop of Jerusalem and his brethren in Syria, adding to it a confession of faith drawn up by the archbishop of Nisibis, and signed by two other archbishops and three bishops, in which Mary was designated as χριστοτόκος. This is also the nature of the works of the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius, and of the maphrian John. Pope Nicholas IV, in 1288, sent an address, together with a confession of faith, to patriarch Jaballaha (1281-1317), to which his successor, Benedict XI, obtained an answer in 1304, in which the Church of Rome is called the mother and teacher of all others, and the pope the head pastor of Christianity. From these expressions, and from the accompanying apparently orthodox confession of faith, Assemani concludes that Jaballaha connected himself with the Romish Church. However true this inference may have been of Jaballaha's individual opinions, they certainly exercised no influence over his followers. At the beginning of the 14th century pope John XXII made a vigorous effort for

the total suppression of the Nestorians. He sent letters to the patriarch of Jerusalem on the subject (A.D. 1326). By this time both Nestorians and Jacobites (who held the Eutychian heresy that there was but one nature in Christ) had exclusive establishments. In the pope's letter it is stated that both these sects "habentes illic distinctas ecclesias, in quibus errores et haereses hujusmodi, non sine magnis suarum et muttorum aliorum animarum periculis publice dogmatisant." The patriarch is accordingly urged to exterminate them. On the other hand, during the pontificate of Eugenius IV, in 1445, a number of Nestorians residing in the island of Cyprus, together with their metropolitan, Timothy of Tarsus, were induced by the missionary archbishop Andreas to join the Romish Church. A more enduring reunion took place in the 16th century; the Nestorians were already greatly reduced in numbers, and, with the exception of the Christians of St. Thomas in India, were all restricted again within the limits of the mountains of Kfurdistan. The patriarchate had become hereditary, the nephew succeeding the uncle in that office. At the death of patriarch Simeon in 1551, his nephew, Bar Mama, with the aid of the only remaining metropolitan, Ananjesu, assumed the office. The three remaining bishops of Arbela, Salmas, and Aderbijan (which in themselves were sufficient to elect a patriarch), assembled a number of priests, monks, etc., at Mosul, and elected John Sulaca, monk or abbot of the convent of Hormuzd, as patriarch. In order to give their patriarch an advantage over Simeon Denha Bar Mama, they sent him to Rome to be ordained. On his return he was made prisoner in Amid (Diarbekir), at the instigation of his rival, according to Assemani, and killed in prison. Another was at once appointed in his place, and matters continued thus for about one hundred years. Simeon Denha, however, sustained by those Nestorians who had remained true to their Church, did not surrender his office, but retained it until his death in 1559, when his adherents appointed another, who, as well as his successors after him, took the name of Elias. Among them was one who, at the request of pope Paul V, sent, in 1607 and 1609, orthodox confessions of faith to Rome, and in a synod held a short time before his death at Amid (in 1617) submitted to the pope's requisitions. The union which resulted was, however, disturbed again by his successors. At last, in 1684, pope Innocent XI appointed a patriarch, who resided in Amid (Diarbekir), as his successors afterwards did, and took the name of Joseph, which they have retained. Since then there is a patriarch of the Chaldmeans (Nestorians who have united with the Church of Rome) who is named Joseph, and resides at El-Kushmur, Mosul (in the convent of St. Hormisdas); while there is

another for the Nestorians, called Simeon, who claims also to be the "patriarch of the Chaldaeans." He resides in the mountains of Kurdistan, near Julamerk. The present Chaldaean community in the East-composed of converts from the Nestorians to the papacy-may be set down as not exceeding 20,000 souls, scattered from Diarbekir to the frontiers of Persia, and from the borders of Tyari to Bagdad-a district which once contained a vast Nestorian population. Many of these "Chaldaeans" sigh for a reform in their Church. The Chaldiean portion of Nestorians, i.e., the Romanized Nestorians, are governed by a patriarch and six bishops, but these have lately been pensioned by the Propaganda, the patriarch receiving a yearly salary of 20,000 piastres, or £200, and the bishops sums varying from 2000 to 8000 piastres each. Through the influence of the French embassy in 1845, Mar Zeya obtained a firman from Constantinople acknowledging him as patriarch of the Chaldaeans. This was the first recognition by the Ottoman Porte of the new community. But the patriarch soon discovered that his functions were virtually exercised by the Propaganda. He grew weary of the interference of the Latin missionaries, and resisted their demands. Various charges were brought against him in consequence, and he was summoned to Rome to answer for himself. He chose rather to resign his office, and was succeeded in 1846 by Mar Yusef. In effect, the Chaldaeans have no longer an independent existence. They are a section of the Romish Church, their connection with which, while on the one hand it has introduced among them schools and education after the European manner, has on the other infected them with deeper superstitions; and the only benefit which they have derived from a change of name and communion is the promise of political protection from France, with occasional presents of ecclesiastical vestments, pictures of saints, and rosaries — "Gifts," says Mr. Badger, "which they know not how to use, and show no disposition to learn." It is worthy of note that, notwithstanding the number of the Church rituals, and the extent of country over which they are scattered, there is a striking uniformity in all the copies now in use both among the Nestorians and "Chaldaeans," except where these latter have omitted parts of the original text, or altered it to suit their present conformity with Rome. The only way of accounting for this coincidence is afforded by the operation of that canon which made it obligatory upon all the metropolitans and bishops to appear in person or by proxy to testify of their faith and obedience before the catholicos — that is, the patriarch. Yet it appears that there is no standard confession of faith —

nothing entitled to be considered a symbol of the doctrines held by this community. *SEE CHALDAEANS*; *SEE NESTORIAN MONASTICS*.

IV. The *Christians of St. Thomas*, in East India, are a branch of the Nestorians. They are named after the apostle Thomas, who is supposed to have preached the Gospel in that country. It is probable also that during the persecution in Persia a number of Christians emigrated to India. A bishop and priest, it is said, went in 345 from Jerusalem to Malabar. Cosmas Indicopleustes (in the 6th century, about 530) speaks of a Church in Malabar. At Calliana there was a bishop ordained in Persia, and in the island of Ceylon a Church with a presbyter, deacon, etc., also ordained in Persia, but these served simply for the Persian merchants in the island, the inhabitants not being Christians. About 570 Bud, the presbyter, visited the churches of India as periodeutes (an office still existing among tle Nestorians; see Assem. *Bibl. Or.* 3:219), but Jesujab of Adiabene (patriarch, 850-860) complained in his letters to Simeon, the metropolitan of Persia, that through his fault and that of his predecessors the churches of India were in a very bad state (it was patriarch Timotheus who first gave them a metropolitan [see below]), and that Christianity had almost died out in Korassan. He commanded the readers no longer to obey their bishop, who was deposed by a synod of Seleucia, and to elect a new one to be sent to him for ordination. It is probable that Christianity spread thence into China, and a stone monument discovered there (whose authenticity there does not seem to be any reasonable ground to doubt) testifies to the success of the Nestorian Church from the time of its introduction under Jesujab of Gadala in 636-781. Salibazacha (patriarch, 714-726) appointed the first metropolitan of China. About the same time there were also metropolitans appointed to Herat and Samarcand. Nestorianism spread subsequently also into Tartary.

But to return to the Nestorians of St. Thomas. They first attained to a metropolitanate in the 8th century. The first incumbent of the office was patriarch Timotheus (A.D. 778-820), and since then their bishops also have been immediately appointed by the patriarchs. They secured from the different governments great privileges, which date chiefly from the beginning of the 9th century. This and their great increase in numbers led them to establish a state and to elect a king, after the death of which their little kingdom fell into subjection to the emperor of Cochin-China. In consequence of the quarrels of the Indian princes with each other quarrels of which the Mohammedans knew how to take advantage-they were

gradually much oppressed, and in 1502 they were induced to offer the crown to the renowned Vasco de Gama, who had landed on their shores. Their connection with the patriarch of the Nestorians appears to have soon come to an end. About 1120-1130 their spiritual chief is said to have gone to Constantinople for the purpose of being made bishop, and thence to Rome. In after-times the Indian churches were reduced to a very small number, only one deacon remaining, who held all ecclesiastical offices. On this account Georgius and Josephus were sent in 1490 to the Nestorian patriarch Simeon to ask him to give them a bishop. They were both ordained priests, and the two monks, Thomas and John, sent back with them as bishops. John remained in India, settling at Cranganor, but Thomas soon went back again. Patriarch Elias (t 1502) instituted three monks, Jaballaha as the metropolitan, Jacob and Denha as bishops, and sent them with Thomas to India. They found Mar John still alive, and stated that they discovered 30,000 Christian families, distributed in twenty provinces; later Portuguese authorities restrict the number to 16,000 families. These gradually declined, being oppressed in many ways, and were thus led to place themselves under the protection of Portugal, offering to recognise king Emmanuel as their only ruler. This led to their ruin, for they were then treated worse than ever by the native princes, and afterwards oppressed by the Portuguese. Papal emissaries — namely, Jesuits — were sent to them, who sought to subject them to the pope by violence and cunning. The archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menez (q.v.), obliged them to recognise the decisions of the synod held in 1599 at Diamper, so that but few communities, and those lost in the mountains, remained true to the faith of their forefathers (comp. Marsden, *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects,* pge 99).

Two centuries had elapsed without any particular information concerning the Nestorian Christians in the interior of India. It was doubted by many if they were still in existence, when they were visited by Dr. Claudius Buchanan in 1807. He found, in the neighborhood of Travancore the Syrian metropolitan and his clergy. They were much depressed, but they still numbered fifty-five churches. They made use of the liturgy of Antioch, in the Syrian language. They had many old and valuable copies of the Scriptures. One of these, a Syrian manuscript of high antiquity, they presented to Dr. Buchanan, by whom it was placed in the university library at Cambridge. He describes the doctrines of the Syrian Christians as few in number, but pure, and agreeing in essential points with those of the Church

of England. There were then, he computed, 200,000 Syrian Christians in the south of India, besides the Indians who speak the Malabar language, and are subject to the Church of Rome. Dr. Buchanan thus describes the appearance of Mar Dionysius the metropolitan: "He was dressed in a vestment of dark-red silk, a large golden cross hung from his neck, and his venerable beard reached below his girdle. On public occasions he wears the episcopal mitre, and a muslin robe is thrown over his under garment; and in his hand he bears the crosier, or pastoral staff. He is a man of highly respectable character in his Church; eminent for his piety, and for the attention he devotes to his sacred functions." Later visitors speak in less glowing terms of this interesting people. Their general ignorance seems to have been much greater than Dr. Buchanan was led to suppose, and they observe superstitions with which he does not appear to have been made acquainted. But in 1853 almost simultaneously with the restoration of the patriarchate of the Chaldeeans, those subject to the Romish Church threw off the yoke out of hatred towards the Jesuits. The barefooted Barnabites have, in recent times, been trying with more zeal than success to bring them again into the Romish communion. The Christians of St. Thomas are still considered to number about 70,000, forming an independent state under the protectorate of Great Britain, and governed by their priests and elders. They honor the memory of Theodore and Nestorius in their Syriac liturgy, and adhere to the Nestorian patriarchs. *SEE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS*.

Picture for Nestorians 1

Besides these Nestorians, there are yet some 200,000 Jacobites around the coasts of Malabar and Travancore. These appear to have gone there only since the 16th century, perhaps on account of the above-mentioned reaction against Romanism. The Jacobite patriarch sent Gregory of Jerusalem as metropolitan to India; the office of maphrian was afterwards held successively by Andreas, Basilius, John, and Thomas, who in 1709 and 1720 wrote to the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius. In his last letter, among other information, he states that in 1709 Gabriel of Nineveh, who was sent to him as metropolitan by patriarch Elias, and whom he received because he recognised two natures and two persons in Christ, had since been discovered by him to be a heretic (Nestorian). Anterior conversions to Jacobitism as well as the existence of anterior Jacobite communities in India appear doubtful. To this must be added that there are said to be four

Jacobite bishops in India, one of whom resides in Cochin-China. *SEE JACOBITES*.

V. We now return to the *Nestorians of Persia* and the neighboring countries. Like the Christians of St. Thomas, these too had perished from the knowledge of European Christendom, and their existence had been almost forgotten when the missionary enterprise of the American Protestant churches again brought them into notice. Attention was particularly called to them in 1830 by Messrs. Smith and Dwight, missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who, while on an exploring missionary tour, visited the Nestorians. They embodied their observations in a publication entitled *Researches*. From this source and other works of Badger (below quoted), and Dr. Andersen's *Oriental Missions*, we derive the following statements: Dividing the Turkish from the Persian empire is a wild range of mountains, now called Kfirdistan, which includes within its boundaries portions of the ancient Assyria, Media, and Armenia. In the most inaccessible parts of this district the Nestorians dwell, about 100,000 strong. They are still governed by "meliks," or kings, chosen from their own people by the popular voice irregularly expressed. The office of these chiefs is usually hereditary in the same family. The Turkish government, however, is making vigorous efforts, through the agency of the neighboring Kurds, to reduce these independent Nestorians to a state of vassalage. Dwelling in these mountainous recesses, their independence is dearly purchased; they find it difficult to obtain a bare subsistence, and many of them are miserably poor; numbers travel abroad and beg as a profession. Their fare is coarse and their manners rude. During the summer many of them descend to the plains of Orfimiah, at the foot of the Kufrdistan range. and here a considerable body of Nestorian Christians, estimated at about 40,000, have fixed their residence. They have a tradition that their ancestors came down from the mountains to live on the plain five or six hundred years ago. It is probable that they were entirely swept away from this province during the devastations of Timurlane, but there are monuments of their residence here at an earlier period. The oldest mosque in the city of Orimiah was once a Christian church. The Nestorians of the plain partake in their manners of the urbanity of the Persians, and they themselves denominate their fellow-Christians, the mountaineers, wild men. Though suffering oppression and extortion from the Mohammedans, their circumstances are tolerable for a people in bondage. The country is fertile, and the industrious among them

are surrounded with plenty. Their character is bold, generous, kind, and artless. Oppression has not broken their spirit; they are still brave and restless, and, so far as a subject people can be, independent. The Nestorians of the mountains, with all their rudeness and even ferocity, possess the same traits of kindness and generosity. The hungry man will divide his last morsel of bread with a stranger, or even with a foe. The Nestorians of the plain, as a matter of calculation, lay in liberal stores for their poor countrymen of Kurdistan, when, pinched with want, they come down in the winter to seek subsistence. In their language, as in Arabic, the missionaries found no word for *home;* and there is no need of it, for the thing itself is wanting. The house consists of one large room, and is generally occupied by several generations. In that one room all the work of the family is performed. There they eat, and there they sleep. The beds consist of three articles — a thick comfortable filled with wool or cotton beneath, a pillow, and one heavy quilt for covering. On rising they "take up their beds" and pile them on a wooden frame, and spread them down again at night. The room is lighted by an opening in the roof, which also serves for a chimney; though, of course, in a very imperfect manner, as the inside of every dwelling that has stood for any length of time bears witness. The upper part of the walls and the under surface of the roof we can hardly call it ceiling — fairly glitter, as if they had been painted black and varnished, and all articles of clothing, books, and household utensils are saturated with the smell of creosote. The floor, like the walls, is of earth, covered in part with coarse straw mats and pieces of carpeting; and the flat roof, of the same material, rests on a layer of sticks, supported by large beams; the mass above, however, often sifts through, and sometimes during a heavy rain assumes the form of a shower of mud. Bad as all this may seem, the houses are still worse in the mountain districts, such as Gawar. There they are half under ground, made of cobble stones laid up against the slanting sides of the excavation, and covered by a conical roof with a hole in the centre. They contain, besides the family, all the implements of husbandry, the cattle, and the flocks. These last occupy "the sides of the house" (1 Samuel 24:3), and stand facing the "decana," or raised place in the centre, which is devoted to the family. As wood is scarce in the mountains, and the climate severe, the animal heat of the cattle is a substitute for fuel, except as sun-baked cakes of manure are used once a day for cooking, as is the practice also on the plain. In such houses the buffaloes sometimes break loose and fight furiously, and instances are not. rare when they knock down the posts on which the roof rests, and thus bury all in one common

ruin. The influence, of such family arrangements, even in the most favored villages of the plain, on manners and morality need not be told. It is equally evident that in such circumstances personal tidiness is impossible, though few in our favored land have any idea of the extent of such untidiness. The total number of the Nestorian Christians, exclusive of the Jacobites or monophysite Syrians, and the Chaldaeans or converts to the Romish faith, was computed by the American missionaries, in 1840, at 140,000; 100,000 in the mountains, and 30,000 or 40,000 in the plain. Later travellers would make the figure a little larger, and it is now generally stated as 150,000.

Picture for Nestorians 2

The patriarch of the Nestorian Church (who is always chosen from the same family, and invariably takes the name of Shamun or Simon) resides at Diz, a village in one of the most inaccessible parts of the Kirdish mountains. In early times, as we have seen, the patriarch resided at Seleucia; after A.D. 752 at Bagdad; later he established himself at Elkush. Since the quarrel of the rival candidates and the defection of the Chaldaeans to Rome, about the close of the 16th century, the patriarch has taken refuge in the mountains. He professes only to wield spiritualpower, but among the mountaineers his word is law, both in matters spiritual and temporal. Among the Nestorians of Orimiah his power is more limited; he seldom ventures to come among them; and being thus beyond the reach of the full exercise of his authority, the people have become lax in their regard for his spiritual prerogatives; still they look up to him with respect and veneration. The patriarch does not receive the imposition of hands at his consecration, since it cannot be performed by his inferiors; but all orders of the clergy, from the deacon to the metropolitan, are ordained by him with the imposition of hands. Under the Nestorian patriarch are eighteen bishops, four of whom reside in the province of Orfimiah. A diocese varies in size from a single village to twenty or thirty. The bishops ordain the inferior clergy, make annual visitations, and superintend the diocese. Besides deacons and priests, there are archdeacons, subdeacons, and readers. The office of metran, or metropolitan, is distinct from that of the patriarch, although, it is true, they are often united in the same person. The canons of the Nestorian Church require celibacy, but only of the episcopal orders. They also demand from these higher ecclesiastical orders abstinence from animal food, even from their infancy. The mother of the candidate for the episcopate or patriarchate must observe the same abstinence while she nurses the infant. The Nestorian bishops do not

defend these practices from Scripture, but only as matters of propriety (this restriction, however, is not always observed, and was violated only recently by bishop Mar Yohann in 1859). Neither celibacy nor abstinence from animal food are required of the inferior clergy, nor do monasteries or convents exist among the Nestorians proper. The clergy are usually poor. They cultivate the ground, or teach a few scholars, or gain a small pittance by marriage fees and small contributions. It can be no matter of surprise that some of them can scarcely read. When visited by the American missionaries in 1833, a majority of them could merely chant their devotions in the ancient Syriac, and even some of the bishops were in the same predicament. The Syriac Bible has since been distributed freely among them, and the state of general knowledge is improved. The patriarch receives an annual contribution, collected for him by the bishops; it seldom exceeds three hundred dollars. The Romish agents leave no measures untried, of force or fraud, to seduce the Nestorian Church and even its patriarchs. A few years ago a Jesuit offered to the Nestorian patriarch ten thousand dollars, it is said, on condition that he would acknowledge the papal supremacy. He made answer in the words that Simon Peter once addressed to Simon Magus, "Thy money perish with thee." A more adroit overture was made afterwards, though with as little success, in the offer to canonize Nestorius.

Picture for Nestorians 3

Religion, in the proper sense, is in a low condition. The vice of lying is almost universal among clergy and laity; intemperance is very prevalent. The Sunday is to a great extent regarded only as a holiday, and profaneness and some other vices are very common. Still a venerable remnant exists of a primitive Church, founded, as they invariably maintain, not by Nestorius, but in apostolic times by Thomas the Apostle (q.v.). It is beset with dangers on every side. The artifices of the Jesuits are unceasing and sometimes successful. Recently a patriarch was brought over by violence to the Church of Rome. On the other hand, the Mohammedans attempt to proselyte. Nestorian girls are occasionally kidnapped or decoyed away, and become the wives of the followers of the false prophet. Some hardened culprits apostatize for the sake of escaping punishment, but these are all the triumphs of which the Mohammedans can boast.

Picture for Nestorians 4

The sword of the Moslem has not spared the Nestorians. They are grievously oppressed and ground down with taxes and impositions. The Nestorians are marked out alike by religion and nationality as victims of oppression. However great their wrongs, they can hope for little redress, for a distant court shares in the plunder taken from them, and believes its own officials rather than the despised ravahs whom they oppress. Even when foreign intervention procures some edict in their favor, these same officials, in distant Orumiah, are at no loss to evade its demands. The Nestorian is not allowed a place in the bazaar; he cannot engage in commerce. And in the mechanic arts he cannot aspire higher than the position of a mason or carpenter, which, of course, is not to be compared to the standing of the same trades among us. When our missionaries went to Oruimiah a decent garment on a Nestorian was safe only as it had an outer covering of rags to hide it. The lofty spirit of the mountaineers in 1843 ventured to rebel, and an indiscriminate massacre was the penalty. "What can we do?" said they to the European visitors who inquired the cause of their rebellion; "if we descend into the plains, build villages, plant vineyards, and till the barren soil, we are so overwhelmed with taxations and impositions of every kind that our labor, though blessed of God, is of no profit to ourselves. If we take refuge in the mountains, even here we are liable every year to be hunted like partridges. Such is our lot; but God is merciful." Mr. Badger, who visited the Kurds, on behalf of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, relates that as he passed through Marden, a village on one of the summits of the mountain range, in 1843, he saw in the market-place several human heads rolling in the dust which had been brought in as trophies by the soldiers of Mohammed Pasha. "The next day," he says, "I saw a large number of horses, asses, mules, and even cows, laden with booty taken from the same people, the Kurds of a neighboring district. Among these there were loads of human heads, and a number of prisoners, some of whom were to be impaled on the morrow. The collector of taxes in the district had embezzled a sum of money, and the Kurds were ordered to make good the deficiency. As they were unable or unwilling to comply, a troop of Albanians was sent against them, who plundered the refractory villages, massacred about a hundred and fifty persons, and committed other excesses too horrible to relate. Such is Ottoman rule."

The creed and practice of the Nestorians are more simple and more scriptural than those of the Greek or any other Oriental Church. They entertain the deepest abhorrence of image worship, auricular confession, and purgatory. Their doctrinal tenets lie under suspicion; yet the American missionaries do not hesitate to vouch for their correctness. Mr. Perkins was sent out by the American Board of Foreign Missions, and lived among them six years, laboring with considerable success. "On the momentous subject of the divinity of Christ," he says, "in relation to which the charge of heresy is so violently thrown upon them by the papal and other Oriental sects, their belief is orthodox and scriptural." Mr. Badger also judges favorably of their orthodoxy. He thinks that, although in error with respect to the language in which they express their belief with regard to the second person in the Trinity, the Nestorians hold, nevertheless, in effect the true Catholic doctrine as it is revealed in Holy Scripture, and as it was set forth by the Council of Epliesus.

Several writers have lately made English translations of the Nestorian rituals. These are so overlaid with Oriental figure and sentiment that to ascertain their exact meaning on the points at issue is, however, by no means an easy task. We make a single extract from a service for the Holy Nativity: "Blessed art thou, O Virgin, daughter of David. Since in thee all the promises made to the righteous have been fulfilled, and in the race of prophecy has found rest; for after a wonderful manner thou didst conceive as a virgin without marriage, and in a wonderful way thou didst bring forth the Messiah, the Son of God; as it is written, the Holy Spirit formed him in thee, and the Word dwelt in him by union, without conversion or confusion, the natures continuing to subsist unchanged, and the persons also, by their essential attributes, the divinity and humanity subsisting in one parsopa of filiation. For the Lord is one, the power is one, the denomination ruling over all is one, and he is the ruler and disposer of all by the mysterious power of his divinity, whom we ought ever to thank and worship, saying, Blessed is the righteous One who clothed himself with Adam's [humanity], and made him Lord in heaven and earth" (Badger, 2:34). But though the ritual does not clearly develop the Christological dogmas, it is certain that the Nestorian Church is the only body outside of Protestantism (excepting the Moravians and Waldensians) which acknowledges, as do the churches which appeared at the Reformation, or came out of these, the *supreme* authority of the Holy Scriptures, and holds no doctrine or practice essential to salvation which may not be proved

from Holy Writ. Indeed, the reverence in which the Nestorians hold the inspired volume has made them the fortunate possessors of some of the most ancient and valuable MSS. in existence. Their ancient language was the Syriac, of which the modern vernacular is a dialect, corrupted by contractions and inversions and a great number of Persian and Turkish words. Among their books are some very ancient copies of the Scriptures in Syriac. Several of these are at least six hundred years old. They also possess a copy of the N.T. which purports to be fifteen hundred years old. These copies are regarded by them with much veneration, and are used with great care; they are wrapped in several covers, and when taken into the hands are as reverently kissed as the Jews do their MSS. of the O.T. used for synagogal service. It must not be supposed, however, that they are the possessors of very large numbers of MSS. Dr. Grant found in the library of the patriarch not more than sixty volumes, all in manuscript, and a part of these were duplicates. Indeed, they have no works of value, except on devotional subjects. Once an educated people, the Nestorians are now perfectly illiterate. Very little attempt has been made to reduce the vernacular language to writing, and the printing-press was unknown to them until the advent of the American missionaries. The only books they possess are the Church rituals; to be able to read these, and to write fairly, is considered a high education, and is all that is desired, even from candidates for holy orders. Except the priests, few or none can read; and even of these but few can do more than merely repeat their devotions in an unknown tongue, while neither they nor their hearers know anything of the meaning. The N.T. is read in the old Syriac; but this differs considerably from the dialect in common use, and it is read withal in such a manner as to be almost unintelligible. The laity are regular in attendance at church, where they hear a liturgy of great beauty, partly chanted and partly mumbled. Certain prayers are familiar to all ranks, and persons devoutly disposed are often seen retiring to a corner of the church to pray in secret. There is no sermon to arouse reflection or to sustain faith, by impressing the conscience and the understanding; no lecture to expound the difficulties of Scripture. Thus the main body of the Nestorians are only nominal Christians, and such they must probably remain until more favored nations come to their relief. True, their religious principles are more simple and scriptural than those of other Oriental churches, and they are not guilty of so many corrupt practices as the Papal and Greek churches. But the life and power of Christianity are departed in a large measure, and scarcely a symptom of spiritual vitality was apparent when the American missionaries

first met them. The existence of such a people for seventeen hundred years, among hostile nations and circumstances so disastrous, is a matter of astonishment; and their own preservation, too, of so much of the pure doctrine of the Gospel as they still retain is remarkable. Their liturgical books recognise seven sacraments, but confession is infrequent, if not altogether disused. Marriage is dissoluble by the sentence of the patriarch; communion is administered in both kinds; and although the language of the liturgy plainly implies the belief of transubstantiation, yet it is said not to be popularly held among them. The fasts are strict, and of very long duration, amounting to very nearly one half the entire year. They pray for the dead, but are said to reject the notion of purgatory. Monasteries and convents do not exist among this branch of the Nestorians. "They have no relics such as are common in the Church of Rome," says Mr. Badger *(Nestorians and their Ritual,* 2:136), yet "they believe the remains of the martyrs and saints to be endowed with supernatural virtues;" and they invoke the Virgin and the saints, asking for their prayers to Christ. They have no pictures or images in their churches, and are much opposed to the use of them. The only symbol among them is a plain Greek cross, which they venerate highly. The sign of the cross is used in baptism and in prayer; a cross is engraved over the low entrances of their churches, and kissed by those who enter. and the priests carry with them a small silver cross, which is often kissed by the people. They are very scrupulous respecting their religious ceremonies and fasts. Many Nestorians would rather die than violate their periodical fasts, yet are they very far from Protestant in their ideas respecting their daily life; even their most intelligent ecclesiastics seem to have hardly any idea of the meaning of regeneration. Indeed, the Nestorians, take them as a whole class, are ignorant and superstitious; lying, profanity, and intemperance are common vices.

VI. *Missions among the Nestorians.* — Probably no Christian mission in modern times has been so satisfactorily conducted, or so decidedly happy in its influences and results, as that among the Nestorians, in all its branches. British and American missionaries have labored among the Nestorians since the year 1833. The missionaries sent forth by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions were the first of Protestant missionaries to occupy the field, and it is generally conceded that their labors have met thus far with a success beyond the most sanguine expectations, proving clearly that these efforts for the evangelization of the Nestorians are owned and blessed by the great Head of the Church. The

first missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was Mr. Justin Perkins, who was taken from Amherst College, where he was teaching at the time of this appointment. In the instructions given to him the main object of the mission was defined to be to bring about a change which would "enable the Nestorian Church. through the grace of God, to exert a commanding influence in the spiritual regeneration of Asia." Considering the past history of Nestorianism, its present state, and the character of the people attached to it, it was hoped that, brought again to a fuller knowledge of the truth, and to feel the regenerating and sanctifying power of truth attended by the influences of the Spirit, the members of that belief would again become, not only themselves true disciples of Christ and heirs of life, but efficient laborers in the great work of building up Christ's kingdom throughout the world. Mrs. Perkins joined in the work, and together they studied the language and customs of the people whom they were to serve until, in 1835, Dr. Grant, a physician, of Utica, N.Y., joined them. Dr. Grant's professional character served to secure the favor of the Persian governor, and the Nestorian bishops and priests at once gave them their cordial cooperation in the prosecution of their missionary labors, regarding them not as rivals, but as coadjutors with them in a necessary work of instruction and improvement among the people. The first thing which these excellent men attempted, after having obtained a mastery of the language, ancient and modern, was to commence the establishment of schools. One, for boys, was opened in 1836; it began in a cellar, with seven pupils. A school for girls was opened in 1838. It commenced with four scholars, taught by Mrs. Dr. Grant. As the result of her exertions, it is said that "hers was the privilege of creating such a public sentiment in favor of the education of woman that her successors have found the gates wide open before them, and often wondered at the extent and permanence of the influence she acquired." In 1843 the first female boarding-school was started by advice of Miss Fidelia Fiske, who, after graduatiun at Mount Holyoake, joined this mission in 1843. In this school, which was established at Orumiah, nearly two hundred women have been educated, of whom about one half were hopefully pious. Many of the young women after leaving the seminary have married young men who had been educated in the male seminary. For some years there have been some seventy schools, with about twelve to thirteen hundred pupils of both sexes in annual attendance. It is estimated that about six thousand persons have learned to read, most if not all of whom possess and read the sacred Scriptures. A high school at Orimiah (which is the principal seat of the

American mission), opened and presided over by the late excellent professor Stoddard for several years, has been blessed in an extraordinary manner. Of the many young men who may be considered as graduates, more than two hundred and thirteen left the seminary hopefully pious. Of the many others who did not complete a full course of studies not a few left it giving good evidence of piety; and, better than all, many of the young men who left the seminary are now faithful preachers of the Gospel, efficient teachers in the village schools, or otherwise useful Christians.

In 1840 the first printing-press was set up in Orumiah by the ingenious and efficient missionary printer, Mr. Breath, who died in 1861. The Nestorials, who formerly had no printed copies of the sacred Scriptures, or any part of them, now have the Bible in both the ancient and vernacular languages, printed in parallel columns. Through the exertions of the missionaries they now have also quite a literature, embracing many volumes of religious books and tracts, together with spelling-books, geographies, arithmetics, etc. A monthly periodical, called *The Rays of Light*, is published, and read with much delight by the people; and there are now publishing two smaller periodicals, entitled *Night of Toil* and *Signet Ring.* In all, eleven thousand volumes have been printed at the mission press. Native printers and bookbinders have been so well trained that since the death of Mr. Breath they have progressed without American help in this direction. The missionaries have, from the first, labored much in the good work of imparting the Gospel by oral instruction in Orumiah, and in the villages far and wide. Until 1868 all plans for the forming of separate churches were opposed; the missionaries therefore formed no churches, wisely preferring to promote the regeneration of the national churches — a good work and noble in purpose; but finding by experience that the old Church, as such, could not be reformed, or, as Dr. Anderson has it, "that the dead Church could not be galvanized into spiritual life" (2:312), it was at last determined that all who sought the higher life, and found it not in the national Church, should form reunions on the apostolic basis. There are now of such societies seventeen, with seventy-three congregations, and seven hundred and sixty-seven members. The attempt at separation from the national Church has resulted in the formation of a High-Church party, supported by Anglican High-Churchmen. The Church of England has, however, refused to send missionaries into this field, and the only injury done by this movement to the American mission work is the delay which it has caused in bringing the independent societies into self-supporting condition. There

are no doubt many others who are truly pious, though they receive the sacraments in the national churches. Indeed, the missionaries preach much in the national churches, and enjoy the confidence of the patriarch and of many priests. It can certainly be asserted that the Gospel is now preached among the Nestorian people not by the missionaries only. When the mission was commenced the ecclesiastics were not preachers, and their public religious services were not preaching services. But bishops and priests have been pupils in the schools, and bishops and priests have felt the force of truth have become new creatures in Christ Jesus, and are now, in some cases, zealous and impressive preachers. And some young men who have been educated at the seminary, and have become apparently devoted Christians. have been ordained by the bishops of their Church, and are thus fully introduced into the work of the ministry. The patriarch has at times opposed, and some of the bishops, in 1867, prohibited the pious helpers of the mission from preaching in their dioceses; but, to a great extent, the whole field is and has been open to them, and among them are some who make extensive tours, not only on the plain, but in the mountain districts, as zealous and able evangelists. Take it all in all, the influence of the mission upon the condition and morals of the people has been most salutary. They have readily imbibed the spirit of Christian civilization, and faithfully observed all the precepts of the Gospel. The influence of spiritual religion upon the pupils, and their friends is manifest in all their daily walks in life, and their example is making a deep impression on those who have not yet been made objects of religious instruction. The schools that have been organized in the villages now help to support themselves; the mission having made it a rule to furnish no teacher, except in new villages, where a part of the support was not assumed by the people. In the year 1861 upwards of five hundred dollars were contributed for the support of missions, and since then the sum has considerably increased. The missionary zeal is growing constantly, and the Nestorians are anxious to become the bearers of the truth to other Asiatic peoples. At the annual convention of helpers and representatives of the Nestorian churches held in October 1867, a demand was made for special mission fields; and in 1870 the mission resolved that they considered it a duty urged upon them to embrace at once within their efforts the Armenians and the Mussulman sects of Central Persia; and they expressed the hope that the Board would heartily endorse their action, and help them to carry it out without delay. The Board approving such a step, the Nestorians have since labored among the Armenians in Russia, and the same people at Tabriz, Hamadan (the

ancient Ecbatana), Teheran, Ispahan, in Persia, and the numerous villages in the intervening regions — descendants, to a great extent, of Armenians carried captive, in 1605, from the regions of Ararat by shah Abbas the Great.

Since the autumn of 1870 the Nestorian mission has passed from the control of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the care of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and it is expected that the work so gloriously begun will be prosecuted by that body with equal zeal and success. This mission, being on the western borders of Persia and the eastern borders of Turkey, in the very heart of the Mohammedan world, and on the dividing line of its two great sects, the *Sunies* and *Shiites*, certainly occupies a position of transcendant importance. We insert below a table from Dr. Anderson's work on *Oriental Missions* (2:498-9), showing the laborers employed, etc.

Picture for Nestorians 5

VII. *Probable Origin of the Nestorian People*. — We have seen above that the Nestorians claim to have been early instructed in Christian truths. Dr. Grant, a learned American missionary, has recently put forth an argument to show that the Nestorians are the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. He cites as proof of his theory their Jewish physiognomy, the frequency of those proper names which occur in the Old Testament, the peculiarities of their customs, and other points of resemblance. His proofs are not regarded as satisfactory by his co-missionaries, nor by Mr. Badger, who contests his facts. It is a question, however, of detail and research, and we can only here make mention that such a theory of their origin is espoused, and refer to Dr. Grant's and Mr, Badger's writings. One service of the Nestorian Church certainly partakes much more of a Jewish than a Christian character: this is a commemoration for the dead celebrated in all the mountain villages once a year, on some Saturday in the month of October. For some days previous to the festival each family prepares its offerings. These consist of lambs and bread, which are carried into the church-yard. After the people have partaken of the holy eucharist, the priest goes out, cuts several locks of wool off the fleeces, and throws them into a censer. While a deacon swings this to and fro in the presence of the guests the priest recites an anthem, in which the oblation is offered to the Lord, and prayers are made both for the living and the dead. The service concluded, the lambs and the bread are divided among the company. Many

come from distant villages to join in the commemoration. Those who can afford it kill a lamb and distribute bread and other provisions among the poor, after the death of their relations, hoping that the offerings will, in some way, profit the souls of the departed. Dr. Grant mentions another sacrifice which is offered occasionally as a thank-offering for blessings received. A lamb is slain before the door of the church, when a little of the blood is put on the door and lintel; the right shoulder and breast belong to the officiating priest, and the skin is also given to the priest as was required in the law of burnt offerings (Leviticus 7); but these strange customs may have been derived from the Mohammedans, who often sacrifice a lamb with the same intention at the doors of their shrines throughout Turkey, and sprinkle the building with the blood, after which the animal is distributed among the people of the village. As might be expected in a people so ignorant, the Nestorians are superstitious. They observe many fasts. Their ritual contains offices for the purification of those who have touched the corpse of an unbeliever, and a service for the purification of unclean cisterns and fountains, some parts of which are extremely beautiful. The Nestorians place a high value on charms and talismans, and the clergy are generally the authors of these profane and absurd effusions which they transcribe and sell to the people.

VIII. *Literature.* — The works extant on the history of Nestorianism are very numerous. In Malcom's *Theological Index* is a long list of such works; the most important are, Doucin, *Histoire du Nestorianisme* (1689) Franzius (Northolti), *Dissertationes;* Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus;* Schroder, *Liberati Historia controversice Nestoriance.* In the foregoing account, besides the usual materials, the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, who was archdeacon of Carthage, written cir. A.D. 564, and the works of Marius Miercator, already referred to under Nestorius (q.v.), have been largely relied upon. On the Nestorian side appear the sermons of Eutherius; and Assemani, *De Syris Nestorianis,* in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (Rom. 1719-1728 sq.), tom. 3, part 2 (quoted by Dr. Hey, book 4, art. 2, § 9), gives a catalogue of 198 writers, with more in an appendix, who are called Syrian Nestorian writers: "but the New Testament is one book so reckoned, and Clemens Romanus one author." See also Ebedjesu (Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis, t 1318), *Liber Mararitae de veritateo fidei* (a defence of the Nestorians), in Man's *Script. vet. nova. collect.* part 10, 2, 317; Gibbon, *Decline aund Fall of the Roman Empire,* chapter 47, near the end; Hohlenberg, *De originibus et fatis ecclesiae Christianae in India orientali*

(Havnie, 1822, 8vo); Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrines,* 1:20, 241, 275; 2:35, 117, 344, 361; Hardwick, *Hist. Mid. Ages* (see Index); Lea, *Hist. Sacerdotal Celibacy,* page 97 sq.; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens,* 1:190-192; 2:119, 139, 166, 289, 320; Bruns, *Neues Repertorium f.d. theol. Literatur u. kirchliche Statistik;* Ritter, *Erdkunde;* Justin Perkins, *A Residence of Eight Years in Persia* (Andover, 1843, 8vo); Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Mesopotania,* etc.; Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains;* Perkins, *Eight Years spent among the Nestorian Christians* (New York, 1843); Buchanan, *Christian Researches in the East;* Smith and Dwight, *Researches in Armenia, with a Visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christiins of Orumiah and Salnas* (Bost. 1833, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Woman and her Saviour in Persia* (Bost. 1863); Etheridge, *Rituals of the Syrian Churches;* Grant, *The Nestorians* (1841); Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals* (Lond. 1852, 2 volumes); Wiltsch, *Kirchliche Geographie u. Statistik,* 1:214 sq.; Wiggers, *Kirchliche Statistik,* volume 1, part 2, § 73 sq.; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions,* page 553 sq.; Anderson, *Hist. of the Missions of the A.B.C.F.M. in the Oriental Churches,* volumes 1 and 2; Grundemann, *MissionsAtlas,* part 2, No. 3; *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine,* July and August 1852; *North British Review,* volume 11; 38:247; *Ch. Remembrancer,* 1862, page 65; *Princeton Rev.* 1842, page 59; Kitto, *Jour. Sac. Lit.* January 1853, page 513; *Meth. Quarn. Rev.* July 1854, page 462; 1843, page 479; 1841, page 483.

Nestorius

a celebrated theologian of the 5th century, noted as the founder of the Nestorians (q.v.)an important and early sect of Christians was born, according to the ecclesiastical historian Socrates, who has written his life, at Germanicia, a city in Northern Syria, near the opening of the 5th century. He received his theological education, it is supposed, under the Monophysite Theodore of Mopsuestia. Nestorius was ordained to the priesthood at Antioch, where he was made a presbyter, and where he was "esteemed and celebrated," says Neander, "on account of the rigid austerity of his life and the impressive fervor of his preaching." The popularity of his pulpit gifts attracted to him large and attentive audiences, and he became a great favorite with the people generally. The Church — which was then greatly divided on the doctrine of the motherhood of Mary, some holding her to be the mother of God, others regarding her simply in the modern evangelical light — looked upon Nestorius as the man eminently fit by his sound, practical judgment and his vast theological learning for a clearing

process in this mystifying dogma; and so general was the opinion that Nestorius could unite all Christian believers of the East that the people hailed with great satisfaction and joy his elevation (A.D. 428) to the patriarchate of Constantinople, which had been sought for by more prominent ecclesiastics, whom the emperor had passed by because of their rivalry. In Constantinople Nestorius was looked to as a second Chrysostom, and a restorer of the honor of his great predecessor against the detraction of his Alexandrian rival. But no sooner was Nestorius promoted to this elevated and responsible position than he began to display an intemperate neal, which partook more of the bigotry of the monk than the general tolerant spirit which was becoming his character and, positions as a minister of Christ. His very first efforts when once seated in the patriarchal chair were directed towards the extirpation of heretics, including Arians and; Novatians, Quartodecimani and Macedonians, who at that time abounded in the capital of the East and its subordinate dioceses. Indeed Nestorius's course had been foreshadowed in his inaugural. discourse, in which, addressing the emperor Theodosius II, or the Younger, he gave utterance to these violent expressions: "Give me a country purged of all these heretics, and in exchange for it I will give you heaven. Help me to subdue the heretics, and I will help you to conquer the Persians." Nor did his fury against the heretics find vent only in words; he proceeded to deeds of persecution which, by exciting tumults among the people, led to the effusion of blood. The Pelagians alone, with whose. doctrine of free-will (but not of original sin) he sympathized, he treated indulgently, receiving to himself Julian of Eclanum, Coelestius, and other banished leaders of that party, interceding for them in 429 with the emperor and with the pope Celestine, though, on account of the very unfavorable reports concerning Pelagianism which were spread by the layman Marius Mercator, then living in Constantinople, his intercessions were of no avail (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:716). While thus busily engaged in the persecution of others, Nestorius raised up even among the orthodox party in the Church a numerous host of enemies, who were not long in accusing him also of heresy. Having been trained in the strict Antiochian doctrine as to the clear distinction between the divine and human natures of Christ, he and his friend Anastasius, whom he had brought with him from Antioch, could not fail to disapprove of some expressions then current in the Church, which evidently proceeded upon confused notions in respect to the two natures of Christ. One expression in particular, the title θεοτόκος, or Mother of God, applied to the Virgin

Mary, more especially taken in connection with the excessive veneration of the Virgin which had begun to prevail, called forth the strongest reprobation on the part of Nestorius. Along with his friend Anastasius he took occasion in his public discourses to state, in the most emphatic manner, his objections to the certainly very bold and equivocal expression *mother of God,* which had already been sometimes applied to the Virgin Mary by Origen, Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, and others, and which, after the Arian controversy, and with the growth of the worship of Mary, had passed into the devotional language of the people (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:716, also 582,583). The sense, or monstrous nonsense, of this term of course was not that the creature bore the Creator, or that the eternal Deity took its beginning from Mary, which would be the most absurd and the most wicked of all heresies, and a shocking blasphemy; but the expression was intended only to denote the indissoluble union of the divine and human natures in Christ, and the veritable incarnation of the Logos, who took the human nature from the body of Mary, came forth God-Man from her womb, and as God-Man suffered on the cross. For Christ was born as *a person,* and suffered as *a person;* and the personality in Christ resided in his divinity, not in his humanity. So, in fact, the reasonable soul of man, which is the centre of the human personality, participates in the suffering and the death-struggle of the body, though the soul itself does not and cannot die. The Antiochian theology, however, could not conceive a human nature without a human personality, and this it strictly separated from the divine Logos. Therefore Theodore of Mopsuestia had already disputed the term *theotokos* with all earnestness. "Mary," he says, "bore Jesus, not the Logos, for the Logos was, and continues to be, omnipresent, though he dwelt in Jesus in a special manner from the beginning. Therefore Mary is strictly the mother of *Christ,* not the mother of *God.* Only in a figure, per *anaphoram,* can she be called also the mother of God, because God was in a peculiar sense in Christ. Properly speaking, she gave birth to a man in whom the union with the Logos had begun, but was still so incomplete that he could not yet (till after his baptism) be called the Son of God." He even declared it "insane" to say that God was born of the Virgin; "not God, but the temple in which God dwelt, was born of Mary." In a similar strain Nestorius and his friend Anastasius argued from the pulpit against the *theotokon.* Nestorius proposed the middle expression, mother of *Christ (*Χριστοτόκος*),* because Christ was at the same time God and man. He delivered several discourses on this disputed point. "You ask," he says in his first sermon, "whether

Mary may be called *mother of God.* Has God, then, a mother? If so, heathenism itself is excusable in assigning mothers to its gods; but then Paul is a liar, for he said of the deity of Christ that it was without father, without mother, and without descent (Hebrews 8:3 ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἄνευ γενεαλογίας*).* No, my dear sir, Mary did not bear God;... the creature bore not the uncreated Creator, but the man who is the instrument of the Godhead; the Holy Ghost conceived not the Logos, but formed for him, out of the virgin, a temple which he might inhabit (John 2:21). The incarnate God did not die, but quickened him in whom he was made flesh... This garment, which he used, I honor on account of the God which was covered therein and inseparable therefrom;... *I separate the natures, but I unite the worship.* Consider what this must mean. He who was formed in the womb of Mary was not himself God, but God assumed him *[assumsit,* i.e., clothed himself with humanity], and on account of him who assumed, he who was assumed is also called *God."* A controversy now ensued in which the enemies of Nestorius, not comprehending the danger which he saw to be involved in the use of the word *theotokos,* charged him most unjustly with holding the Photinian and Samosatenian views, which asserted that Jesus was born of Mary as a mere man; or, in other words, they accused him of denying the divinity of Christ. The question was very keenly agitated, both among the clergy and laity, whether Mary was entitled to be called the mother of God. In this dispute Nestorius took an active part, adhering firmly to the doctrine of the school of Antioch. Dupin *(Bibliotheque,* 1:442, ed. 1722) thus summarizes his views as expounded by himself:

1. He expressly rejected the error of those who said that Christ was a mere man, as Ebion, Paul of Samosata, Photinus.

2. He maintained that the Word was united to the humanity in Christ Jesus, and that this union was most intimate and strict.

3. He maintained that these two natures made one Christ, one Son, one Person.

4. And that this Person may have either divine or human properties attributed to him. But his words contradicted this formal enunciation of his doctrine. His illustrations proved that he did not allow the hypostatic union, but admitted a moral union only. A contemporary writer (Marius Mercator, *Opera* [Paris, 1673, ed. Gamier]), who lived in the first half of the fifth century, says that Nestorius was sound in most of the Catholic

truths on this question taken seriatim. He was sound "de persona divina assumente," also "de natura humana assumpta," and also "de tempore, quo primum extitit unio;" all these positions being demonstrated by extracts from extant sermons and other writings of Nestorius. But he was unsound "de genere unionis." He certainly allowed only a moral union, "Deus et homo unum tantum moraliter." Hence the incarnation according to him was "ἐνοίκησις, ἀνάψις, ἐνέργεια, ἐνανθρώπησις." There were two natures in Christ, and the properties in each should be very carefully distinguished — "duae in Christo reipsa hypostases; secernenda singulorum idiomata." Nor would he allow human attributes to be predicated of the divine nature of Christ: "Nec quae unius tribuenda alteri, nisi .καθ ὁμονυμίαν Rogers *(Parker Soc.* page 55) quotes an opposite passage in this connection: Φησὶ γὰρ ἐνωθῆναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας ἀνθρώπῳ σπερ εἴ τις φίλος φίλῳ ἕνωσιν διὰ σχέσεως ποιοῖτο (Nicephorus, 18:48). He denied therefore that God the Son had endured human suffering or gone through human experiences, and he necessarily rejected, according to the above view, the term θεοτόκος, and proposed Χριστοτόκος as an alternative. There is abundant proof from his works of his denial of the hypostatic union. He compared the union of the two natures in Christ to marriage; he spoke of Christ's humanity being the habit, the temple of his divinity. He said that Thomas had touched him that was risen again and honored him that raised him up. He believed "hominem Deificatun, et non verbum carnem factum," that Christ became God by merit and not by nature. At some meetings at Ephesus, preliminary to the council, Nestorius said he would not admit that a child could be God. Acacius, bishop of Melitana, at the council said that he had heard a bishop of the party of Nestorius say "that he that suffered for us was a distinct person from the Word" (Dupin, 1:640). Nestorius proposed an alteration of phraseology in order to overcome this difficulty. He suggested that there would be no difficulty if we said the divine Jesus Christ knew men's thoughts, the human Jesus Christ was hungry, and the like (see Dr. Hey's *Lect.* 4. He speaks of the cruelty of the persecution of Nestorius, and does "not scruple to say that the Council of Ephesus erred in treating Nestorius with too great severity"). Practically it became clear that his doctrine amounted to teaching that there were two persons in Christ, and it was so felt at the time. *SEE HIYPOSTATICAL UNION*. Thus the word *theotokos* became the watchword of the orthodox party in the Nestorian controversy, as the term *homoousios* had been in the Arian; opposition to the word θεοτόκος meant denial of the mystery of tile incarnation, or of the true

union of the divine and human natures in Christ. Unquestionably the Antiochian Christology, which was represented by Nestorius, did not make the Logos truly *become* man. It asserted indeed, rightly, the duality of the natures, and. the continued distinction between them; it denied, with equal correctness, that God, as such, could either be born, or suffer and die; but it pressed the distinction of the two natures to double personality. It substituted for the idea of the incarnation the idea of an assumption *(*πρόσληψις*)* of human nature, or rather of an entire man, into fellowship with the Logos, and an indwelling of Godhead in Christ *(*ἐνοίκησις in distinction from ἐνάρκωσις*).* Instead of God-Man (θεάνθρωπος), we have here the idea of a mere God-bearing man (ἕνωσις καὲ ὑπόστασιν*);* and the person of Jesus of Nazareth is only the instrument, or the temple, in which the divine Logos dwells. The two natures form, not a personal unity (θεοφόρος, also θεοδόχος, from δεχεσθαι, God-assuming), but only a moral unity, an intimate friendship or conjunction *(*συνάφεια*).* They hold an outward, mechanical relation to each other, in which each retains its peculiar attributes *(*ἰδιώματα*),* forbidding any sort of *communicatio. idiomatum.* This union is, in the first place, a gracious condescension on the part of God *(*ἕνωσις κατὰ χάριν, .or καὶ εὐδοκίαν*),* whereby the Logos makes the man an object of the divine pleasure, and in the second place an elevation of the man to higher dignity and to sonship with God *(*ἕνωσις καὶ ἀξίαν, καὲ υἱοθεσίαν*).* By virtue of the condescension there arises, in the third place, a practical fellowship of operation *(*ἕνωσις καὶ ἐνέργειαν*),* in which the humanity becomes the instrument and temple of the Deity and the ἕνωσις σχετική culminates. Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'the able founder of the Antiochian Christology, set forth the elevation of the man to sonship with God (starting from Luke 2:53) under the aspect of a gradual moral process, and .made it dependent on the progressive virtue and meritoriousness of Jesus, which were completed in the resurrection, and earned for him the unchangeableness of the divine life as a reward for his voluntary victory for virtue. The Antiochian and Nestorian theory amounts therefore, at bottom, to a duality of persons in Christ, though without clearly avowing it. It cannot conceive the reality of the two natures without a personal independence for each. With the theanthropic unity of the person of Christ it denies also the theanthropic unity of his work, especially of his sufferings and death; and in the same measure it enfeebles the reality of redemption. From this point of view Mary, of course, could be nothing more than mother of the mall Jesus, and the predicate *theotokos,* strictly understood,

must appear absurd or blasphemous. Nestorius would admit no more than that God passed through *(transiit)* the womb of Mary. Cyril charges upon Nestorius *(Epist. ad Coelest.)* that he does not say the Son of God died and rose again, but always only the man Jesus died and rose. Nestorins himself says, in his second homily (in *Mar. Mere.* page 763 sq.): "It may be said that the *Son* of God, in the *wider* sense, died, but not that *God* died. Moreover the Scriptures, in speaking of the birth, passion, and death, never say *God,* but *Christ,* or *Jesus,* or the *Lord* — all of them names which suit both natures. A born, dead, and buried God cannot be worshipped." "Pilate," he says in another sermon, "did not crucify the Godhead, but the clothing of the Godhead, and Joseph of Arimathaea did not shroud and bury the Logos" *(in Mar. Merc.* page 789 sq.).

Nestorius by this controversy had opened a question which went beyond the usual theological arena. The sentiment of venerating Mary had spread so greatly among the people that it touched the most vehement passions, and he was, therefore, not only resisted by theologians of the opposite camp,viz., the Alexandrians, but by the people, and was rejected in public by some of his own clergy even. He accordingly, enraged at the contempt shown to his authority as patriarch, hesitated not to issue orders that the most refractory should be seized, and forthwith beaten and imprisoned. One of these, Proclus by name, who had at a former period applied in vain for the patriarchate of Constantinople, rendered himself peculiarly conspicuous by the bitter hostility which he evinced to the opinions of Nestorius. This man having, on one occasion, been called to preach in the presence of his patriarch, took occasion, in the course of his sermon, to extol the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, and charged all who refused to acknowledge her as such with being believers in a deified man. Proclus, in the course of his discourse, praised Mary as "the spotless treasure-house of virginity; the spiritual paradise of the second Adam; the workshop in which the two natures were annealed together; the bridal chamber in which. the Word wedded the flesh; the living bush of nature, which was unharmed by the fire of the divine birth; the light cloud which bore him who sat between the cherubim; the stainless fleece, bathed in the dews of heaven, with which the Shepherd clothed his sheep; the handmaid and the mother,, the Virgin and Heaven." The sermon was received with loud applause, and Nestorius found it necessary to defend his own doctrine against the misrepresentations of the preacher. Nestorius's middle term *of* Χριστοτόκος, which he had adopted to prevent a schism in the Church,

failed longer to satisfy any except his most devoted associates; and a considerable party, composed both of clergy, monks, and Church members, refused outright to recognise Nestorius as their ecclesiastical superior. They even renounced all Church fellowship with him. The patriarch accordingly convened a synod at Constantinople in A.D. 429, which deposed some of the most violent of the clergy as favorers of Manichaean doctrines by denying the reality of Christ's humanity. In a short time, however, the Nestorian controversy, which had raged so violently in the Church and patriarchate of Constantinople, extended far beyond these narrow limits, and soon another eminent opponent appeared to harass Nestorius. This one was Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who had previously exhibited a violent persecuting spirit against pagans, Jews, and heretics. He took the field, moved by interests both personal and doctrinal, and used every means to overthrow his rival in Constantinople, as his like-minded uncle and predecessor, Theophilus, had overthrown the noble Chrysostom in the Origenistic strife. The theological controversy was at the same time a contest of the two patriarchates. In personal character Cyril stands far below Nestorius, but he excelled him in knowledge of the world, shrewdness, theological learning, and acuteness, and had the show of greater veneration for Christ and for Mary on his side; and in his opposition to the abstract separation of the divine and human he was in the right, though he himself pressed to the verge of the opposite error of mixing or confusing the two natures in Christ. (Comp. in particular his assertion of an ἕνωσις φυσική in the third of his Anathematism against Nestorius; Hefele *[Conciliengesch.* 2:155], however, understands by this not a ἕνωσις εἰς μίαν φύσιν, but only a real union in *one being, one existence.)* Cyril, as if to blind the eyes of his antagonists, opened the controversy by mild and apparently suave measures. He simply wrote to Nestorius remonstrating against the views of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. Cyril published two letters addressed to Egyptian monks, in which he assailed the opinions of Nestorius, without, however, alluding to or once mentioning his name. The appearance of these writings excited no light sensation in the East, and gave great offence to Nestorius, against whom they were so plainly levelled. Cyril followed this up by a solemn protest, and finally launched out by vehement and bitter denunciations of Nestorius and his doctrine, declaring the latter at variance with the very essence of Christianity. An epistolary altercation now took place between the two patriarchs, which continued for some time, with considerable bitterness on both sides. To bring about Nestorius's removal from the

patriarchate, Cyril addressed the emperor, the empress Eudocia, and the emperor's sister Pulcheria, who took a lively interest in Church affairs; and when these efforts failed to bring about the much desired result, he finally determined to rouse the pope against Nestorius, and therefore caused the sermons of that patriarch to be translated and sent to Rome, and at the same time urged his holiness to take summary measures for the vindication of pure doctrine. Celestine, moved by orthodox instinct, and flattered by the appeal to his authority, summoned a synod to meet at Rome, and with their sanction decided that the clergy excommunicated by Nestorius should be restored to the fellowship of the Church; and, further, that if within ten days after receiving the sentence pronounced at Rome, Nestorius should not give a written recantation of his errors, he should be forthwith deposed from his office as patriarch and excommunicated, "ab universalis ecclesiae catholicae communione dejectus." Cyril having thus found at last the opportunity of humbling his rival, took it upon himself to execute the sentence of the Roman synod. Summoning a synod of Egyptian bishops at Alexandria, Cyril despatched a letter, A.D. 430, in the name of the synod to Nestorius, in which, conformably to the sentence pronounced at Rome, he called upon him to recant, and concluded with twelve anathemas against his presumed errors, thus formally setting forward the Egyptian creed in opposition to the Antiochian system, as expressed by Theodore of Mopsuestia. The controversy now completely altered its aspect, being converted from a personal into a doctrinal dispute. By orders of John, patriarch of Antioch, a refutation of the Egyptian anathemas was published by Theodoret, bishop of Cyros, a town on the Euphrates; and this refutation, which was written with great severity, called forth an equally violent reply from the pen of Cyril. Nestorius, on his part, treated the deputies sent from Celestine and Cyril with the utmost contempt, and answered the anathemas of Cyril by sending twelve counter anathemas, in which he accused his opponents of the heresy of Apollinaris (q.v.).

The controversy had now become so general and critical that it was thought to be absolutely necessary to summon a general council, and therefore the emperor, Theodosius II, in connection with his Western colleague, Valentinian III, issued a proclamation to all the metropolitans of his empire to meet in oecumenical council at Ephesus about Pentecost of the following year. Cyril and Nestorius arrived at Ephesus at the appointed time, the former authorized temporarily to represent the pope, Celestine, and accompanied by a great number of Egyptian bishops, who came to act

as his devoted tools. The bishop of the city in which the council was assembled was the friend of Cyril, and such was the extent of influence arrayed against Nestorius that he found it necessary to solicit from the imperial commissioner a guard to protect his person and the house in which he resided. A number of the Syrian bishops were prevented from reaching Ephesus in time for the opening of the council, and having waited sixteen days beyond the time appointed by the emperor, Cyril insisted on commencing proceedings, and accordingly on June 22, 431, he opened the synod with 200 bishops. The bishop of Hippo, St. Augustine, was to have presided at the Council of Ephesus, but he died in the latter part of the year 430. Nestorius refused to attend till all the bishops had assembled, and having been formally invited three several times to appear and answer the various charges, oral and written, laid against him, his refusals to obey the summons of the synod were construed as an admission on his own part of his guilt, and it therefore proceeded to his condemnation. The bishops unanimously cried, "Whosoever does not anathematize Nestorius, let himself be anathema; the true faith anathematizes him; the holy council anathematizes him. Whosoever holds fellowship with Nestorius, let him be anathema. We all anathematize the letter and the doctrines of Nestorius. We all anathematize Nestorius and his followers, and his ungodly faith, and his ungodly doctrine. We all anathematize Nestorius," etc. (Mansi, 4:1170 sq.; Hefele, 2:169). Then a multitude of Christological expressions of the earlier fathers and several passages from the writings of Nestorius were read, and at the close of the first session, which lasted till late in the night, the synod, in which, says Schaff, "an uncharitable, violent, and passionate spirit ruled the transactions," after many tears, as its members declared, constrained by the laws of the Church, and by the letter of the Roman bishop, Celestine, pronounced sentence in the following terms: 'The Lord Jesus Christ, by Nestorius blasphemed, has ordained by this most holy synod that the Nestorius above named be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from sacerdotal fellowship'? (Mansi, 4:1211; Hefele, 2:172). This sentence was no sooner passed than, by orders of Cyril, it was publicly proclaimed by heralds through the whole city. It was also formally announced to the emperor. Meanwhile John, bishop of Antioch, with about thirty Syrian bishops, arrived at Ephesus a few days after the council headed by Cyril had met and deposed Nestorius, and, on learning what had been done, they declared the proceedings of that council null and void, proceeded to form a new council, or conciliabulum — yielding nothing to the heated violence of the other — in the dwelling of the celebrated

Theodoret (q.v.), under the protection of the imperial counsellor and a body-guard, and declared itself to be the only regular one. The conciliabulum, in turn, now deposed Cyril and Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, and excommunicated the other members who had taken part in the proceedings of the Cyrillian councils until they should manifest penitence and condemn the anathemas of Cyril (Mansi, 4:1259 sq.; Hefele, 2:178 sq.). The sentence against the two bishops was made known throughout the city, and formally communicated to the emperor. In the midst of this conflict of councils the deputies of the Roman bishop appeared at Ephesus, and, according to their instructions, gave their formal sanction to all the proceedings of Cyril and his council. The emperor, however, on hearing the report of his commissioner, lost no time in despatching a letter to Ephesus by the hands of an imperial officer, conveying his royal pleasure that the disputed question should be carefully considered, not by any party in the assembly but by the whole council in common, and until this was done no one of the bishops could be permitted to return to his diocese or to visit the court. Cyril and his party, seeing the evident leaning of the emperor in favor of Nestorius, resorted to various expedients for the purpose of enlisting the influence of the court for, themselves, and at length they succeeded in prevailing upon the feeble and vacillating emperor, through the intervention of Theophilus's sister, to confirm the deposition of Nestorius, although he had agreed to withdraw his objection to the word "theotokos," mother of God. Thus, finally forsaken by the court, which had so long protected him against his numerous and powerful enemies, Nestorius saw himself deserted by many of the bishops of his party; and though John of Antioch and a number of the Eastern bishops stood firm for a time, John and Cyril were ultimately brought to an agreement, and both retained their sees. The compromise which was effected between the two prelates and the emperor was brought about mainly by the following steps. John of Antioch sent the aged bishop Paul of Emesa a messenger to Alexandria with a creed which he had already, in a shorter form, laid before the emperor, and which broke the doctrinal antagonism by asserting the duality of the natures against Cyril, and the predicate *mother of God* against Nestorius (Mansi, 5:305; Hefele, 2:246; Gieseler, I, 2:150). "We confess," says this symbol, which was composed by Theodoret, "that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and body subsisting (θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς [against Apollinaris] καὶ σώματος*);* as to his Godhead begotten of the

Father before all time, but as to his manhood born of the Virgin Mary in the end of the days for us and for our salvation; of the same essence with the Father as to his Godhead, and of the same substance with us as to his manhood ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα Here *homoousios*, at least in the second clause, evidently does not imply numerical unity, but only generic unity); for two natures are united with one another (δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε, in opposition to the μία φύσις of Cyril). Therefore we confess *one* Christ, one Lord, and *one* Son. By reason of this *union*, which yet is *without confusion (*κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου [against Cyril] ἑνώσεως ἔννοιαν*)*, we also confess that the holy Virgin is *mother of God*, because God the Logos was made flesh and man, and united with himself the temple [humanity] even from the conception; which temple he took from the Virgin. But concerning the words of the Gospel and Epistles respecting Christ, we know that theologians apply some which refer to the *one person* to the two natures in common, but separate others as referring to the two natures, and assign the expressions which become God to the Godhead of Christ, but the expressions of humiliation to his manhood" (καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ παραδιδόντας*)*. This compromise of principle with which John of Antioch was thus made chargeable roused a large party in his own diocese, and many of the Syrian bishops withdrew from all fellowship with him. A schism followed in various parts of the Eastern Church. Nestorius, on the other hand, at his own request, was assigned to his former cloister at Antioch, and on October 25, 431, Maximian was nominated as his successor in Constantinople. Upon the death of this patriarch in A.D. 433, however, a large party at Constantinople demanded the restoration of Nestorius, threatening that if their wish was refused they would set fire to the patriarchal church; but so strong was the influence exercised by the opponents of the deposed patriarch that the vacant dignity was conferred upon his early adversary, Proclus. Cyril, seeing the strength of Nestorius's friends, determined now that his opponent should be forever removed beyond the possibility of exercising any longer any influence in the Church; and the Antiochians, having saved the doctrine of two natures, were gradually won over by persuasives in various forms to consent to the sacrifice of the person of Nestorius for the sake of the unity of the Church. Finally, in A.D. 435, an imperial edict appeared which condemned Nestorius to perpetual banishment in the Greater Oasis of Upper Egypt.

"The unhappy Nestorius," says a Church historian, " was now dragged from the stillness of his former cloister of Euporpius, before the gates of Antioch, in which he had enjoyed four years of repose, from one place of exile to another — first to Arabia, then to Egypt and was compelled to drink the bitter cup of persecution which he himself, in the days of his power, had forced upon the heretics." To his credit, be it said, he bore his sufferings with resignation and independence. In his exile Nestorius busied himself by the writing of several theological works. Thus he wrote a history of his life and of his theological controversy, in which he sought to vindicate himself against the reproaches of both friends and foes, significantly entitled a *Tragedy.* (Fragments in Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:7, and in the *Synodicon adversus Tragediam Irenaei,* c. 6. That the book bore the name of *Tragedy* is stated by Ebedjesu, a Nestorian metropolitan. The imperial commissioner, Irenaeus, afterwards bishop of Tyre, a friend of Nestorius, composed a book concerning him and the ecclesiastical history of his time, likewise under the title of *Tragedy,* fragments of which, in a Latin translation, are preserved in the so-called *Synodicon,* in Mansi, 5:431 sq.) Various accounts are given of the circumstances which led to his death, but in one thing all are agreed, that his last years were embittered by many acts of harsh and cruel persecution. The precise time or place of his death has not been ascertained, but he is believed to have died previous to A.D. 450, when the Eutychian controversy began to attract notice. The account given by Evagrius, that Nestorius's death was caused by a disease in which his tongue was eaten by worms, rests, according to Evagrius himself, on a single and unnamed authority. The more probably authentic narratives ascribe his death to the effects of a fall. He was still living A.D. 439, when Socrates wrote his history *(Hist. Eccles.* 7:34). The Monophysite Jacobites are accustomed from year to year to cast stones upon his supposed grave in Upper Egypt, and have spread the tradition that it has never been moistened by the rain of heaven, which yet falls upon the evil and the good. The emperor, who had formerly favored him, but was now turned entirely against him, caused all his writings to be burned, and his followers to be named after Simon Magus, and stigmatized as Simonians. But though this be his memory in the East, in the West the sad fate and upright character of Nestorius, after having been long abhorred, has in modern times, since Luther, found much sympathy; while Cyril, by his violent conduct, has incurred much censure. Walch *(Ketzerhist.* 5:817 sq.) has collected the earlier opinions. Gieseler and Neander take the part of Nestorius against Cyril, and think that he was unjustly condemned. So

also Milman, who would rather meet the justice of the divine Redeemer loaded with the errors of Nestorius than with the barbarities of Cyril, but does not enter into the theological merits of the controversy *(Hist. of Latin Christianity,* 1:210). Petavius, Baur, Hefele, and Ebrard, on the contrary, vindicate Cyril against Nestorius, not as to his personal conduct, which was anything but Christian, but in regard to the particular matter in question, viz., the defence of the unity of Christ against the division of his personality. Dorner (2:81 sq.) justly distributes the right and wrong, truth and error, on both sides, and considers Nestorius and Cyril representatives of two equally one-sided conceptions, which complement each other. Cyril's strength lay on the religious and speculative side of Christology, that of Nestorius on the ethical and practical. Kahnis *(Dogmatik,* 2:86) gives a similar judgment. Perhaps it is nearest the truth to concede that Nestorius was possessed of an honest and pious zeal, but was wanting in that prudence and moderation by which zeal should have been controlled.

Literature. — On the sources are to be consulted —

(1.) *In favor of Nestorius:* Nestorius, ῾Ομιλίαι, *Sermones; Anathematismi.* Extracts from the Greek original in the *Acts* of the Council of Ephesus; in a Latin translation in Marius Mercator, a North African layman who just then resided in Constantinople *(Opera,* ed. Garnerius [Paris, 1673], part 2; and better ed. Baluzius, Paris, 1684); also in Gallandi, *Bibl. vet. P.P.* (8:615-735), and in Migne's *Patrol.* (tom. 47). Nestorius's own account (Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:7) was used by his friend Irenseus (bishop of Tyre till 448) in his *Tragaedis s. comm. de rebus in synodo Ephesina ac in Oriente foto gestis,* which, however, is lost; the documents attached to it were revised in the 6th century in the *Synodicon adversus Tragaediam Irenaei* (in Mansi, 5:731 sq.). In favor of Nestorius, or at least of his doctrine, Theodoret (t 457) in his works against Cyril, and in three dialogues entitled Ἐρανιστής (Beggar). Comp. also the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia (t 429).

(2.) *Against Nestorius:* It has been shown that the great opponent of Nestorius was Cyril of Alexandria. He published Ἀναθεματισμοί, five books κατὰ Νεστορίου, and several Epistles against Nestorius and Theodoret, in volume 6 of Aubert's ed. of his *Opera* (Paris, 1638 [in Migne's ed.], tom. 9). These aim to prove that the Virgin Mary was θεοτόκος, and not χριστοτόκος. But there are besides a great number of writers against Nestorius and his heresy whose works are extant. Among

these are, Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 7, c. 29-35 (written after 431, but still before the death of Nestorius; comp. c. 34); Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:2-7; Liberatus (deacon of Carthage about 553), *Breviariun causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* (ed. Garnier, Paris, 1675; and printed in Gallandi, *Bibl. vet. Patrum,* 12:121-161); Leontius of Byzantium (monachus), *De sectis;* and *Contra Nestorium et Eutychen* (in Gallandi, *Bibl.* 12:625 sq., and 658-700). Besides these should be mentioned Philastrius, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Faustus, Maxentius, Marius Mercator, and many others. A complete collection of all the acts of the Nestorian controversy, see in Mansi, 4:567 sq.; and 5, 7, 9.

Of later literature, see Petavius, *Theolog. dogmatum,* tom. 4 *(de incarnatione),* lib. 1, c. 7 sq.; Garnier, *De haeresi et libris Nestorii,* in his edition of the *Opera Marii Mercator.* (Paris, 1673; newly edited by Migne, Paris, 1846); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* chapter 47; Jablonski, *De Nestorianismo* (Berol. 1724); Gengler (R.C.), *Ueber die Verdammung des Nestorius* (in *Tibinger Quartalschrift,* 1835, No. 2); Schmid, *Vera Nestorii de unione naturarum in Christo sententia* (Jena, 1794, 4to); Salig, *De Eutychianismo ante Eutychen* (Wolfenb. 1723, 4to); Schrockh, *Kirchen-Geschichte,* 18:176-312; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* 5:289-936; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:714-733; Neander, Torrey's transl. 2:446-524; 4:44 sq.; and his *Hist. of Dogma.* pages 329, 331-333, 336, 393; Gieseler, *Kirchen-Geschichte,* 1, div. 2, page 131 sq. (4th ed.); Baur, *Gesch. der Dreieiniqkeitslehre,* 1:693-777; Dorner, *Person of Christ,* 2:60-98; Hefele (R.C.), *Conciliengesch.* 2:134 sq.; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity,* 1:195-252; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church (Patriarchate of Alexandria),* 1:233-277; Wright, *Early Christianity in Arabia,* § 9; Stanley, in his *History of the Eastern Church,* has seen fit to ignore the Nestorian and the other Christological controversies — the most important in the history of the Greek Church; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ,* pages 121, 257, 463; comp. also W. Moller, art. Nestorius, in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* 10:288-296. See also the literature appended to the article *SEE NESTORIANS*.

Net

Picture for Net 1

There are in Scripture several words denoting different kinds of nets, and this, with the frequency of images derived from them, shows that nets were

much in use among the Hebrews for fishing, hunting, and fowling. Indeed, for the two latter purposes nets were used to an extent of which now, since the invention of fire-arms, a notion can scarcely be formed. The various terms applied by the Hebrews to nets had reference either to the construction of the article or to its use and objects. To the first of these we may assign the following terms:

(1.) rmkjmæ, *mikmar*, or Amkjmi, *makmor*, which occurs only in <19E110>Psalm 141:10; <2502>Isaiah 52:20, where it denotes a hunter's net, is derived from rmK; *kamdr*, to *plait or interweave;* but a longer word, from the same source, trmkjmæ, *mikmoreth* (A.V. "drag"), denotes the net of fishermen (<2308>Isaiah 19:8; <3015>Habakkuk 1:15, 16).

(2.) Ëbcj, *sebdk*, or (in its fem. form) hkbcj, *sebakdh*, which is derived from Ëbc; *sabdk*, to *twine*, and designates an actual hunting-net in <1806>Job 18:6 (A.V. "snare"); but elsewhere is applied to network or latticework, especially around the capitals of columns ("network, wreathen-work," etc., <1078>1 Kings 7:18, 20, 41, 42; <2257>2 Kings 25:17; <4042>2 Chronicles 4:12, 13; <2422>Jeremiah 52:22, 23), and also before a window or balcony ("lattice," <2002>2 Kings 1:2). To the second head we may assign the following:

(3.) µrjc, *cherem*, which denotes a net for either fishing or fowling. It is derived from µrij; *chaadm*, signifying *to shut up;* and the idea is. therefore, founded on its shutting in the prey. It occurs (in this sense) in <3016>Habakkuk 1:16, 17; <2605>Ezekiel 26:5, 14; 47:10; <3411>Zechariah 14:11, etc. In <2026>Ecclesiastes 7:26 it is applied by an apt metaphor to female entanglements.

(4.) dwxm; *matsod*, or dWxm; *matsud* (with the corresponding feminine forms, hdwxm, *metsodah*, and hdWxm, *metsudah)*, from the root dWx *tsud*, *to lie in wait*, occurs in the sense of a *net* for fishes (<2012>Ecclesiastes 9:12) or animals (<1806>Job 19:6; <1911>Psalm 46:11; "snare," <2613>Ezekiel 12:13; 17:20; "to be hunted," <2621>Ezekiel 13:21); metaphorically of the *prey* caught (<2010>Proverbs 12:10), or of female blandishments ("snare," <2026>Ecclesiastes 7:26).

(5.) tvr, *resheth*, the most common term, from vry; *yarash, to get possession of,* is applied to a corded *meshwork* of any description, whether for catching birds (<2017>Proverbs 1:17) or other animals (<1808>Job 18:8;

<19915>Psalm 9:15; 10:9; 25:15; 31:4; 35:7, 8; 57:6; 140:5; <21205>Proverbs 29:5; <25113>Lamentations 1:13; <26123>Ezekiel 12:13; 19:8; 32:3; <28801>Hosea 5:1; 7:12), or as a screen for sifting ashes from the fire (<12704>Exodus 27:4, 5; 38:4). What distinction other than these vague intimations there may have been between the various nets described by the Hebrew terms we are unable to decide. In the New Testament no other net than that for fishing is mentioned.

(6.) The most general word which describes it *(*δίκτυον, from δικεῖν, *to throw*, occurring in <40420>Matthew 4:20, 21; <41618>Mark 1:18, 19; <42502>Luke 5:2, 4, 5, 6; <43206>John 21:6, 8, 11) is usually confined to fishing-nets by classical writers, although sometimes applied to the nets of hunters.

(7.) Another word to describe a net, ἀυφί βληστρον (from ἀμφιβάλλω, to *cast around)*, occurs in <40418>Matthew 4:18; <41616>Mark 1:16, which, like *cherem* above, is founded on the idea of enfolding or shutting in the prey.

(8.) A special kind was the σαγήνη (from σάττω, *to load)*, whence our word *seine*, a large hauling or drawnet; it is the term used in the parable of the draw-net (<40347>Matthew 13:47).

Picture for Net 2

The metaphorical references to the net are very numerous: it was selected as an appropriate image of the, subtle devices of the enemies of God on the one hand (e.g. <19915>Psalm 9:15; 25:15; 31:4), and of the unavertable vengeance of God on the other (<25113>Lamentations 1:13; <26123>Ezekiel 12:13; <28712>Hosea 7:12). *SEE SNARE*.

Picture for Net 3

1. *Fishing-nets*. — We have no direct information concerning the fish-nets of the Hebrews, but suppose that they were not materially different from those of the ancient Egyptians, concerning which we now possess very good information, and which are more than once mentioned in Scripture (<23908>Isaiah 19:8). The Egyptians constructed their nets of flax-string: the netting-needle was made of wood, and in shape closely resembled our own (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 2:95), *SEE NEEDLE*. The usual fishing-net among this people was of a long form, like the common drag-net, with wooden floats on the upper and leads on the lower side. The leads were occasionally of an elongated shape, hanging from the outer cord or border of the net; but they were most usually flat, and, being folded round the

cord, the opposite sides were beaten together; and this method continues to be adopted by the modern Egyptians. The net was sometimes let down from a boat, but those who pulled it usually stood on the shore, and landed the fish on a shelving bank. This mode, however, was more adapted to river than to lake fishing; and hence in all the detailed examples of fishing in the New Testament the net is cast from and drawn into boats, excepting in one case where, the draught being too great to take into the boat, the fishers dragged the net after their boats to the shore (<4B206>John 21:6, 8). Sometimes in shallow water a smaller net was used furnished with a pole on either side, to which it was attached; and the fisherman, holding one of the poles in each hand, thrust it below the surface of the water, and awaited the moment when a shoal of fish passed over it.

Picture for Net 4

This, or a smaller landing-net, likewise secured the large fish, which had been wounded with the spear or entangled with the hook. In the large cut given on page 978 the fishermen in the boat, excepting the master, are almost naked, as are also those who have occasion to wade in the water in hauling the net to the shore. Such seems also to have been the practice among the Hebrew fishermen; for Peter, when he left the boat to hasten on shore to his risen Lord " girt his fisher's coat unto him, for he was naked" (<4B207>John 21:7); although, in this case, the word "naked" (q.v.) must be understood with some latitude. For modern fishing-nets in Palestine, see Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:79 sq. *SEE FISHING*.

2. *Fowling-nets.* — These were also in common use among the Hebrews, and the references to them in the Bible receive striking illustration from the representations on the Egyptian monuments. The ancient Egyptians either caught the birds in large clap-nets or in traps; and they sometimes shot them with arrows, or felled them with a throw-stick, as they flew in the thickets. The trap was generally made of network, strained over a frame. It consisted of two semicircular sides or flaps, of equal size, one or both moving on the common bar, or axis, upon which they rested. When the trap was set, the two flaps were kept open by means of strings, probably of catgut, which, the moment the bait that stood in the center of the bar was touched, slipped aside, and allowed the two flaps to collapse, and thus secured the bird. Another kind, which was square appears to have closed in the same manner; but its construction was different, the framework running across the centre, and not, as in others, round the edges of the trap. So

skillful were they in making traps that they were strong enough to hold the hyena; and in the one which caught the robber in the treasury of Rhampsinitus the power of the spring or the mechanism of the catch was so perfect that his brother was unable to open it or release him. Similar in ingenuity, though not in strength, were the nets made by the convicts banished to Rhinocolura by Actisanes, which, though made of split straws, were yet capable of catching many of the numerous quails that frequented that desert region at a particular period of the year. The clap-net was of different forms, though on the same general principle as the traps. The larger ones consisted, like the smaller ones above, of two sides or frames, over which the network was strained (see next page); at one end was a short rope, which they fastened to a bush or a cluster of reeds, and at the other was one of considerable length, which, as soon as the birds were seen feeding in the area within the net, was pulled by the fowlers, causing the two sides to collapse. As soon as they had selected a convenient spot for laying down the net, in a field or on the surface of a pond, the known resort of numerous wild fowl, they spread open the two sides or flaps, and secured them in such a manner that they remained flat upon the ground until pulled by the rope. A man, crouched behind some reeds growing at a convenient distance from the spot, from which he could observe the birds as they came down, watched the net, and, enjoining silence by placing his hand over his mouth, beckoned to those holding the rope to keep themselves in readiness till he saw them assembled in sufficient numbers, when a wave of his hand gave the signal for closing the net (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians,* 2:181 sq.).

Picture for Net 5

"Birds formed an article of food among the Hebrews (<03:1713>Leviticus 17:13), and much skill was exercised in catching them. The following were the most approved methods:

(1.) The trap (jP), which consisted of two parts — a net, strained over a frame, and a stick to support it, but so placed that it should give way at the slightest touch; the stick or spring was termed vqem (<30:305>Amos 3:5, 'gin;' <19:6922>Psalm 69:22, 'trap'); this was the most usual method (<18:1809>Job 18:9; <21:912>Ecclesiastes 9:12; <20:823>Proverbs 8:23).

(2.) The snare (µyMæi, from µmix;*to braid;* <181809>Job 18:9, A.V. 'robber'), consisting of a cord (l b,j , <181810>Job 18:10; comp. <191805>Psalm 18:5; 116:3; 140:5) so set as to catch the bird by the leg.

(3.) The net, as above.

(4.) The decoy, to which reference is made in <240526>Jeremiah 5:26, 27 — a cage of peculiar construction **(**bWl K**)** — was filled with birds, which acted as decoys; the door of the cage was kept open by a piece of stick acting as a springe (tyjæ]mi), and closed suddenly with a *clap* (whence perhaps the term *keltib)* on the entrance of a bird. The partridge appears to have been used as a decoy (Ecclus. 11:30)." *SEE FOWLING*.

Picture for Net 6

3. *Hunting-nets*. — These, as has already been seen, were of universal use among the Hebrews. "The objects for which hunting is practiced indicate the various conditions of society and the progress of civilization. Hunting, as a matter of necessity, whether for the extermination of dangerous beasts or for procuring sustenance, betokens a rude and semicivilized state; as an amusement, it betokens an advanced state. In the former, personal prowess and physical strength are the qualities which elevate a man above his fellows and fit him for dominion, and hence one of the greatest heroes of antiquity is described as a ‘mighty hunter before the Lord' (<011009>Genesis 10:9), while Ishmael, the progenitor of a wild race, was famed as an archer (<012120>Genesis 21:20), and Esau, holding a similar position, was 'a cunning hunter, a man of the field' (<012527>Genesis 25:27). The latter state may be exemplified, not indeed from Scripture itself, but from contemporary records. Among the accomplishments of Herod, his skill in the chase is particularly noticed; he kept a regular stud and a huntsman (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:10, 3), followed up the sport in a wild country *(Ant.* 15:7, 7) which abounded with stags, wild asses, and bears, and is said to have killed as many as forty head in a day *(War*, 1:21, 113). The wealthy in Egypt and Assyria followed the sports of the field with great zest; they had their preserves for the express purpose of keeping and hunting game (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians,* 1:215; Xen. *Cyrop.* 1:4, 5, 14), and drew from hunting scenes subjects for decorating the walls of their buildings. and even the robes they wore on state occasions. The Hebrews, as a pastoral and agricultural people, were not given to the sports of the field; the density of the population, the earnestness of their character, and the

tendency of their ritual regulations, particularly those affecting food, all combined to discourage the practice of hunting; and perhaps the examples of Ishmael and Esau were recorded with the same object. There was no lack of game in Palestine; on their entrance into the land the wild beasts were so numerous as to be dangerous (<022329>Exodus 23:29); the utter destruction of them was guarded against by the provisions of the Mosaic law (<022311>Exodus 23:11; <032507>Leviticus 25:7). Some of the fiercer animals survived to a late period, as lions (<071405>Judges 14:5; <091734>1 Samuel 17:34; <102320>2 Samuel 23:20; <111324>1 Kings 13:24; 20:36) and bears (<091734>1 Samuel 17:34; <120224>2 Kings 2:24); jackals (<071504>Judges 15:4) and foxes (<220215>Song of Solomon 2:15) were also numerous; hart, roebuck, and fallow deer (<051215>Deuteronomy 12:15; <110423>1 Kings 4:23) formed a regular source of sustenance, and were possibly preserved in enclosures. The manner of catching these animals was either by digging a pitfall (tjivi), which was the usual manner with the larger animals, as the lion (<102320>2 Samuel 23:20; <261904>Ezekiel 19:4, 8); or, secondly, by a trap (jPi), which was set under ground (<181810>Job 18:10), in the run of the animal (<202205>Proverbs 22:5), and caught it by the leg (<181809>Job 18:9); or, lastly, by the use of the net, of which there were various kinds, as for the gazelle (?) (<235120>Isaiah 51:20, A.V. 'wild bull'), and other animals of that class. The game selected was generally such as was adapted for food (<201227>Proverbs 12:27), and care was taken to pour out the blood of these as well as of tame animals (<031713>Leviticus 17:13)." All this is admirably and fully illustrated on the Egyptian monuments. Among the ancient Egyptians, in hunting, a space of considerable size was sometimes enclosed with nets, into which the animals were driven. The spots thus enclosed were usually in the vicinity of the water brooks to which they were in the habit of repairing in the morning and evening; and having awaited the time when they went to drink, the hunters disposed their nets, occupied proper positions for observing them unseen, and gradually closed in upon them. The usages of the Egyptians, and, so far as can be ascertained, of other Oriental nations, in this respect, correspond with the intimations of Julius Pollux *(Onomast.* 5:4), who states that two kinds of nets were employed in this mode of hunting. One, a long net, called by the Greeks δίκτυον, was furnished with several ropes, and was supported on forked poles, varying in length to correspond with the inequalities of the ground over which it extended. The others were smaller nets, called ἐνδδια (a, for stopping gaps. These practices are obviously alluded to in such passages as <181906>Job 19:6; <194005>Psalm 140:5; <235120>Isaiah 51:20. The method in which the net was applied is familiar to us

from the descriptions in Virgil *(AEn.* 4:121, 151 sq.; 10:707 sq.); it was placed across a ravine or narrow valley, frequented by the animals for the sake of water, and the game was driven in by the hunters, and then despatched either with bow and. arrow or spears (comp. Wilkinson, 1:214). The Assyrian monuments likewise confirm this method of taking game. *SEE HUNTING*.

Picture for Net 7

Netchaef, Innocent

a Russian prelate and writer, was born in 1722, and was educated for the Church; and, after filling various offices of distinction, was made archbishop of Pskof and of Riga. He died at St. Petersburg, January 24, 1799. Netchaef is known as the author of several *Sermons,* published by the holy synod in 1775, to be read in the pulpit; and by the following works: *Of the Manner of Confessing Children* (Moscow, 1769 and 1795, 8vo): — *Counsels of a Bishop to a Priest* (St. Petersburg, 1790 and 1795): — *Preparations for Death* (St. Petersburg, 1793). The celebrated poet Derjavin has composed the epitaph of Netchaef's tomb, which may be seen in a cell of St. Alexandre-Nevski. See *Dictionnaire historique des ecrivains ecclesiastiques de l'Eglise Greco-russe,* s.v.

Nethan'eel

(Heb. *Nethanel',* laen]t'n], *given of God;* Sept. Ναθδναήλ*),* the name of ten Hebrews. *SEE NATHANIEL*.

1. A son of Zuar and phylarch of Issachar at the time of the exode (<040108>Numbers 1:8; 2:5; 7:18, 28; 10:15). B.C. 1657.

2. The fourth son of Jesse, and brother of king David (<131114>1 Chronicles 11:14). B.C. cir. 1070.

3. A priest who blew a trumpet before the ark when David brought it from Kirjath-Jearim to Jerusalem (<131524>1 Chronicles 15:24). B.C. 1043.

4. A Levite, father of the scribe Shemaiah (<132406>1 Chronicles 24:6). B.C. ante 1014.

5. A porter of the Temple, fifth-named son of Obededom of the family of Korhites in the tribe of Levi (<132604>1 Chronicles 26:4). B.C. cir. 1014.

6. One of five "princes" who were commanded by Jehoshaphat, on his accession, to teach the law from the book, in connection with priests and Levites, through the cities of Judah (14707 2 Chronicles 17:7). B.C. 912.

7. A chief Levite, brother of Conaniah and Shemaiah, who gave offerings when Josiah renewed the observance of the passover in Jerusalem (14609 2 Chronicles 35:9). B.C. 628.

8. Fourth named of six sons of Pashur, of the "sons of the priests," who were found by Ezra to have taken idolatrous wives (15022 Ezra 10:22). B.C. 458.

9. A priest, "son" of Jedaiah, " chief of the fathers," in the days of the high-priest Joiakim (16221 Nehemiah 12:21). B.C. cir. 446.

10. A priest's son, and brother of Zechariah, who bore a trumpet at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (16236 Nehemiah 12:36). B.C. 446. Possibly he was identical with 9.

Nethani'ah

(Heb. *Nethanyah'*, הָיְנְתַנ also in the prolonged form *Nethanya'hu*, וּהָיְנְתַנ 13252 1 Chronicles 25:12 ; 14708 2 Chronicles 17:8; 24614 Jeremiah 36:14; 40:8; 41:9, *given of Jehovah;* Sept. Ναθανίας, v.r. in 12523 2 Kings 25:23 Μαθθανίας), the name of four Hebrews.

1. Third named of four sons of Asaph, who were appointed by order of David to minister in the Temple. He was chief of the fifth division of sacred musicians (13212 1 Chronicles 25:2, 12). B.C. cir. 1015.

2. A Levite, one of those sent with "princes" and priests, on the accession of Jehoshaphat, to teach the law through the cities of Judah (14708 2 Chronicles 17:8). B.C. cir. 912.

3. Son of Shelamiah and father of Jehudi (q.v.) (24614 Jeremiah 36:14). B.C. cir. 638.

4. Son of Elishama (q.v.) of the royal family of Judah, and father of Ishmael (q.v.) who murdered Gedaliah (12523 2 Kings 25:23, 25; 24108 Jeremiah 40:8, 14, 15; 41:1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10,11, 12,15,16,18). B.C. cir. 620.

Nether

SEE NITRE.

Netherlands

SEE BELGIUM AND HOLLAND.

Netherlands Missionary Society

See the article MISSIONS in this volume, especially page 358.

Neth'inim

(Heb. *Nethinim*, μynytn) is the name given in the post-exilian books of the Hebrew Scriptures to the hereditary Temple servants who were assigned to the Levites to do the subordinate and menial work.

1. *Name and its Signification*. — The name μynwtn, which is the plural of ^ytn, passive adjective from ^tn, *to give*, "to set apart, to denote," properly denotes *given*, "the devoted," i.e., to do the menial work of the sanctuary for the Levites, and, like other terms of office, has become the appellative of that class of men who were thus allotted as hereditary Temple servants to assist the Levites. Hence they are called ἱερόδουλοι by Josephus *(Ant.* 11:5, 6), while the Vulg. *(Nathinzaei)*, the Chaldee (^ynytn), Luther *(Nethiniam)*, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, Matthew's Bible, the Geneva Version, the Bishops' Bible, and the A.V. uniformly retain the original in all the seventeen passages in which it occurs, except that the A.V., following the example of the preceding English versions, incorrectly adds the plural termination s *("Nethinims")* to the Hebrew μy, which is already plural, as it does in "cherubims." The Sept., however, is ins consistent both in its spelling and rendering of it. Thus, in nine places out of the seventeen it has οἱ Ναθινίμ, Alex. Ναθινείμ *l* (<150270>Ezra 2:70; 7:7, 24; 8:20 [twice]; <160326>Nehemiah 3:26; 7:46, 73; 10:28); in three οἱ Ναθιναῖοι (<150243>Ezra 2:43 [Vat. Ναθινίμ]; <161103>Nehemiah 11:3, 21); in two Ναθανείμ [Vat. Ναθανίμ] (<150258>Ezra 2:58; <160760>Nehemiah 7:60); in one Ἀθανείμ, (<150817>Ezra 8:17); in another it takes μynytnh tyb for one word, and substitutes for it Βηθανναθινίμ (<160331>Nehemiah 3:31); and in another place again it translates μynytn by οἱ δεδομένοι (<130902>1 Chronicles 9:2). Theodoret's explanation of μynytn, δόσις Ἰαώ, τουτέστι, τοῦ ὄντος

θεοῦ *(Quaest. in. i. Paralip.),* which is also that of Bochart, *"dedititios* appellavit, quod se sponte deedissent" *(Phaleg,* lib. 2, cap. 1; *Opp.* 1:67, ed. Lugduni, 1692), is both contrary to the grammatical meaning of the word, which, as *"Pail" participle,* can only be *those given,* and not *who voluntarily gave themselves,* and at variance with facts.

2. *Origin and Duties of the Nethinim.* — It is the unanimous voice both of Jewish tradition (comp. *Jebasmoth,*. 78 b; *Midrash Jalkut* on <06927>Joshua 9:27) and the best Jewish commentators (comp. Rashi and Aben-Ezra on <15243>Ezra 2:43; Kimchi on <06910>Joshua 9:20) that the Gibeonites whom Joshua consigned forever to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, i.e., the perpetual menial servants (yhla tybl) of the sanctuary (<06921>Joshua 9:21-27), are the original caste denominated *Nethinim* in the post-exilian period; and there is no valid reason for rejecting this ancient tradition. As these Gibeonites or sanctuary slaves were greatly diminished by the bloody persecutions of Saul, and in the massacre at' Nob (<102101>2 Samuel 22:1-19), and moreover, as the reorganization and extension of the sanctuary service effected by the royal Psalmist both rendered the work of the Levites very laborious and demanded an increase of the existing staff of menial. servants, "David and the princes [after him] gave (ˆtn) the *Nethinim* (or *these given ones,* : µynytnh) for the service of the Levites" (<15820>Ezra 8:20). From the ancient practice of consigning aliens and captives of war to do both the menial work of the people at large and of the priests and Levites (<043125>Numbers 31:25-47; <052910>Deuteronomy 29:10), which also obtained among the Syrians, Phoenicians, the Greeks, and other nations of antiquity, and which still obtains among the Arabs, who devote slaves to the service of the Kaaba at Mecca and to the sepulchre of the Prophet at Medina (Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia,* 1:288, etc.; 2:166, etc., 174, 181), there can be little doubt that the thinned ranks were recruited by David and the other princes from the captives taken in battle. Indeed, their foreign names given in the catalogue of those who returned from Babylon (<15243>Ezra 2:43-58) fully confirm this view. As this newly increased and reorganized staff, founded upon the remnant of the aboriginal Gibeonites, was now formally and *exclusively given* by David to the Levites (<15820>Ezra 8:20), just as the Levites themselves, by the command of God, were given to the priests (<040819>Numbers 8:19; 18:2-6), their primitive name was no more applicable to them, because the new accession, constituting the majority, were no Gibeonites, and because they were **no** more the servants of the sanctuary at large, but were *a gift* to the Levites. It was for this reason that they were

henceforth called *Nethinim* (µyny t n), *the given ones,* i.e., to the Levites, the very expression used with regard to the Levites when they in their turn were given to the priests. *SEE LEVITE*. Being thus given to them, the Nethinim had to relieve the Levites of every menial and laborious work connected with the sanctuary. They had to draw and carry the water, hew and fetch the wood, and attend to everything which the Levites ordered them to do; and because they were so entirely at the disposal of the Levites, therefore the Bible prescribes no special duties for the Nethinim.

3. *Number of the Nethinim, their Locality, Revenues, and Social Position.* — We must not forget that the Levites were *given* to Aaron and his sons, i.e., to the priests as an order, and were accordingly the first Nethinim (µnWet n] <0403>Numbers 3:9; 8:19). At first they were the only attendants, and their work must have been laborious enough. The first conquests, however, brought them their share of the captive slaves of the Midianites, and 320 were *given* to them as having charge of the Tabernacle (<0347>Numbers 31:47), while 32 only were assigned specially to the priests. This disposition to devolve the more laborious offices of their ritual upon slaves of another race showed itself again in the treatment of the Gibeonites. They, too, were *given* (A.V. "made") to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the house of God (<0627>Joshua 9:27), and the addition of so large a number (the population of five cities) must have relieved the Levites from much that had before been burdensome. We know little or nothing as to their treatment. It was a matter of necessity that they should be circumcised (<1248>Exodus 12:48) and conform to the religion of their conquerors, and this might at first seem hard enough. On the other hand, it must be remembered that they presented themselves as recognising the supremacy of Jehovah (<0609>Joshua 9:9), and that for many generations the remembrance of the solemn covenant entered into with them made men look with horror on the shedding of Gibeonitish blood (<1209>2 Samuel 21:9), and protected them from much outrage. No addition to the number thus employed appears to have been made during the period of the Judges, and they continued to be known by their old name as the Gibeonites. The want of a further supply was, however, felt when the reorganization of worship commenced under David. Either the massacre at Nob had involved the Gibeonites as well as the priests (<0919>1 Samuel 22:19), or else they had fallen victims to some other outburst of Saul's fury, any though there were survivors (<1202>2 Samuel 21:2), the number was likely to be quite inadequate for the greater stateliness of the new worship at Jerusalem. It is to this

period accordingly that the origin of the class bearing this name may be traced. The Nethinim were those "whom David and the princes appointed (Heb. *gave)* for the service of the Levites" (<1582>Ezra 8:20). Though their number is nowhere given up to the time of the Babylonian captivity, yet the fact that the aboriginal *Hieroduli,* i.e., the Gibeonites, consisted of thee population of five cities when the service of the sanctuary was not so imposing makes it pretty certain that the Nethinim with whom David and the other princes replenished the thinned ranks at the time when the Temple worship required a large staff of menial servants must have counted their thousands. As a matter of convenience, they most probably lived within the precincts and in the immediate neighborhood of the Temple, and must have been supported by the contributions of the people. We have more decided information about them in the post-exilian records. Only 612 Nethinim returned from Babylon — 392 with Zerubbabel (<1258>Ezra 2:58; <1660>Nehemiah 7:60), and 220 with Ezra (<1582>Ezra 8:20) — under the leadership of Ziha and Gispa (<1612>Nehemiah 11:21), who, as their foreign names indicate, were of their own body. But even this small number had to be coaxed in order to get them to return from exile, as is evident from <1587>Ezra 8:17, where they are addressed as *brethren* of Iddo, a chief of the Levites. It is evident from the whole context (<1585>Ezra 8:15-19), which speaks of securing Iddo's interests to procure Levites as well as Nethinim, that he was not *a Nathin,* but a *distinguished Levite* who had great influence both among his own Levitical brethren and the Nethinim who were under his control. Some of them lived in Ophel, which they helped to rebuild (<1626>Nehemiah 3:26; 11:26), because of its proximity to the Temple; while others, as in the preexilian period, dwelt with the Levites in their own cities (<1170>Ezra 2:70). They were under the control of a chief of their own body (<1243>Ezra 2:43; <1746>Nehemiah 7:46). Belonging to the Temple, they, like the other sacred ministers, were exempted from taxation by the Persian satraps (<1724>Ezra 7:24), and were maintained from the Temple treasury and (µnç rç[m) the second tithes *(Jebamnoth,* 86 b; *Jerusalem Maaser Sheni,* 5:15; *Jerusalem Sota,* 9:11; comp. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* 1:138-140). Though they conformed to the Jewish religion (<2248>Exodus 12:48; <5291>Deuteronomy 29:11; <0609>Joshua 9:9; <1608>Nehemiah 10:28), they occupied a very low position, and were even ranged below the *Mamzer* (rzmm), or illegal offspring, as may be seen from the following order of precedence given in the Mishna: "A priest is before a Levi, a Levi before an Israelite, an Israelite before a *Manzer,* a *Mamzer* before a *Nathin,* a *Neathin* before a proselyte, and a proselyte

before a manunitted slave" *(Horajoth,* 3:8). The Nethinim were restricted to intermarriage among themselves, and if a Jew or Jewess married one of them, though all the valid ceremonies were performed, the issue shared in all the degrading disqualifications of the Nethinim (Mishna, *Kiddushin,* 3:12; 4:1; *Jebamoth,* 2:4); and they were even excluded from the privileges of being exempt from military service, allotted to newly-married people and to those who were faint-hearted (<05107>Deuteronomy 20:7, 8, with Mishna, *Sota,* 8:3-6). If a woman was suspected of being deflowered by any one, or if she had an illegitimate child, it was ascribed to a Nathin, and the offspring took the degraded position of the Nathin, notwithstanding the assertion of the mother that the father of the child was a priest, unless she could adduce proof to support her assertion (Mishna, *Kethuboth,* 1:8, 9). If a court of justice (ˆyd tyb) gave a decision, and one of the members of the court was found to be a Nathin, the judgment was invalid, inasmuch as he was not regarded as a legal number of the congregation (hd[) specified in <03413>Leviticus 4:13; <04524>Numbers 35:24 (Mishna, *Elorajoth,* 3:1). Eventually they seem to have been merged in the mass of the Jewish population, as no allusion to them occurs in the Apocrypha or New Testament. Their number, at all events, was then insufficient for the service of the Temple; whence, as Josephus tells us (*War,* 2:17, 6), a festival, called Ξυλοφορία (Xylophoria), was established, in which the people, to supply the deficiency, were obliged to bring a certain quantity of wood to the Temple for the use of the altar of burnt offering. See Schroder, *De Netthinceis* (Marb. 1719; Will, *De Nethinceis Levitarmur famulis* (Altdorf, 1745); Lampe, in *Miscell. Groning.* 1:463 sq., 539 sq.; Pfeffinger, in *Ugolin. Thesaur.* volume 13. *SEE GIBEONITE*; *SEE TEMPLE*.

Neton

Macrobius, in his *Saturnalia,* mentions that the Accitani, an Iberian tribe, worshipped under the name of *Neton* a statue of Mars adorned with rays of light.

Neto'phah

(Heb. *Netophah',* hp;fn] *distillation;* Sept. Νετωφά in Ezra, v.r. Νεφωτά; but Ἀνετωφά in Nehemiah, v.r. Ἀτωφά; Vulg. *Netopha),* a town in Palestine, fifty-six of whose people returned from captivity with Zerubbabel (<15122>Ezra 2:22; <16726>Nehemiah 7:26). Two of David's guard, Maharai and Heleb or Hildai, leaders also of two of the monthly courses

(<13273>1 Chronicles 27:13, 15), were Netophathites, and it was the native place of at least one of the captains who remained under arms near Jerusalem after its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar; for the "villages of the Netophathites" were the residence of the Levites (<13916>1 Chronicles 9:16), a fact which shows that they did not confine themselves to the places named in the catalogues of Joshua 21 and 1 Chronicles 6. From another notice we learn that the particular Levites who inhabited these villages were singers (<16228>Nehemiah 12:28). That Netophah belonged to Judah appears from the fact that the two heroes above mentioned belonged, the one to the Zarhites — that is, the great family of Zerah, one of the chief houses of the tribe — and the other to Othniel, the son-in-law of Caleb. To judge from <16026>Nehemiah 7:26, it was in the neighborhood of, or closely connected with, Bethlehem, which is also implied by <13254>1 Chronicles 2:54, though the precise force of the latter statement cannot now be made out. From the number of Netophathites who returned from captivity, the place was probably only a small village, which indeed may account for its having escaped mention in the lists of Joshua. The Netophathites seem to have been a warlike race, if we may judge from the fact that one of the great military leaders of the Jews during the rule of the viceroy Gedaliah was Seraiah from that place (<12523>2 Kings 25:23; <24008>Jeremiah 40:8). A remarkable tradition, of which there is no trace in the Bible, but which, nevertheless, is not improbably authentic, is preserved by the Jewish authors, to the effect that the Netophathites slew the guards which had been placed by Jeroboam on the roads leading to Jerusalem to stop the passage of the first-fruits from the country villages to the Temple (Targum on <13234>1 Chronicles 2:34; on <08040>Ruth 4:20, and <21081>Ecclesiastes 3:11). Jeroboam's obstruction, which is said to have remained in force till the reign of Hoshea (see the notes of Beck to Targum on <13254>1 Chronicles 2:54), was commemorated by a fast on the 23d Sivan, which is still retained in the Jewish calendar (see the calendar given by Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, volume 6, chapter 29). Netophah is not mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, and although in the Mishna reference is made to the "oil of Netophah" *(Pearh,* 7:1, 12), and to the "valley of Beth-Netophah," in which artichokes flourished, whose growth determined the date of some ceremonial observance *(Shebiith,* 9:7), nothing is said as to the situation of the place. The latter may well be the present village of *Beit Nettif*, which stands on the edge of the great valley of the Wady es-Sumt (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2:16, 17; Porter, *Hand-book,* page 248), but can hardly be the Netophah of the Bible, since it is not near Bethlehem, but in quite another

direction. It may, however, be the place mentioned (as above) by the rabbins (see Reland, *Palcest.* pages 650, 909). The only name in the neighborhood of Bethlehem suggestive of Netophah is that which appears in Van de Velde's map (1858) as *Antubeh,* and in Tobler *(Dritte Wand.* page 80) as *Urn-Tlba,* attached to a half-ruined village about two miles north-east of Bethlehem and a wady which falls therefrom into the Wady en-Nar, or Kidron. *SEE NETOPHATH.*

Neto'phathi

(16228Nehemiah 12:28) or Neto'phathite (so A.V. in the sing., except 131541 Chronicles 2:54; 9:16, "Netophathites," Heb. everywhere *Netophathi',* the form corresponding to "Netophathite" and "Netophathites," always with the ytpæfNhi, a Gentile from *Netophah;* Chronicles [plene] ytpæ/fNhi; Sept. Νετωφαθί, as 131541 Chronicles 2:54, etc., but Νετωφατίτης, 102382 Samuel 23:28; Νετωφαθίτης, 122532 Kings 25:23; Νετωφατί, 137151 Chronicles 27:15; Νετουφάτ , 137131 Chronicles 27:13; Νετωφαθεί, 24108Jeremiah 40:8; with v.r. Νωτεφατί*;* once mistakenly rendered ἀπὸ ἐπαυλέων, 16228Nehemiah 12:28), an inhabitant of Netophah (q.v.). The Netophathites are called sons of Salma (131541 Chronicles 2:54), probably the founder of the village (102382 Samuel 23:28, 29; 24108Jeremiah 40:8).

Netovtshins

a sect of Russian dissenters who are described by Dr. Pinkerton in his account of the Greek Church in Russia as very ignorant and much divided in opinion. They go under the general name of *Spasova Soglasia,* or the Union for Salvation. Their leading tenet is that Antichrist has come and begun his ruin of the Church, and has put an end to everything good, and that a gradual extinction of all holiness is now going on. The Netovtshins appear to be an offshoot of the *Pomorane* (q.v.). See Platov's *Present View of the Russian Church.*

Netpe or Nutpe

an Egyptian female deity, is spoken of as daughter to the Sun, wife of Seb, and mother of Typhon, the god of evil among the ancient Egyptians. According to a myth, she was represented as seated on the tree of life, and sprinkling healthful water upon the souls of men. In one form she personifies the abyss of heaven, represented as a female figure, stretched across the aerial vault, with her arms and legs enclosing, the earth. She was

thought to be the *Rhea* of the Greeks. See Trevor, *Ancient Egypt*, pages 147, 149.

Nets

SEE HAWK.

Netter, Thomas Of Walden

(generally known as *Thomas Waldensis)*, an eminent English Roman Catholic Church historian of the early part of the 15th century, was born at Walden, Essex. He joined the Carmelites, and rose in course of time to prominence in his order in England. He was placed first in London, and afterwards at Oxford, where he became a professor, first of philosophy and then of divinity. He zealously contested the opinions of Wickliffe both in the schools and in the pulpit; was elected provincial of his order; and by command of King Henry IV attended the Council of Pisa in 1409. By Henry V he was appointed privy counsellor and confessor, and sent to the Council of Constance, where he distinguished himself by his speeches against the Wickliffites and Hussites. He likewise possessed the favor of Henry VI, and went to France with the intention of being present at his coronation at Paris, but he died on his journey at Rouen in 1430. He wrote a number of works; the Bodleian Library at Oxford possesses numerous MSS. of his, for instance, a list of all the heresies, under the title of *Catalogus Zizaniorum.* But his only published, work is his *Doctrinale antiquitatlum fdei Ecclesice Catholices* (Paris, 1521, 1523, 1532; 2d ed. Salamanca, 1556; 3d aed. Venice, 1571, with notes by a Carmelite monk named Rubeo; 4th ed. Venice, 1757, with notes by Blanciotti). The work is divided into six books: 1, of God and Christ; 2, of the body of Christ, the Church, and its members; 3, of monachism; 4, of the begging monks and monastic property; 5, of the sacraments; 6, of other parts of divine worship. The book is simply a criticism of the Lollards and of Wickliffe's whole system. It is still held in great esteem by Roman Catholics. Among his other writings we notice commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, and the first Epistle of Peter, and a multitude of dissertations, disputations, sermons, letters, etc., which are enumerated in Freheri *Theatrum Vir. Erud. Clar. Moreri.* See Lechler, *Wiclif u., d. Lollarden* (1874, 1875): Niedier's *Zetschriftf. histor. Theologie,* 1853, pages 559-572; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.*

7:401; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. Mid. Ayes,* page 393, n. 6; page 394, n. 3. (J.N.P.)

Nettle

is the rendering in the Auth. Ver. of two Hebrew words. *SEE TORN*.

1. *Charu'*, lWyj;(so called from its *pricking* or *burning;* Sept. φρύγανα ἄγρια*;* Vulg. *sentes, urtica,* and *spina),* occurs in three places in Scripture. Thus in <200430>Proverbs 24:30, 31, "I went by the field of the slothful, etc., and, lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles *(charulbim,* µyLæajl) had covered the face thereof." So in <183007>Job 30:7 it is stated that he was insulted by the children of those whom he would formerly have disdained to employ, and who were so abject and destitute that "among the bushes they brayed; under the *nettles* they were gathered together;" and in <360209>Zephaniah 2:9, "Surely Moab shall be as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah, even the breeding of *nettles,* and salt-pits, and a perpetual desolation." Considerable difficulty has been experienced in determining the plant which is alluded to in the above passages, which, as Celsius says, "has been sparingly mentioned, and not minutely described by the sacred writers." The majority of translators and commentators have thought that some thorny or prickly plant is intended by the *charul,* on account of the other plants which are mentioned along with it. Hence brambles, the wild plum, thistles, etc., have been severally selected; but nettles have had the greatest number of supporters. Celsius, however, prefers the *Zizyphus Paliurus,* or the plant called *Christ's thorn,* as best suited to the contexts. The *cactus,* or prickly pear, would be a very suitable representative, in many respects, as it is largely used in Palestine for a hedge or fence, and grows to the height of eight or ten feet. But there is this great objection to many of the plants proposed, that they are of too slow growth to suit the passage in Proverbs, which implies a rapid and general intrusion of the plant in question. All these determinations, however, amount to nothing more than conjectures, because, as Rosenmuller says, the cognate languages have not this word, and also because "the Greek translators of Alexandria in the first and last of the three places in which the Hebrew word occurs entirely deviate from our present Hebrew text; but in Job they translate *charul* by *wild shrubs."* It does not appear that a thorny plant is necessarily meant by the term. All that is implied is that neglected fields will become covered with *weeds,* and that these will be of a kind such as idlers may take shelter under. This

passage, indeed, seems to preclude any thorny plant or nettle, as no one would voluntarily resort to such a situation; and Bar-Bahlul, as quoted by Celsius (2:168), considers *pease*, or rather vetches to be intended. Moreover, it is worthy of remark that there is an Arabic word not unlike *charul* which is applied to plants apparently suitable to all the above passages. The word *khardul* applies to different species of *mustard*, and also to plants which are employed for the same purposes as mustard. Some of the wild kinds of mustard spring up in corn-fields, and become very troublesome. One of these, indeed, *sinapis arvensis*, is abundant in corn-fields, where it is a pernicious weed, and also in waste ground when newly disturbed. Khardul is that indigenous in Asia. Some of the species are found in Syria and Palestine; and Russell mentions the above *(sinapis arvensis)*, or charlock, as common in the neighborhood of Aleppo. It is also widely diffused in Europe (see Decandolle, *Syst. Natural.* 2:615). *SEE MUSTARD*.

2. *Kimmosh'*, vwMqæ; *kimosh'*, vwmyqæ; and *kimmashon*, ˆwvMqæ; occur, the first in <23413>Isaiah 34:13, the second in <28906>Hosea 9:6, and the third in <20431>Proverbs 24:31, where it is mentioned along with *charul*, which we believe to indicate *charlock.* The field of the slothful is there described as being grown over with thorns *(charullim)*, "and *nettles (kimshon)* had covered the face thereof." In Isaiah it is said, "And thorns *(choach)* shall come up in the palaces, *nettles (kimosh)* and brambles in the fortresses thereof." <28906>Hosea 9:6, "The pleasant places for their silver, *nettles (kimosh)* shall possess them; thorns *(choach)* shall be in their tabernacles." Though different interpretations have been given of this word (Sept. ἀκάνθινα ξύλα, ἄκανθα, ὄλεθρος ; Vulg. *urticae)*, as thorns, thistles, wild camomile, etc., the greatest number of authors have united in adopting *nettles*, chiefly in consequence of the authority of Jewish writers. Thus, Rosenmuller says, rabbi Tanchum, on <28906>Hosea 9:6, explains *kilmosh* by the common nettle, in Pococke's *Commnent. on Hosea.* So rabbi Ben-Melech, as quoted and translated by Celsius *(Hierobot.* 2:207), speaks of it as a kind of nettle, commonly called *urtica.* Nettles spring up rapidly in deserted as in inhabited places, in fields, ditches, and road-sides, especially where there is some moisture in the soil or climate. They are found in tropical situations as well as **in** temperate climes, but the springing up of nettles in deserted places is rather a European than an Oriental idea. *SEE THORN*.

Nettleton, Ashael, D.D.

a Congregational minister of note, was born April 21, 1783, at North Killingworth, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1809; entered the ministry May 28, 1811; and from 1812 to 1822 travelled as an evangelist through Connecticut and parts of Massachusetts and New York. He had originally intended to become a missionary; but his preaching was attended with such great success, hundreds being converted by his labors, that he concluded to stay at home and continue in this work. In 1822 his health failed, and he almost ceased preaching for two years, but afterwards resumed the work, spending his winters in the South, and visiting England, Scotland, and Ireland in 1831. On his return, in 1832, he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in the then newly-organized theological seminary at East Windsor; but he did not accept this office, and simply took up his residence in the place and lectured occasionally to the students. He died May 16, 1844. Dr. Nettleton was a decided opponent to the New Haven theology, and in sermons and addresses took frequent opportunity to combat it. His only publication was a compilation, *The Village Hymns* (1824). After the doctor's death there was published *Remains of the late Rev. A. Nettleton, D.D., consisting of Sermons, Outlines and Plans of Sermons, Brief Observations on Texts of Scripture, and Miscellaneous Remarks* (edited by Bennet Tyler, D.D. [Hartford, 1845, 12mo]), of which the *Christian Review* (October 1846, page 171) spoke in terms of high commendation. The "Remains" was remodelled in some parts, and brought out by Bonar in 1854. See, besides this and the review referred to, Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 2:542; Drake, *Dictionary of American .Biography,* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Neubrigensis, Williams

(called also *Petit* or *Parvus),* canon of the Augustine convent of Newbury, was born at Bridlington in 1136. He gave early promises of great talent, and was on that account educated in the convent. At the request of the superiors of a neighboring convent he wrote a commentary on Solomon’s Song, and afterwards a *Historia Rerum Anglicarum,* which he dedicated to Ernald, abbot of Rivaulx.

This history, divided into five parts, embraces the period from William I to 1197. The first book, in which he mainly follows Henry of Huntingdon, extends to the time of Stephen, and is merely an introduction to the most

important part of the work, which treats of the history of his own times, and is the best chronicle of that period. He evinces, for his age, remarkable critical acumen, a great spirit of observation, and fine discrimination. Although not completely free from the prejudices of the Middle Ages, the author is worthy of the name of historian. The work was first published at Antwerp in 1567, then at Heidelberg in 1587, Paris in 1610-1632, and at Oxford (by Hearne) in 1719. The best edition is one corrected from two MSS. of the 13th century by H.C. Hamilton, for the English Historical Society (1856). Neubrigensis is believed to have died about 1208. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 10:298; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2:253.

Neuenar

(Lat. *Neuenarius* or *Nevenarius),* HERMANN, *Count,* a learned German prelate, was born in 1491 in the town of Julich. He entered into holy orders; became provost of the College Church of Aix-la-Chapelle, afterwards of the Cathedral of Cologne; and lastly, in 1524, chancellor of the high school in that city. He possessed great knowledge, and defended Reuchlin against the attacks of the Dominicans of Cologne. In agreement with Hutten and Camerarius upon literary questions, he separated himself from them on the subject of religious reform, and voted against the innovators at the Diet of Augsburg. He died at Augsburg in 1530. We have of his works, *Oratio in comitiis Francofurtensibus pro Carolo Romanorum rege recens electo* (Frankfort, 1519, and Hanover, 1611, fol.): — *Oratio gratulatoria ad Carolum* V (1519), reprinted, as well as the preceding piece, in the third volume of the *Scriptores* of *Freher*: — *Epistola ad Carolum V* (Schelestadt, 1519, 4to), written to engage that prince to favor classical *studies: — Brevis enarratio de origine et sedibus Francorum* (Cologne, 1521, 4to; Anvers, 1585); in this work, reprinted with others in volume 1 of the *Scriptores* of Duchesne, the author is among the first to combat the erroneous opinion regarding the Trojan origin of the Franks:-De *Mllorbo seufebri sudatoria, vulgo sudore Brittanico vocato* (Cologne, 1529, 4to): — *Carmina* (Leipsic, 1529): — Annotationes *aliquot herbarum,* in volume 3 of the *Herbarium Brumifeldii* (Basle, 1540): — *De Gallia Belgica commentariolus* (Anvers, 1584, 4to). Neuenar also gave the first edition of the *Vie de Charlemagne* and of the *Annales* of Eginhard (Cologne, 1521, 4to), and of the *Art veterinaire* of R. Vegece (Basle, 1528, 4to); he also translated into Latin several Greek epigrams in the collection of Soter, published at Cologne in 1528; his translation of the *Psalms* and other fragments from the Bible are found in

the *Psalmi* published (Hagenau, 1532, 8vo) by one of his nephews, who has placed at the beginning of it a *Vie de Neuenar,* reproduced in the *Noctes academicce* of J. Fr. Christ; his *Poem on the Death of the Saviour* is inserted in the *Hymni sacri* of G. Fabricius; finally, several letters of Neuenar are found in the correspondence of Reuchlin. See Burckhardt, *Analecta,* and *De fatis linguae Latinac,* page 337; Hartzheim, *Bibl. Coloniensis;* Buschius, *Vallum humanitatis;* Paquot, *Memoires,* volume 16.

Neufchatel

SEE SWITZERLAND.

Neufchatel, Berthold de

a Swiss prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century, of noble origin. After filling several important ecclesiastical offices, he was elected bishop of Basle in 1122. He followed the custom of the prelates of noble birth, and went to join the aulic cortege of the Roman king, and neglected the affairs of his diocese. We find him at Strasburg in 1123; in 1124 he was a member of the assembly of Mayence, where he favored the pretensions of Philip of Swabia, aspiring to the empire after the death of Henry V. But the majority of votes was in favor of Lothaire, and Lothaire, proclaimed emperor, commenced by treating Berthold as an enemy. Berthold had some difficulty with the monks of Saint-Blaise. The emperor wished to hear the cause, and declared himself in favor of the monks. Berthold was restored to the good graces of the emperor in the year 1130; but a few years later, in 1134, he was obliged to abdicate, and died not long after. The motive of this abdication is not well known. It is believed, however, to have been enjoined Upon him by Innocent II. See *Basilea Sacra,* page 191; *Monuments de l'Histoire de l'ancien eveche de Bale,* published by M. Trouillat, passim.

Neufchatel, Charles de

a French prelate, who lived in the latter part of the 15th century, was the son of Jean de Neufchatel (q.v.). Charles was chief singer in the Cathedral of Besanoon when Quentin Monart governed that church. When the latter died, the age of Charles did not permit the canons to confer upon him the vacant title by vote of election; they could simply make him a candidate, and this they did. Charles had for competitor the celebrated cardinal of

Arras, Jean Jouffroy. Yet the credit of his family prevailed over the power of the cardinal; after having been made a candidate by the canons of Besaneoni, he was nominated by the pope. The city of Besan9on had itself wished this nomination, the facile and benevolent character of Charles giving it hope that his administration would be peaceful. He met their expectations, and even wished, in the year 1471, to efface the last trace of the discords which had troubled the government of his predecessor; he consented then to the destruction of the Chateau de Brigilles, newly rebuilt, and the citizens pledged themselves, through gratitude to him, to pay 600 florins in gold. In the mean time, the civil tumults being appeased, the city and church of Besan9on were desolated by foreign war. After the death of Charles the Bold, the French, united to the Lorraines, invaded the FrancheComtd, and made great ravages. Charles de Neufchatel at first resisted the enemy's forces; but Louis XI was a very skillful prince, who knew how to intimidate and corrupt. The duke Maximilian, learning that Charles de Neufchftel had taken sides with France. declared he had forfeited his office, and even obliged him to leave his archiepiscopal palace. Charles then retired, and enjoyed the society and protection of king Louis, who, as the story goes, assigned him a pension of 4000 livres. Charles de Neufchatel was at the court of France in the year 1480, when Louis, bishop of Bayeux, died. The king immediately nominated Neufchatel administrator of that church (March 6). He could not indeed institute as bishop a confirmed archbishop; he could simply, by a sort of incardination, place him over the government of a vacant bishopric. Thus the canons of Besan9on, deprived of their living archbishop, had not the right to give him a successor. Charles received for some time the revenues from his archbishopric, which, joined to his pension and his salary as administrator, made him one of the richest prelates of the kingdom. Neufchatel died towards the close of the 15th century. His body was transported to Bayeux, his heart to Besancon. See *Gallia Christ. vetus.* volume 1; Dunod, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Besancon,* volume 1; L'Abbe Richard, *Hist. des Dioc. de Besancon et de S. Claude.*

Neufchatel, Henri de

another Swiss prelate, flourished in the first part of the 13th century. His father, Ulric III, was count of Neufchatel. At first provost of the church of Basle, and coadjutor to bishop Berthold of Ferrete, he established himself upon the episcopal seat in 1262. He was a man proud of his origin and of his alliances, and would yield to no one, not even the sovereign princes.

From the first he engaged in an armed warfare with Rudolph of Hapsburg, his relative. They quarrelled about the castles of Brisach and of Neuenburg. The two armies had for chiefs the count and the bishop, and took as many strong places, and desolated as many boroughs and farms in the name of the one as of the other. In 1268, Henry of Neufchatel carried by assault Hertenberg, Blotzheim, and Rheinfelden, although the latter place was accounted impregnable; Rudolph in turn besieged Toggenburg: there interposed in the affray the peasants, ill-treated by count Rudolph, who rushed suddenly upon the castles of Auggen, Gervesch, and Froschbach, and demolished them. Desolation reigned everywhere in the year 1269, when the two adversaries concluded to close the strife by a treaty. But they finally failed to agree, and reopened the war. In 1272, Rudolph, making each day new progress, ruined the Chateau de Tieffenstein, and carried conflagration even to the suburbs of Basle, and finally besieged the episcopal city. Henry, though for a long time he had valiantly opposed, now found himself unable to prolong the struggle, and signed a truce Sept. 22, 1273. His death occurred the following year, September 13, 1274. One does not find in the life of Henry de Neufchatel any acts properly belonging to a bishop. Absolutely destitute of all ecclesiastical science, ignorant of or despising his episcopal duties, he acted the part of a valiant warrior and a skilful captain, and this part alone he was by education and general training fitted to play in lile. See *Annoles Colmarienses,* apud Urstisium, passim; Herrgott, *Genealog. Habsb.* volume 2, passin; *Btsileat Scra,* page 237; *Monum. de l'Hist. de l'ancien geche de Bale,* collected by M. Trouillat, volume 2, passim.

Neufchatel, Jean de

a French prelate of note, was born in Neufchatel, Switzerland, about 1335. Belonging to one of the most important houses of the county of Bourgogne, and son of Thibaut, baron de Neufchatel, and of Jeanne de Chalons, he became at fifteen canon of Autun, then prior of St. Peter of Abbeville and of Notre-Dame of Bar-le-Duc. Ordained priest in Besan$_{9}$on, he appeared as a candidate for archbishop of that city, but failed to secure support, and was content to be consecrated in 1371 bishop of Nevers, whence he passed in October 1372, to the see of Toul. The emperor Charles IV gave him, in 1377, letters-patent which invested him with temporal power and recognized him as a prince of the empire. Robert de Geneve, his relative, having become pope under the name of Clement VII, made him, in 1378, one of his chamberlains, and on October 23, 1383,

created him cardinal. Jean in the following year resigned his bishopric, the administration of which he resumed May 29, 1385. He became, in December 1392, bishop of Ostia and of Velletri, and two years after concurred in the election of Pierre de Lune, otherwise known as Benedict XIII, whom he crowned at Avignon in October 1394. Jean was long obedient to him but, afflicted by the schism which rent the Church, he used all means to bring it to an end, and ceased not' to solicit Benedict XIII to resign; yet Neufchatel died without having been able to triumph over the obstinacy of Pierre de Llne. On the day of his death, which occurred in Avignon, October 4, 1398, a fire, consumed his palace, and his ashes, collected by his friends, were deposited in tile Carthusian Monastery of Villeneuve-les-Avignon. See *Gallia Cahristiana,* volumes 12 and 13; Aubery, *Histoire des cardinaux.*

Neugard, Trudpert

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Villingen, in Baden-Baden, January 23, 1742; studied with the Benedictines, who have a monastery at that place, and joined that order in 1759. In 1765 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1767 was made teacher of the Oriental languages and hermeneutics at the theological school in Freiburg. Four years later he was recalled to his monastery, and was given the care of the younger brethren of his order. In 1807, after the secularization of this convent, Neugard went to Austria and lived in monastic retirement. He died about 1815. He left in MS. some historical and ascetical writings. He compiled a history of several monasteries, and assisted on a number of large works: e.g. the *Germania Sacra,* etc. See Waitzenegger, *Gelehrten- u. Schriftsteller-Lexikon,* 3:340-343.

Neuilly, Fulk of

SEE FULCO.

Neukomm, Chevalier Sigismund

a celebrated German composer, noted for his devotion to sacred music, was born at Salzburg in 1778. He was related to the Haydn family, and, evincing musical talents at a very early age, he was placed under the Haydn brothers for instruction. From Michael Haydn, the elder brother — author of *The Creation* — Neukomm acquired that predilection for sacred music which distinguished him throughout his career. At the age of twenty he

went to Vienna to study under Joseph Haydn, who received his young relative most kindly and made him his pupil; and the friendship thus begun lasted without interruption during the whole of the great master's life. Neukomm's close and unbroken intercourse with Joseph Haydn, and admiration of his genius, had a sensible effect on the formation of his own style. which is marked not only with Haydn's regularity, symmetry, and clearness, but with many of Haydn's characteristic traits of musical phraseology. After having gained a high reputation in Germany, Russia, France, Italy, and South America, Neukomm went to England in 1829, and his reception by the public was such as to induce him to pass much time in that country. His residence in England was an active period of his life. It was while there that his greatest works were composed, among them the oratorios of *Mount Sinai* and *David. Mount Sinai,* originally set to German words, was afterwards adapted by him to an English version of the text, and performed for the first time at the Derby Musical Festival of 1831. *David,* the poem of which was originally written in English, was composed: expressly for the Birmingham Musical Festival, and performed in 1834. During the same period he gave the English public many vocal pieces, both sacred and secular, which obtained general popularity. Among these, his sacred cantatas, *Miriam, The Prophecy of Babylon,* and *Absalom,* are remarkable for their grandeur, expression, and complete adaptation of the music to English poetry, for Neukomm was a perfect master of the English language. *The Sea* was for a long time the most popular song of the day; and though it has given place to newer favorites, it is still frequently heard, and always with pleasure. Neukomm's latest work is *Twenty Psalms selected from the authorized English Version,* for the use of singing-schools, choral societies, churches, and chapels of every persuasion. It was written for the Association for the Revival of Sacred Music in Scotland, and published by that body at Edinburgh in 1853. It possesses great value. The most beautiful of the Psalms are selected, and the music, in a plain and simple style. has the grand and solemn beauty which characterizes Neukomm's sacred works. Neukomm died at Paris, April 3, 1858. His residence for a few years previous had been alternate lay at London, Paris, and Bonn. There is scarcely a branch of his art which he has left untouched. A collection of voluntaries for the organ — an instrument on which Neukomm was one of the greatest performers in Europe — is among the most important works produced by him in England. His instrumental compositions, symphonies, quartets, sonatas, etc., are very numerous and of much merit; but it is on his great sacred

works that his permanent fame will rest. In the course of his long life Neukomm received many of the honors due to the highest distinction in his art. He was invested with several orders of knighthood in France, Portugal, and Prussia; was a member of the Royal Academy of Arts in Prussia, and of most of the principal musical institutions and societies in Europe and the United States. The doctorate of music was conferred on him by the University of Dublin, and he was one of the jury of the great London Exhibition in 1851. For several years before his death he was afflicted with an ophthalmic complaint, at one time almost amounting to deprivation of sight, but he partially recovered from its See Fetis, *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens,* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *Esquisse biographique de Sigismond Neukomm* par lui meme, in *La Maitrise* (Paris, 1859).

Neuman, Johann Georg

a German theologian, was born in 1661 at Hertz, near Merseburg. He was educated at the University of Wittenberg, and became in 1690 professor of poesy and librarian in his alma mater, and in 1692 obtained a theologian's chair; he was called later to the dignity of provost of the court chapel. His death occurred in 1709. Neuman was one of the principal adversaries of Spener. He wrote more than a hundred and twenty dissertations upon theological, historical, and literary subjects, most of which are collected in his *Primiiwe dissertationum* (Wittenberg, 1700, 1707, and 1716, 8vo), and in his *Progranmmata academica* (ibid. 1707 and 1722, 4to). He also published the biographies of several theologians; among them Hunnius, Hutter, Runge, etc. See Schonbach, *Vita Neumanni* (1716, 8vo); Raufft., *Leben der chur-sachsischen Theologen,* volume 2; Faber, *Nachrichten von der Schloss-Kirche zu Wittenberg;* Gass, *Dogmengesch.* 3:57; Erdmann, *Biographien der Probste zu Wittenberg.*

Noeuman, John Nepomacee, D.D.

a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Bohemia, March 28, 1811, and came to this country upon the completion of his university course at the high school in Prague. He took holy orders at New York in 1836, and subsequently entered the Order of the Most Holy Redeemer. After filling several appointments as priest, he was consecrated bishop of Philadelphia March 28, 1852, and he held that episcopal see until his decease, January 5, 1860. Bishop Neuman was generally esteemed and much beloved by his people. He was a man of more than ordinary ability.

Neumann, Carl Friedrich

a distinguished German Orientalist, ethnographer, and historian, was born, of Jewish parents, December 22, 1798, at Reichmannsdorf, near Bamberg. Without any means, but by hard study and diligence, he was enabled in the year 1817 to go to Heidelberg to attend the lectures there. In 1818 he joined the Christian Church, taking instead of his former name, *Bamberger,* that of *Neumann,* under which he became known to the literary world. Upon the completion of his studies at Heidelberg and Munich, he was appointed in 1821 as professor at the Gymnasium of Speier, but on account of his liberal views he had to give up his position in 1825. He next went to Venice, where he studied the Armenian language with the Mechitarists in the monastery of St. Lazarus; he then continued his Oriental studies at Paris and London; and in 1830 went to India and China, with a view to becoming thoroughly acquainted with the Chinese language and literature. He there collected a library of about 12,000 volumes, chiefly on Chinese literature; and after his return he was appointed, in 1833, professor at Munich, where he lectured on the Chinese and Armenian languages and literature, on ethnography, universal and German history, until the year 1852, when he was discharged on account of his liberal religious and political views. He settled at Berlin in 1863, and there he remained until his death, which occurred March 17, 1870. He was a close student of political and philosophical phases in history, and was greatly devoted to republican institutions. The American government he admired, and warmly met every American who had occasion to see him. He freely mingled in foreign society at Berlin, and was much sought after by all literature-loving strangers in the German capital. He wrote, *Memoirs sur la vie et les ourrages de David, philosophe Armenien* (Paris, 1829): — *Catechism of the Shamans* (from the Chinese, 1831): — *Pilgerfahrten buddhistischer Priester aus China nach Indien* (Leipsic, 1833): — *Lehrsaal des Mittelreichs* (Munich, 1836): — *Versuch einer Geschnichte der armenischen Litetatur* (Leipsic, 1836): — *Translations from the Chinese and Armenian, with Notes and Illustrations* (London, 1839): — *Geschichte des englischen Reiches in Asien* (Leipsic, 1857, 2 volumes): — *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Berlin, 1863-1866, 3 volumes), besides a number of essays, which were published in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society (1:91-128, 217-237; 4:33-43, 225-243; 7:141-155; 18:294). A translation of his *Hoei Schein, or The Discovery of America by Buddhist Monks in the 5th Century,* was

published at London in 1874. See Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche* (Hamburg, 1869), page 128; *Literarischer Handweiser,* 1870, page 487 sq.; Kurz, *Gesch. d. deutschen Literatur,* 4:867, 925; *For. Quar. Rev.* 21:126, 255. (J.H.W.)

Neumann, Caspar

a German theologian, noted as a Hebraist, was born at Breslau, in Silesia, Sept. 14, 1648. After graduating at the Gymnasium of St. Magdalen, he went in 1667 to Jena to study theology. Three years later he published his dissertation on the Roman Catholic Church *(D)issertatio de Ecclesia Catholica),* and the university conferred on him the title of "magister." He soon commenced lecturing on Church history, and his lectures were attended by a great many students. At the recommendation of the divines of Jena, duke Ernest the Pious, of Gotha, appointed him as the fellowtraveller of his son, prince Christian, with whom Neumann went through Germany, Switzerland, Southern France, Savoy, and Upper Italy. In 1678 he was appointed by the successor of the duke court-preacher in Altenburg. A year later the authorities of his native place appointed him to the diaconate of St. Mary Magdalen, and in 1689 as pastor of the same church and assessor of the consistory. In 1697 he became superintendent of the evangelical churches and schools, pastor of St. Elizabeth, and first professor of theology at the gymnasia. He died January 27, 1715. Besides devotional works, he wrote twdl]wT ae, *Genesis linguae sanctae Vet. Test.* (Norimb. 1696): — *Exodus linguae sanctae e captivitate Babylon. tentatus in Lexico etymologico Hebraeo-biblico* (ibid. 1697-1700): — , rb,[etyBej tp]mae *Janua at significationem hieroglyphicam litterarum Ebraicarum.* etc. part 3 (Breslau, 1712): — *De punctis vocalibus* (ibid 1715). Possessed of great learning, he was likewise a very pious and saintly man, full of love for humanity. He is also the author of thirty-nine hymns, which are yet to be found in many hymn-books. The best known is his *Herr, auf Erden muss ich leiden* (English translation in Choral-book for England, No. 66, "Lord, on earth I dwell sad-hearted"). See Tacken, *Life of M. Casp. Neumann* (Breslau and Leipsic, 1741); Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes,* 5:456 sq.; Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon,* 3:881; supplement by Rottermund, 5:563; Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz,* page 1339, s.v.; Furst, *Biblioth. Judaica,* 3:30; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr: Handbuch,* page 101; Bleek, *Einleitung. in das A. Test.* page 132; Keil, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* 2:175 (B.P.)

Neumann, Joachim

a noted German educator and Hebraist, was born at Brody, in Austrian Poland, in the year 1778 or 1779, of Jewish parentage. Up to his thirteenth year he received his education in the house of his father, which he then left for Posell, where he was enabled to satisfy his thirst for knowledge. Towards the end of the last century he obtained an appointment as teacher in a celebrated Jewish school at Dessau, where he remained until the year 1807. During his residence there he took part with three other learned Jews in publishing a German translation of the twelve minor prophets, which was accompanied by a Hebrew commentary. At that time a great change had taken place among the Jews living in different parts of Prussia with regard to their social position. About the year 1790 the king of Prussia granted the Jews who had obtained permission to live in Breslau an exemption from the taxes which had formerly been imposed on them when obtaining such permission, on the condition that they should establish a. school for the poor children of their community. This led to the founding of William School in 1791, and in 1807 Neumann was invited to become the head master and inspector of that school. For about nineteen years he had charge of that institution, i.e., from 1807 to 1826. During his connection with this school Neumann had been on terms of the most intimate friendship with professors Steffens and Scheibel, who were the means of bringing him to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ. Satisfied of the necessity of accepting Christ as the Messiah, he was baptized on April 16, 1826, together with his wife and three sons, in the parish church of St. Elizabeth, by professor Scheibel, having as one of the sponsors professor Braniss, of the University of Breslau, his brother-in-law. Neumann was now engaged as a teacher of Hebrew in the university, in which, besides professor Braniss, professor Fischer, professor of chemistry-another brother-in-law of his were distinguishing themselves. Neumann died suddenly, March 3, 1865. His second son is now professor of medicine in the University of Breslau. Neumann wrote, besides his *Commentary on Amos, Nahum, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi,* which was published at Dessau in 1805, under the title, µ[æsi[}yrœ]txq] rWabWea8t, a Hebrew Chrestomathy in 2 volumes. (Breslau, 1821). See Furst, *Bibl Jud.* 3:30; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (Leipsic, 1859), page 101; *Jewish Intelligencer,* 1865. (B.P.)

Neumark, Georg

a German musician and author of a great number of sacred songs, commonly heard in the evangelical churches of Germany, was born in Thuringia about the year 1621. His parents, who were poor, soon after went to reside at Mullhouse, in France, which accounts for his having often been considered a native of that city. In 1643 he went to study law at the University of Konigsberg, where Simon Dach, the centre of the Kinnigsberg school of poetry, was professor of poetry and poet-laureate. Dach was also a great musician. Under his influence the young law student became, like the professor, a musician and a poet. When a student Neumark frequently suffered for want of food. In 1651 he went to live at Hamburg. There his poverty was so great that he was obliged to pawn his violdi-gamba, a six-stringed instrument then in use, upon which he played very skilfully. In the midst of his sufferings he refused every unworthy method of seeking a livelihood, and preserved his simplicity of life and his trust in God. An attendant of the Swedish ambassador being greatly moved by a hymn which Neumark had sung, accompanying it upon his viol, which the Jew pawnbroker had permitted him to use, sought him out, learned his story, and afterwards repeated it to his master. The result was the young poet was appointed secretary of the ambassador. His first act on receiving the joyful news of his appointment was to redeem his viol. Then, as expressive of the way in which his faith had been justified by the issue, he composed his most famous hymn, *Wer nur den lieben Gott lasst walten,* translated into our tongue in the *Lyra Germanica* of Susanna Winkworth as "Leave God to order all thy ways." In 1651 he settled at Weimar, where he was appointed by duke William IV librarian of the royal archives. He lived a life of cheerful confidence in God, often giving expression to his pious sentiments in Christian hymns, and died at Weimar, July 8, 1681. Besides his numerous poetical productions, which were often published, Neumark wrote also some historical essays in Latin, such as *Horti historici, manuale et libellus precatorius*: — *Comediae de Caliste et Lysandro,* etc., a history of the successful society to which he belonged: — *Hochsprossender poetischer Palmbaum* (Nuremberg, 1670). The American Tract Society has published an English version of his hymns. See Miller's *Singers and Songs of the Church;* Koch, *Gesch. des Kircheniejdes,* volumes 1, 2, and 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 10:300.

Neumark, Jehuda Lob

(BEN-DAVID), OF HANAU, a Jewish writer of note, flourished near the opening of the 18th century. He died April 9, 1723. Jablonski (q.v.) mentions Neumark in the preface to his *Biblia Hebraica cum noiis Hebraicis* (Berlin, 1699) as the author of a Hebrew Grammar, entitled hdwhyjvr20v (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1693), which was long used and valued. In the preface to this grammar Neumark gives a history of the best Hebrew grammarians, and criticises very sharply the neglect of Hebrew philology. See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica,* 3:31; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei,* page 245 (Germ. trainsl.); Kalisch, *Hebr. Grammar,* 2:35; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch,* page 101; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana,* page 1364; Zunz, *Monatstage des Kalenderjahres,* page 18 (Berlin, 1872; Engl. transl. by the Reverend B. Pick in *Jewish Messenger,* New York, 1874). (B.P.)

Neumeister, Erdmann

a German Protestant divine and author of numerous hymns, was born at Uechtritz, near Weissenfels, May 12, 1671. He studied first at the school of Pforta, and afterwards at the University of Leipsic. In 1697 he became pastor at Bibra, in Thuringia, and filled successively the same office at Eckartsberga, Weissenfels, Sorau, and Hamburg, where he died, while pastor of the church of St. Jacob, August 18, 1756. He was an opponent both of pietism and of chiliasm, and held fast to the old orthodoxy. Neumeister is best known by his hymns, of which he wrote about 700; some of them are truly excellent, and still in use. Among these we notice. "Gott macht ein grosses Abendmahl," etc.; "Jesus nimmt die Sunder an," etc. (Engl. transl. in Mill's *Horae Germanicae,* page 73, "This man sinners doth receive"); "Wie Gott will!" also "Will ich sagen" (Engl. transl. in *Hynns from the Land of Luther,* page 155, as "Thou wilt, my God, I ever say"); and "Lass irdische Geschafte stehn," etc. He wrote also a *Specimen dissertationis historico-criticae de poetis Germanicis.* His poetical works are, *Funffache Kirchenandachten* (1716 and 1717): — *Fortgesetzte funffache Kirchenandachten* (1726): — *Evangelischer Nachklang* (1718-1729): — *Zugang zum Gnadenstuhl.* See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, 10:*301; Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes,* 5:371 sq.; Doring, *Die Deutschen Kanzelredner,* s.v.; Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz,* page 1339 sq. (J.H.W.)

Neuser, Adam

a German Socinian theologian, was born in Swabia in the 16th century. Educated in Lutheranism by his parents, who belonged to that communion, he entered the Reformed Church, after having finished his studies, probably because he sought greater liberty of thought than he could find in the Lutheran Church. He then established himself in the Palatinate, and soon gained the good-will of the elector, who appointed him pastor of St. Peter's Church of Heidelberg, and who even formed the project of giving him h professor's chair in the university of that city. But this prince wishing in 1569 to introduce into his states the ecclesiastical discipline of the Church of Geneva, Neuser strongly resisted the innovation, perhaps not so much because it departed from the civil power as because this discipline, by an excessive rigor, would have caused an intolerable weight of ecclesiastical despotism over the Reformed Church of the Palatinate. This bold opposition deprived him of the good graces of the elector, and he was dismissed from the pastorate. Neuser now openly espoused Socinianism, to which he had long inclined, and he exerted himself to spread its principles among his friends. Syivanus, pastor at Ludemburg, joined him in this design, which was communicated to Georg Blandrata, physician of the vaivode of Transylvania, and to some other ministers who professed the Socinian opinions. It is related that Neuser and Sylvanus sought to assure themselves of the protection of the sultan Selim, but that they were betrayed by the ambassador of the vaivode of Transylvania, whom they had charged with this negotiation, and that he delivered their letters to the elector palatine. Whatever may be the true history of it, they were certainly arrested, and conducted to Amberg. Sylvanus was decapitated in 1572; Neuser succeeded in escaping from his prison, and, after having wandered over the country for some time, arrived in Constantinople, where he became a Mussulman, and died in the Mohammedan faith, October 11, 1576. As might be expected, the memory of this restless and adventurous man has not been spared. He has been accused, though without apparent ground, of all vices, among others of drunkenness. It is just to add that those who have painted him in black colors recognise, however, by a singular contradiction, that there never was anything to reprimand in his conduct except his departure from orthodoxy, and this, of course, must be regretted. We are assured that he obtained a great ascendency over the people of the Palatinate, and that he owed this extraordinary consideration as well to his religious zeal as to his eloquence. It is a. pity that a man of

his ability should have suffered himself to be led away from his moorings to land finally in Mohammedanism. The biographical *Lexikons* of Jocher assures us that he has left no printed work; the *Biographie Universelle*, on the contrary, pretends that his writings are numerous, and that they have been collected by the Socinians. The *Bibliotheque des Anti-Trinitaires*, which calls him *Neusner*, quotes but one — *Scopus Septini Capitis ad Romanos* (Ingolstadt, 1583, 8vo). His letter to Selim, if it be authentic, is found in the collection of Meg —*Monumenta pietatis et litteraturae* (Frankfort, 1702, 4to), part 1, page 318; volume 3 of the *Melanges tires de la Bibliotheque de Wolfenbuttel* has another letter of Neuser, containing the apology for his conduct, dated at Constantinople the Wednesday before Easter of the year 1574. See Jicher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Gass, *Dognengesch.* 2:21. (J.H.W.)

Neuss, Heinrich Georg, D.D.

a German Lutheran theologian, was born, March 11, 1654, at Elbingeroda, in the duchy of Brunswick. He received his early education at Osterwick, Quedlinburg, and Halberstidt. Being very poor, he accepted the private tutorship in the house of Dr. Reccius, in Wernigerode, a position which he held for three years, until, in 1677, he was enabled to go to Erfurt, where he studied theology. In 1683 he was appointed connector at Blankenburg, and in the next year rector. In 1690 he became adjunct to the Reverend Chr. Schmidt in Wolfenbuttel, and then deacon at the church of St. Henrici. Here he became intimately connected with two other pious ministers, who commenced to hold private meetings for devotional purposes. Soon, however, these meetings were openly spoken against, especially under the lead of Fr. Ulr. Calixt, of Helmstadt, who wrote against chiliasm, and the result was that in 1692 an edict was issued which forbade such pietism as heresy. These three menithen left Wolfenbiittel. Neuss was called to Hedwigsburg, and three years later, in 1695, the duke Rudolph Augustus appointed him superintendent in Remmlingen; and in 1696 count Ernest von Stolberg called him to Wernigerode as pastor primarius at St. Sylvester and George, and superintendent and councillor of the conlistory. Neuss died there September 30, 1716. Besides some theological works, he also published a collection of 134 hymns, entitled *Hebopfer* (heave-offering). The best known of his hymns is his "Ein reines Herz, Herr schaff in mir" (Engl. transl. by E. Cox, in *Hymns from the German*, page 176, "A new and contrite heart create"). Comp. Koch, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, 4:425 sq.; 5:573 sq.; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:888;

supplempent by Rottermund, 5:589 sq.; Wezel, *Hymnopoeographia* (Hermstadt, 1721), 2:240 sq.; Winterfeld, *Der evang. Kirchengesang* (Leips. 1845), 2:522-533. (B.P.)

Neustadt, Bible of

is the title of a revision of Luther's version of the Scriptures made at Neustadt in 1588 by the Reformed Church to express more clearly the Calvinistic notions of that body. The master spirit in this revision was David Pareus. In 1595 the *Biblia Herbornensia* was brought out by the Reformed body, and it met with less opposition. *SEE PAREUS (DAVID)* and *SEE SIEGWART*.

Neuville, Charles Frey de

a French pulpit orator, brother of the following, was born in the diocese of Coutances, December 23, 1693. He was educated in the college of the Jesuits at Rennes, who, recognising his ability, initiated him into their order in 1710. He taught belles-lettres and philosophy for eighteen years, when he made his debut in the pulpit, where he had great success (1736). After the dissolution of his society, his presence, quite inoffensive, was tolerated in France, and, under the protection of the king and queen, he lived unmolested but retired. His death occurred July 13, 1774, in St. Germain-en-Laye. We have of his works, *Oraison funebre de M. le Cardinal de Fleury*, etc. (Paris, 1743, 4to, and often): — *Oraison de tres-haut, tres-puissant seigneur Charles-Auguste Foucquet de BelleIsle, duc de Gisors, pair et marechal de France*, etc. (Paris, 1761, 4to): — *Sermons* (Paris, 1777, 8 volumes, 12mo; Lyons, 1778, 8 volumes, 12mo). These sermons have been translated into German by J.B. Dily (Vienna, 1777-80, 8 volumes, 8vo) and by Priest. Job. Buchmann (Augsburg, 1841, 12mo); into Spanish by Juan-Antonio Pellicer, Juan Ceron, and Pontela (Madrid, 1784); into Italian (Venice, 1774, 1786, 1793). Neuville had collected three volumes of *Observations hist. et crit.*, but the fear of wrong interpretations and of compromising his editors determined him, some days before his death, to throw his manuscript into the fire. Biographers have often confounded this ecclesiastical orator with his brother, and with Anne Joseph de la Neuville. See Caballero, *Bibliothecae scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (Rome, 181416, 4to); Alois et Alphonse de Backer, *Bibl. des csrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus*, 1st series, pages 519, 520.

Neuville, Pierre-Claude Frey de

a French theologian, was born at Grandville, September 5, 1692. His family were originally from the canton of Basle, and went for some unknown cause to dwell in Brittany. Neuville entered, September 12, 1710, the Society of Jesus, where he occupied honorable and responsible positions. Twice he was provincial. He was a good preacher. When his order was threatened with dissolution (1763), he did not await persecution, but retired to Rennes, where he died in August 1775. We have of his works, *Sermons* (Rouen, 1778, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *Observations sur l'institut de la Societe de Jesus* (Avignon, 1761, 1762, 1771, 12mo): — *Lettre d'un ami de la verite a ceux qui ne haissent pas la lumieure, ou reflexions critiques sur les repoches faits a la Societe de Jesus relativement a la doctrine* (12mo). See Raymond Diosada Caballero, *Bibliothecae scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (181416, 4to); Feller, *Supplement de la France litteraire; Nouvel appel a la raison des ecrits et libelles publies par la passion contre les Jesuites de France* (Brussels, 1761, 12mo); Alois et Alp. de Backer, *Bibliotheque des ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus;* Barbier, *Dict. des Anovymes,* No. 9643; *Catalogus personarum et officiorum provincies Franciae Societatis Jesu,* ann. 1759, page 3.

Neuville (De Plessis-Bardoul), Roland de

a noted French prelate, was born in 1530. He was abbd of St. James of Montfort when, in 1562, he was nominated bishop of St. Pol-de-Leon by the protection of the duke d'Etampes, in the place of Roland de Chauvignd. Though he may have assisted at the Council of Tours (1583), and may have subscribed to the edicts of toleration published in 1588, Neuville showed himself none the less a violent persecutor of the Protestants; he himself boasted of not having left a single heretic in his diocese. He died in Rennes, February 5, 1613, after fifty years' episcopate. The library of Lyons possesses, No. 441, a very beautiful *Missale ecclesiae Gallicob* , folio, written in magnificent Gothic characters and illuminated with excellent vignettes, which appears to have been the property of Roland de Neuville.

Nevay, John

a noted Scotch Presbyterian minister, who flourished in the days of the English Revolution as pastor of Newmills, in the parish of London, was identified with the struggle for the independence of the Kirk, and in 1647

gained unenviable notoriety by the severe measures which he counselled general Leslie to adopt against the British soldiery. But, though severe with his opponents in religion, Mr. Nevay cannot be said to have lacked in religious devotion and Christian zeal. He is commended by his contemporaries of the Kirk for soundness in the faith, shining piety in conversation, and great diligence in attending all the parts of his ministerial functions, particularly church judicatories; one who was always very zealous in contending against steps of defection contrary to the work of reformation carried on in that period. See *Scots Worthies*, page 287.

Neve, Francois de

a Flemish painter of sacred art, was born at Antwerp, according to Balkema, in 1625. He studied for some time the works of Rubens and Vandyck, and afterwards visited Rome for improvement, where he resided several years. On' returning to Flanders he painted a number of good historical works which gained him considerable reputation; but he afterwards painted heroic landscapes with subjects from history or fable, in which he evinced great fertility of invention and refinement of taste. Bartsch mentions fourteen etchings by this artist, executed in a slight but very masterly style, embellished with figures correctly drawn and ingeniously grouped. Neve died in 1681. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, 2:615.

Neve, Timothy (1), D.D.

an English divine, was born at Wotton, in Shropshire, in 1694, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge University. After graduation he taught for a while at Spalding, then took holy orders and was made minor canon of Peterborough; while there he was a joint-founder of "The Gentleman's Society," of which he was for a long time secretary. He was afterwards successively prebendary of Lincoln, archdeacon of Huntingdon, and rector of Alwalton, in Huntingdonshire, where he died in 1759. Dr. Neve was chaplain to the bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Thomas, and is spoken of by his contemporaries as a worthy man and a close student. He published one sermon, entitled *Preaching with Authority* (Oxf. 1747, 8vo), and several astronomical papers which have been republished in this country in the *Philadelphia Transactions;* also an essay on the *Invention of Printing.*

Neve, Timothy (2), D.D.

an eminent English divine, son of the preceding, was born at Spalding in 1724. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which he was elected fellow in 1747. He became successively chaplain of Merton College, rector of Geddington (in 1762) and of Middleton Stoney; was elected Margaret professor of divinity at Oxford, and installed prebendary of Worcester in 1783. He died in 1798. He was an able theologian and scholar. He published a sermon preached before the earl of Westmoreland, chancellor of the University of Oxford, on July 8, 1759, and entitled *The Comparative Blessings of Christianity — Eight Sermons preached*, in 1781, *at the Lecture founded by the Reverend John Bampton* (Oxf. 1781, 8vo): — *Seventeen Sermons on various Subjects* (ibid. 1798, 8vo): — *Animadversiolas on Phillips's Life of Cardinal Pole* (ibid. 1766, 8vo). See Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica*, 2:2169; *Genesis Biog.Dict.* s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7, s.v.

Nevil(le), Thomas, D.D.

an English theologian of the Elizabethan period, noted for his strict adherence to the Calvinistic doctrines in a sharp and decisive form, was born at Canterbury, educated at the University of Cambridge, and became a fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1570. Ten years after we find him proctor of the university, and in 1582 presented to the mastership of Magdalen College. In 1590 he was promoted by the queen to the deaniery of Peterborough. In 1593 he was appointed to the mastership of Trinity College, and in March, 1594, resigned the rectory of Doddington, on being presented to that of Teversham, near Cambridge. In 1595 he was concerned in the controversy which originated at Cambridge from the public declaration of William Barret, fellow of Caius College, against the doctrine of predestination and falling from grace. On these points, the general persuasion being then favorable to the system of Calvin, Barret was called before some of the heads of the Church, and compelled to retract his Arminian opinions. The dispute, however, which was referred by both parties to archbishop Whitgift, occasioned the well-known conference of the divines at Lambeth (1595), where they agreed on certain propositions, in conformity with Calvin's principles, commonly called the *Lambeth Articles* (q.v.). Dr. Neville and his brethren soon after had to complain of Dr. Baro(n), lady Margaret professor of divinity, for maintaining some doctrines respecting universal salvation diametrically opposite to those of

the Lambeth Articles, in consequence of which he was removed from his station in the university. (For a full account of this, see the life of Peter Baro(n); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:647; and Strype, *Annals*, 4:322.) In 1597 Neville was promoted to the deanery of Canterbury. He was in this position on the accession of king James to the throne of England, and was by archbishop Whitgift, in his, own name and of all the bishops and clergy, sent into Scotland to give his majesty assurance of their unfeigned duty and loyalty, and to know what commands he had for them to observe concerning ecclesiastical causes; recommending also the Church of England to his favor and protection. The Puritans had always hoped much for the Presbyterian cause from this king, and the Anglican clergy were therefore doubly anxious as to the result of this mission,which was evidently intended to win him over to the support of the Anglican establishment. It proved that Dr. Neville was the right man for this mission. He impressed the king favorably, and was given the assurance that he (i.e. James) would uphold the government of the late queen as she had left it. This answer was quite in conformity with king James's recent action in Scotland, *SEE JAMES I*. He was inclined to Romanism, but fearing to offend by such an extreme departure, he halted in the Anglican camp, and from henceforth favored Episcopalianism. Neville himself was the frequent recipient of king' James's favor. Thus the king, when on a visit to Cambridge in 1615, accepted the hospitality of Dr. Neville, then at Trinity College. Dr. Neville died in 1615, shortly after king James had visited him. By his munificence to Trinity College Dr. Neville has secured to himself the gratitude and admiration of posterity. He expended more than £3000 in rebuilding that fine quadrangle which to this day retains the name of Neville's Court. He was also a contributor to the library of the college, and a benefactor to Eastbridge Hospital in his native city. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:402-404; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:19; Soames, *Elizabethan Religious History*, pages 454, 471-473, 517; Froude, *Hist. of Eng.* (see Index in volume 12). (J.H.W.)

Nevin, Thomas

an Irish Presbyterian divine, flourished after the opening of the 18th century as pastor of a church in Downpatrick. This church belonged at that time to the synod of Ulster, which was then greatly agitated by the question whether any Presbyterian-ministers could refuse to sign a confession on the ground that by such an act they gave up the right of private judgment. Mr. Nevin belonged to the party who at the synod of

1721 refused to subscribe to the Westminster Confession, and were therefore named *Non-Subscribers*. They were open to much suspicion; and after the synod of 1723, when the controversy regarding the propriety of intercommunion among the subscribers and non-subscribers had become general, Mr. Nevin, having carelessly expressed himself on the Trinitarian doctrine, was forthwith accused of heresy, and brought to trial in the synod of 1724; and though "satisfactory proofs were laid before the synod of Mr. Nevin's orthodoxy; this cardinal point of the Saviour's Deity,... the synod, disregarding these testimonies, and fully aware of Mr. Nevin's determination not to clear himself, under existing circumstances, by any declaration or subscription, resolved not to inquire further into the truth or relevancy of this accusation, but simply to require of him an immediate declaration of his belief in the Supreme Deity of Christ. With this demand, as was to be expected, he refused to comply, as the principle so frequently avowed by the non-subscribers that to clear himself by any such method was directly sinful; but he added that his refusal did not proceed from any disbelief of the doctrine of the Supreme Deity of Christ. Nothing, therefore, could be held to be proved against him, beyond the fact of his being a non-subscriber, like the rest of his party. Yet it was moved that, as Mr. Nevin had refused to make the declaration required of him, the synod should hold no further ministerial communion with him, nor proceed any further in his trial. This motion was carried." By the peculiar nature of the sentence passed on him, Mr. Nevin, though deprived of ministerial communion with the synod, was yet suffered to enjoy his ministerial character, and he therefore remained pastor of Downpatrick. He died about 1730. See Killen's Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, 3:206 sq., 219 sq.

Nevins, William, D.D.

a noted Presbyterian minister, was born in Norwich, Connecticut, October 13, 1797. After a mercantile education, he entered Yale College in 1812, and graduated in 1816. He then became a member of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was licensed to preach at Lisbon, Conn., in September, 1819. On October 19, 1820, he was ordained and installed pastor of the First Presbvterian Church in Baltimore. His health having become impaired, he went for some time to St. Croix to try the effects of a milder climate. Not deriving any benefit from it, however, he returned to Baltimore, and there died, September 14, 1835. Dr. Nevins published two sermons in the *National Preacher,* and five tracts through the American

Tract Society. Shortly after his death where was published a selection of his manuscripts, entitled *Select Remains,* with a memoir by Reverend William S. Plumer, D.D. His contributions to the *N.Y. Observer* were published about the same time in two small volumes, entitled *Thoughts on Popery* and *Practical Thoughts.* A volume of *Sermons.* selected by himself, was printed in 1837. All of his publications were most acceptable at the time of their appearance, and have continued to exert an influence for good to this time. As a pastor and preacher Dr. Nevins was deservedly popular. See, besides the memoir already referred to, Sprague, *Annals,* 4:629.

Nevis

a small but beautiful and fertile island of the West Indies, belonging to Great Britain, forms one of the group of the Lesser Antilles, and lies immediately south-east of St. Christopher, from which it is separated by a strait called the Narrows, two miles wide. It is circular in form, rises in a central peak to the height of about 2500 feet, and has an area of 45 square miles. Population (1871), 11,735, of whom only a small proportion, not more than one fifth, is white. Charlestown, a seaport, with a tolerable roadstead, situated on the south-west shore of the island, is the seat of government, consisting of a government council and general assembly. The principal products are sugar, molasses, and rum. Nevis was colonized by English emigrants from St. Christopher in 1628, was taken by the French in 1706, and restored by the peace of Utrecht; it was taken again by the French in 1782, but restored by the peace of 1783. The Romanists have many adherents in Nevis. The Wesleyans, who were the first Protestant missionaries to preach in the West Indies, established a station at Gingerland, and are laboring there with some appearance of ultimate success. At Charlestown the United Presbyterian Mission is pushing the work of evangelization, especially among the blacks.

Additional Note on the Mormons. — Since our article on this subject was written, the collision between the Mormon authorities and the United States government — which is still the supreme and sole general civil administration in the territory, Congress having steadily refused to admit Utah as a State in the Union without such stipulations to loyalty, as the Mormons are unwilling to accept — has resulted in the federal court taking possession of the Mormon premises in Salt Lake City, practically confiscating, or at least occupying and controlling, them, on the groun of treason; and it is said that the Mormons are secretly preparing for another

migration, this time to Mexico, where they have purchased a large tract of land, so as to be beyond our jursidiction. The temple is nearly completed, although likewsie in the hands of the general government; but it is not to be used by the Mormons as a place of worship, for which intended its interior construction is not adapted, but for purposes of ecclesiastical ceremony and general office work. The denunciatory tone of Mormons is now greatly moderated; and although the old style of declamation on the subject of civil power is still maintained, its tone is greatly softened, and all talk of open or forcible rebellion is abandoned. Criminal suits have been instituted, and are still pending before the U.S. courts, also against many leading Mormons for bigamy, adultery, and other unchaste practices, and in consequence polygamy is generally abandoned, at least in public, by the sect as a whole. The general aspect of the situation points to a speedy disruption of the Mormon community in Utah, especially as the influx of non-Mormon immigrants is gradually but surely overpowering them.