

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**New, Charles- Niles, William Watson**

*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**

## New, Charles

a British missionary to Africa who suffered martyrdom very recently, was a member of the *United Methodist Free Churches* of England. He was laboring among the Chagga, whose chief, Mandara, conceived ill-feelings against New, and used him so ill that he died in consequence of the severe treatment he experienced, in the summer of 1875. The British government is at this writing in negotiation with the Chagga to secure indemnity for their brutal conduct towards one of its subjects. Mr. New deserves to be remembered not only for his Christian missionary labors, but also for his service to African exploration.

## New-Birth

is the technical expression frequently used instead of *regeneration* to express the change from a natural or irreligious to a Christian living. The Church of England theology defines it as “That thing which *by nature* a human being *cannot have*;” “that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ’s holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same.” “A death unto sin, and *a new birth unto righteousness*.” In short, it is that change of the moral nature which is requisite for salvation. This requirement, made by the Protestant Church in Christ’s name, is undertaken by the person to be baptized. In the Anglican and Lutheran churches, in the case of infants to be baptized, the sponsor or parent assumes the responsibility of so training the candidate for baptism that when, “having come to years of discretion,” he recognises the vows of his baptism, and “lives soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.” An ambiguity has arisen from the difference of sense in which the term “new-birth” is at different times employed. It is used by some (in a sense allied to the above statement) to denote the admission to the privileges with which the Christian Church is endowed: namely, that grace whose tendency is to place us in the way of salvation; by others, to signify the state of mind *suitable* to those who are born of (God, and are in the path that leads to eternal life. **SEE CONVERSION SEE JUSTIFICATION; SEE REGENERATION; SEE SALVATION.**

## New-Born

a sect which arose in the United States in the early part of the last century. It was originated by Matthias Baumann, a German emigrant, who embarked for America in 1719, and settled in what is now Bucks County,

Pa. During the few years which he passed in his adopted country — he died in 1727 — Baumann succeeded in drawing around him a small sect who called themselves *New-Born*, pretending to have received the new birth through mediate inspiration, apparitions, dreams, and the like. Any one who had thus been regenerated was alleged to be like Christ and God, and to be incapable of any longer committing sin. They denied that the Bible is necessary as a means of salvation, and scoffed at the holy sacraments. The privilege of impeccability they believed to be the portion of all who truly belonged to Christ. The New Birth they held to be that new stone which none knoweth but he that receiveth it. The sect appears to have survived the death of its founder little more than twenty years.

### New Britain

is the name of one principal and of several subsidiary islands in the Pacific Ocean situated between lat. 40 and 63 30' S., and long. 148<sup>0</sup> and 152<sup>0</sup> 30' E. The principal island, 300 miles in length, and having an area of 12,000 square miles, lies east of New Guinea, from which it is separated by Dampier Strait. The surface is mountainous in the interior, with active volcanoes in the north, but along the coast are fertile plains. Forests abound in the island, and palms, sugarcane, breadfruit, etc., are produced. The inhabitants, the number of whom is unknown, are the *Negritos*. They are well-formed, active, and of a very dark complexion. They are further advanced in civilization than is usual among the Polynesians, have a formal religious worship, temples, and images of their deities. New Britain was first seen by Le Maire and Schouten in 1616, but Dampier, at a later date, was the first to land. *SEE NEGRITOS* and *SEE POLYNESIANS*.

### New Brunswick

#### Picture for New Brunswick

a province of British America, originally a part of Nova Scotia, is situated to the north of that province, and to the south-east of Canada. It has an area of 27,322 square miles, with a coast-line of 500 miles in extent. The population of New Brunswick in 1881 amounted to 321,233. The scenery of this province is beautiful, its soil is rich, and the land abounds in mineral wealth. The northern districts of the province, from the Bay of Chaleurs to the St. John, are occupied by metamorphic slates. In the south the carboniferous and new red sandstone systems (including deposits of red marl and gypsum, and extensive beds of coal) prevail. One third of the

surface of New Brunswick is underlaid by a bed of coal. Many of the coal-measures, however, are thin and impure; but the coal of Albert County is one of the most valuable deposits of bituminous coal on the American continent, and is apparently inexhaustible. Throughout the province 2842 tons of coal were mined in 1851, and 18,244 tons in 1861; but mining has not yet become an important branch of industry. Gold and silver occur in New Brunswick; copper and iron ore of excellent quality abound; gypsum, plumbago, and limestone are very abundant; and the freestone of the province, unsurpassed for beauty and durability, commands a high price in the United States. In 1861, 42,965 casks of lime, 42,476 grindstones, 14,080 tons of building-stone, and 14,000 tons of gypsum were brought into the market. Wild animals abound in the province, the lakes and rivers are well stocked with fish, and along the coasts cod, haddock, salmon, and other fish are caught in great plenty. Indeed, its fisheries are a principal source of income to the province. The autumn — and especially the season called the Indian summer—is particularly agreeable, and the severity of the winter has been already much mitigated by the clearing of the forests. In the interior, the heat in summer rises to 80°, and sometimes to 95°; and in winter, which lasts from the middle of December to the middle of March, the mercury sometimes falls as low as 40° below zero. At Frederickton, the capital, situated on St. John River, 65 miles from the south, and 130 miles from the north coast, the temperature ranges from 35° below to 95° above zero, and the mean is about 42.0. In its social circumstances New Brunswick is preferable to any territory in the same latitude. Though not much given to agricultural development, a healthy state pervades all classes of society, as may be learned from the fact that the provincial penitentiary of St. John contained only thirty convicts (on Dec. 31, 1873). Altogether the province has fourteen jails, and these only contained in all 149 inmates, according to the census of 1871. This unusually high moral status of the community is fostered by a system of free public schools, which was last improved by an act of 1871. The schools are under the general supervision of a chief superintendent of education of the province, with a county inspector for each county, and boards of trustees for the several districts, and are supported by a provincial grant and a county tax equal to thirty cents per head, supplemented by a local tax, which includes a poll-tax of one dollar per head. The expenditures from the provincial treasury for school purposes during the year ending April 30, 1874, were \$122,067 69. The number of schools in operation during the summer term ending Oct. 31, 1874, was 1049, with 1077 teachers and 45,539 pupils; number in

attendance some portion of the year ending on that date, 60,467; number of school districts, 1392; number of school-houses, 1050. A provincial training and model school is sustained at Fredericton; besides which there is the University of New Brunswick at Fredericton, established since 1800, which embraces in its curriculum a classical course of three years, and special courses in civil engineering and surveying, agriculture, commerce, and navigation. There is an annual scholarship of \$60 for one student for each county, who also receives tuition free; and there are five free scholarships, distributed among the counties and cities, exempting from the payment of tuition fees also. In 1872-73 the number of professors was 7; students, 51. The Methodists since 1862 own Mount Allison Wesleyan College at Sackville, which is in connection with the provincial university, and is open to both sexes. It has classical, scientific, and special classes, and provision is made for theological instruction. A male academy and commercial school, in operation more than thirty years, and a female academy, organized in 1854, are connected with it. In 1873-74 these institutions had 15 professors and instructors (5 in the college), 213 students (34 in the college), and a library of 4000 volumes. The Roman Catholics have the St. Joseph's College at Memramcook; it has a commercial course of four years, and a classical course of five years, both taught through the medium of the French and English branches. In 1874-75 it employed 18 professors and instructors, and had 140 students, and a library of 1000 volumes.

The first Wesleyan missionary sent out to this country was the Rev. A. J. Bishop, who arrived in the city of St. John, the capital of the colony. Sept. 24, 1791. He found the inhabitants in a state of great spiritual destitution, and commenced his labors in the true missionary spirit. From this small beginning much good resulted, and the Methodists have become a powerful and a respectable body in the country. The Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians have also done much for the spread of the Gospel. Although the work, as carried on by all denominations in New Brunswick, resembles in many respects that of the mother country, there is still a loud call for an increase of evangelical agency to meet the spiritual necessities of a scattered population in many parts of the colony, as numbers are still to be found who seldom hear a Gospel sermon. The number of the inhabitants in 1871 belonging to the various religious denominations, and the number of churches and buildings attached thereto, are shown in the following table:

Of the Baptists, 27,866 were Free-will Baptists, and of the Methodists, 26,212 were Wesleyans. The principal denominations not named in the table were Adventists (711), Christian Conference (1418), Congregationalists (1193), and Universalists (590).

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia originally formed one French colony, called *Acadic* or *New France*. The first settlement within the present limits of New Brunswick was made by the French on the Bay of Chaleurs in 1639. Other settlements were made in 1672 on the Miramichi River, and elsewhere on the east coast. This accounts for the large number of Roman Catholics in the country. In 1713 Acadia was ceded to the English by the treaty of Utrecht. The first British settler established himself on the Miramichi in 1764, and in 1784 New Brunswick was separated from Nova Scotia, and erected into a distinct colony. The first legislative assembly met at St. John in January, 1786. At the close of the American Revolution about 5000 royalists from the United States settled there, and their descendants now form a considerable portion of the population. In 1867 New Brunswick was made a British province of the Canadian dominion, and is now ruled by a lieutenant governor, who holds office for five years, assisted by an executive council of nine members, who are all responsible to an assembly of the people. See for further details the *American Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

## New Caledonia

an island of the South Pacific Ocean, belonging to France, and lying about 720 miles east-north-east of the coast of Queensland, in Australia, in lat.  $20^{\circ}$ - $22^{\circ}$   $30'$  S., long.  $164^{\circ}$ - $167^{\circ}$  E., is about 200 miles in length, 30 miles in breadth, and has a population estimated at 60,703. New Caledonia is of volcanic origin, is traversed in the direction of its length, from north-west to south-east, by a range of mountains, which in some cases reach the height of about 8000 feet, and is surrounded by sand-banks and coral-reefs. There are secure harbors at Port Balade and Port St. Vincent, the former on the north-east, the latter on the southwest part of the island. In the valleys the soil is fruitful, producing the cocoa-nut, banana, mango, breadfruit, etc. The sugar-cane is cultivated, and the vine grows wild. The coasts support considerable tracts of forest, but the mountains are barren.

The inhabitants of New Caledonia, who resemble the Papuan race, consist of different tribes. They speak a language kindred to the Australian tongues, and are hospitable and honest. They are a well-formed people, tall

and robust, but indolent. Their skin is deep black, and their hair coarse and bushy. They are fond of painting their faces, and even in settlements they wear but little clothing. Their huts, built of spars and reeds, thatched with bark, and entered by a very small opening, bear some resemblance to beehives.

New Caledonia was discovered by captain Cook in 1774. In 1853 the French took official possession of it, and it is now comprised under the same government with Otaheite and the Marquesas Isles. New Caledonia has hitherto been scarcely visited by Protestant missionary enterprise. Some teachers from Samoa attempted to form a community on the Isle of Pines about 1852, but were driven away. French Roman Catholic priests have, however, labored in this quarter for many years with great zeal and courage, worthy of better results than they have secured. It is not easy to obtain a connected view of these attempts from the loose and disjointed statements contained in the *Annales de la Propagation de la F<sup>oi</sup>*, the only authority to which we have access. We find that for several years there have been a vicar apostolic of Melanesia and Micronesia, whose headquarters have varied according to circumstances. One of these dignitaries, bishop Epalle, was murdered in 1846, in the exercise of his vocation, at the Solomon Islands, in the neighborhood of New Guinea. The priests, his companions, absolutely forbade the reprisals which a French officer would fain have exercised for his death, and the mission in that quarter has since been abandoned. Bishop Epalle has been succeeded in his vicariate by monseigneur Collomb, titular bishop of Antiphelle, whose headquarters for some time were in New Caledonia. In 1845 and in 1846 we find priests laboring with very indifferent success among these intractable savages; and in 1847 a ferocious onslaught was made on their little quarters in Balad. in which two priests were killed, and bishop Collomb himself narrowly escaped with his life. The assault was wholly unprovoked; but one of the party seems to have unfortunately exhibited a gun in self-defense, which heightened the exasperation of the assailants. Violent though deserved retribution was taken for it by the crew of a French vessel of war. The French occupation in this instance seems therefore to have been preceded for some years by the missionary efforts of their ecclesiastics. Very recently the labors of the Roman Catholic missionaries have been crowned with greater success than heretofore. Several thousand natives have embraced Christianity, and formed prosperous settlements, where are now cultivated a variety of vegetables and fruits, including wheat and barley, besides the

raising of live-stock. The number of islanders who have embraced Christianity is estimated at 5000. They are proving industrious and temperate citizens. During the last French revolutionary movement the Communists condemned to penal life were sent to this island. See the (London) *Quarterly Review*, 1854, pt. 1, p. 97 aq.

### Newcastle, William Cavendish

*Duke of*, an English general who fought against the Covenanters, deserves a place here for the part he played in the warfare of a State Church against nonconforming religionists. He was born in 1592. He was the nephew of William Cavendish, founder of the ducal house of Devonshire; succeeded in 1617 to large estates, and devoted himself to poetry, music, and other accomplishments. In 1620 he was raised to the peerage as baron Ogle and viscount Mansfield, and in 1628 was created earl of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. At the outbreak of the civil wars he sided with the king, to whose treasury he contributed £10,000, and took the field at the head of 200 cavaliers. He was entrusted with the command of the four northern counties; and, raising an army of 10,000 men, he prostrated the power of the Parliament in that part of England, defeated Sir Thomas Fairfax at Atherton Moor, June 30, 1643, and was made marquis of Newcastle. Subsequently he held the Scots in check at Durham; but was obliged in April, 1644, in consequence of the defeat of colonel Bellasis at Selby, to throw himself with all his forces into York, where for the next three months he sustained an investment by a greatly superior army under Fairfax. Upon the advance of the royal army under Rupert, he joined the latter, with the greater part of the garrison, and endeavored to persuade him that, having raised the siege, he had better defer a battle until the arrival of reinforcements. This advice was disregarded, and the battle of Marston Moor was fought, which ruined the royal cause in the North. Marquis of Newcastle then forced his way with a few followers to Scarborough, set sail for the Continent, and established himself in Antwerp. His estates having been sequestered by Parliament in 1652, he lived in extreme poverty during the protectorate; but on the restoration He received substantial honors, and in March, 1664, was created earl of Ogle and duke of Newcastle. Clarendon says "he was a very fine gentleman, active, and full of courage." For further details, see the excellent article in the *American Cyclopaedia*, 12:282, 283. See also Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Enyland* (Restoration), 2:58; Stephens, *Eccles. Hist. of Scotland*, 2:24, 278; Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion*, vol. 1, bk. 6, sq.



## New Catholics

*SEE HOLY COAT OF TRAVES; SEE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN GERMANY; SEE RONGE.*

## New Christians

a name for Jews who were obliged by the edicts of the Inquisition to embrace Christianity in the 15th century, to avoid unheard-of tortures and death for conscience' sake. Many, rather than quit their homes, embraced the faith for which they had no fervor. (From that time the term New Christians has designated Jewish converts to Romanism.) *SEE MARANOS*. Romanism, however, was not content to make converts. It sought ardent followers, and the inquisitors, finding that, though there were "New Christians" in the land, there were yet Jewish services secretly performed and Jewish practices scrupulously observed, determined to have the property of those rebels or unsubmitive ones if it could not own their souls. The inquisitors therefore, on January 2, 1481, issued an edict, by which they ordered the arrest of several of the New Christians who were strongly suspected of heresy, and the sequestration of their property, and denounced the pain of excommunication against those who favored or abetted them. The number of prisoners soon became so great that the Dominican convent of St. Paul, at Seville, where the Inquisition was established, proved not large enough to contain them, and the court was removed to the castle of Triana, in a suburb of Seville. The inquisitors issued subsequently another edict, by which they ordered every person, under pain of mortal sin and excommunication, to inform against those who had relapsed into the Jewish faith or rites, or who gave reason for being suspected of having relapsed, specifying numerous indications by which they might be known. Sentences of death soon followed; and in the course of that year (1481) 298 "New Christians" were burned alive in the city of Seville, 2000 in other parts of Andalusia, and 17,000 were subjected to various penalties. The property of those who were executed, which was considerable, was confiscated. The terror excited by these executions caused a vast number of "New Christians" to emigrate into Portugal, where numerous communities of Portuguese Jews already existed, who had come to be treated with comparative fairness. In Portugal, e.g., the Jews had long been allowed to appoint judges of their own people, and were otherwise favored. They had consequently attained a high degree of culture: they cultivated medicine, science, and letters. Among a rude

people of warriors and husbandmen, the Jews succeeded, to some extent, to the place left vacant by the Moors. They were the authors, the merchants, and the physicians of the nation; they founded a famous academy in Lisbon, which produced several eminent mathematicians, grammarians, poets, theologians, botanists, and geographers. The first book printed in Portugal was printed by a Jew. By perseverance, union, and talent, the Jews very soon became possessed of enormous influence in that country. But this influence naturally caused a feeling of jealousy in the populace, who could not calmly behold a people whom they considered abandoned by God enjoying such prosperity. This feeling of rancor finally brought about the edict for the expulsion of the Jews from Portugal, which for a time appeased the popular fury. It was, however, but the calm preceding a violent eruption, which exploded on those victims who, bound to the land by ties of family affection or interest, sacrificed their faith to their emotions. Detested by the Christians, who were the authors of their apostasy, and humiliated in their own opinion, the New Christians of Portugal, with those from Spain, cherished in their souls the deepest devotion to their ancient faith, but hoped that hypocrisy might be proof against the numberless opportunities of revenge which their riches afforded. Finally the day came which proved the St. Bartholomew to these poor Jewish converts of the Iberian peninsula. In the spring of 1506 the plague raged in Lisbon. The people, suffering all its horrors, were stricken also by famine, and offered up prayers in their churches for divine intercession, and on Sunday, April 19, while celebrating their service in the church of San Domingo, a brilliant light was seen to illumine the figure of Christ. Among those who doubted the miracle was one of the unfortunate apostates, who dared publicly to express his incredulity. This was sufficient to instigate the brutal and superstitious populace, who immediately seized the unhappy man, and burned him to death. It besides proved the spark that fired a horrible persecution of the apostate Jews. During the three following days upwards of 2000 victims were sacrificed; old men, women, and children were not spared, but dragged from their homes to the fires raging in the public squares. Only on the third day of these horrors the authorities were enabled to restore some tranquillity. The king, Don Manuel, who was absent from Lisbon, received the fearful news with profound indignation, and immediately ordered summary justice on the leaders. Several were put to death, among them being two friars who had been the first instigators of the people's fury. The magistrates, who through fear or negligence had not exerted their authority to quell the

massacre, had their property confiscated; and, finally, a decree of May 22 condemned Lisbon to the loss of many ancient privileges. In vain the corporation sued the king for mercy; he replied that an example was necessary to punish the ferocity of the bloodthirsty and the pusillanimity of the timid. Yet, notwithstanding these generous actions of the king, the Jews and Jewish converts suffered so terribly that many of them left the Iberian peninsula and sought a home on the Continent, especially in Holland, where they enjoyed unlimited toleration. The prudent king Emanuel, seeing that his realm was likely to lose a large number of valuable citizens, and yet satisfied that it would be impossible to prevent the exodus, finally commanded that all children under fourteen should be detained and converted to Christianity. There can be no doubt that this cruel but politic order induced many Jews to embrace Christianity. The Jewish histories dwell on the complete national exodus, both from Spain and Portugal, and they paint in strong colors the heroic adherence to their religious convictions both of Spanish and Portuguese, and the terrible sufferings they underwent in consequence; nevertheless, the evidence of physiognomy and of family tradition are all against this alleged universality of the movement, and, if a change of name had not been made compulsory in the days of persecution, so also undoubtedly would be the evidence of names. There are, unquestionably, innumerable families of Jewish lineage in Portugal, and Israelitish blood flows in the veins of many noble Portuguese families. It is related that when that foolish liguot, king John (Don Juan III), proposed to his minister Pombal that all Jews in his kingdom should be compelled to wear white hats as a distinctive badge, the sagacious minister made no objection, but when next he appeared in council it was with two white hats. "One for his majesty and one for himself," explained Pombal, and the king said no more about his proposal. It was during the reign of this king that the Inquisition was introduced into Portugal, but it was milder than in Spain, and the New Christians were suffered so long as they continued in public professions of the Christian faith.

In modern times the descendants of unfortunate apostates, under the name of New Christians, have been gradually losing all traces of the religion of their ancestors. Their family names alone point them out, such as Sequeira, Costa, Marques, Lucas, Pinto, Cardoso, Castro, and many others, now borne by Roman Catholic families. There are still to be found, even in distant provinces of Portugal, some who keep up a few vestiges of former rites, especially the observance of the great Day of Atonement. A few

families do not eat bread during the Passover, and many treasure the Jewish sacred prayer, the *Shemang Israel*. See Lindo, *History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, ch. 22 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 309 sq.; Grutz, *Gesch, der Juden*, 8:61 sq.; Barnum, *Romanism*, p. 378. (J. H. W.)

## New Church

*SEE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH.*

## Newcomb, George

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Quincy, Mass., Nov. 8, 1814. Upon attaining manhood he devoted himself to teaching, which vocation he followed for many years. In 1856 he was licensed as a local preacher by the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1864, impelled by a sense of duty, he went to Beaufort, S. C., to labor among the freedmen as superintendent of schools. In 1867 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, decided to take active work in the ministry, and joined the South Carolina Conference. He was appointed to Beaufort Circuit, where he remained three years. While laboring there he organized several societies on the Combahee River and Ladies' Island. At the Annual Conference of 1870 he was made presiding elder, and assigned to St. John's District, Fla. He knew from experience what privations and hardships mean; but, bold in the strength of God, he braved storms of opposition, surmounted difficulties, and in the pine lands and river bottoms, as well as in the crowded streets of the busy town, his voice was heard heralding forth the words of truth and soberness. The work proved too great for his physical strength, and he was finally obliged to relinquish it, and went North to regain his health. On his way, while at Beaufort, S. C., he fell a victim to yellow fever, and died Oct. 12, 1871. George Newcomb "occupied a large place in the hearts of all who knew him." See *Minutes of Annual Conf. of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, 1871, p. 10.

## Newcomb, Harvey

D.D., a noted Congregational minister, was born at Thetford, Vt., in 1803. In 1818 he removed to Alfred, Vt., and in the following year, though still quite young, he commenced teaching school, and continued in that occupation most of the time for eight years. In the spring of 1826 he became publisher and editor of a newspaper in Westfield, N. Y. Two years

later he removed to Buffalo, as editor of the *Buffalo Patriot*. In 1830 and 1831 he published the *Christian Herald* at Pittsburgh, Pa., and a paper for children, and for nearly ten years from that period was mainly engaged in writing Sabbath-school books. In 1840 he was licensed to preach, and the following year was made pastor of the Congregational Church at West Roxbury, Mass., and subsequently ministered to the churches at West Needham and Grantville. In 1849 he returned for a season to editorial life, being assistant editor of the *Daily Traveller* for about a year, and of the *New York Observer* for two years. In the fall of 1859, having spent several years in writing, establishing mission Sabbath-schools in Brooklyn, N. Y., and preaching to the Park Street Mission Church of that city, he was installed over the Congregational Church in Hancock, Pa., where he continued to labor as long as his health allowed him to remain in active life. He died at Brooklyn, N. Y., Aug. 30, 1862. Dr. Newcomb was an able and useful Christian laborer, whose memory will be revered for many generations yet to come. He labored especially with his pen, and was the author of not less than 178 volumes, a great majority of which had special reference to the wants of children and youth, and had a large circulation; among these were fourteen volumes of Church history. According to a calculation made in 1853, the circulation of his works had then reached nearly sixty-five million pages. His largest work was the *Cyclopaedia of Missions* (New York, 1854, 8vo; 4th ed. 1856), a book of great value to the student seeking information on American missions, though of assistance also in the general field which it seeks to cover. At the time of its publication it proved a welcome guest, not only on this side of the Atlantic, but also in Great Britain, where it has been freely used in compilations requiring statistics of missions. In our own pages the work is frequently quoted, and its usefulness often made apparent by the lengthy extracts which it affords us. Revised and brought down to date, it would still rank as the best cyclopedia of missions in the English tongue. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1410; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* p. 656; *Congreg. Quarterly*, 1863, 352 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Newcomb, Peter

an Anglican clergyman of note, flourished very near the opening of the last century. He was vicar of Aldenham, Hertfordshire, and died about 1722. Four separate sermons of his were published in 1705, 1710, 1715, 1737, and another four together in 1719; also fifty-two discourses, constituting a catechetical course upon the Church Catechism for the whole year (2d ed.

1702; 1712, 2 vols. 8vo). His son, of like name, born in 1717, was rector of Shenley, in the same county, and died in 1797. He wrote, *History of the Abbey of St. Alban, 793-1539* (Lond. 1793-1796, 2 vols. 4to).

### Newcomb, Thomas, D.D.,

an Anglican divine, was born in 1675. But little is accessible regarding his early personal history. He was a great grandson of Spenser, the poet, and seems to have inherited the ancestral love for the muse. In 1734 Newcomb became rector of Stopham, Sussex, and this position he held until his death, about 1766. He was a sound theologian, but a better poet than preacher. His poetical publications have received many encomiums. His best known production is his *Bibliotheca*, published in vol. iii of Nichols's *Select Collection of Miscellaneous Poems*. See Chalmers's *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.*, s.v.

### Newcome, Richard

an English prelate, flourished near the middle of the last century. He was canon of Windsor until, in 1754, he was elevated to the episcopate and made bishop of Llandaff, was transferred to the see of St. Asaph in 1761, and died in 1769. He published several of his sermons (Lond. 1756, 1761, 1764, all 4to).

### Newcome, William

a learned English prelate, counted as one of the most eminent divines of the 18th century, was born in 1729 at Abingdon, Berkshire, where his father, an esteemed Anglican clergyman, was then vicar. William was educated at the grammar-school of his native town, from whence he passed to the University of Oxford, where he became in due time a fellow and tutor of Hertford College, and had Charles James Fox for one of his pupils. In 1765 he was honored with the doctorate in divinity, and in that year accompanied his patron, the earl of Hertford, when he went as lord-lieutenant to Ireland. Newcome went as private chaplain; but a bishopric, that of Dromore in that country, falling vacant soon after the earl's settlement in Ireland, Newcome was placed in it. Entering the episcopal order thus early in life, it is not extraordinary that he had several translations, which were first to Ossory in 1775. then to Waterford in 1779, and finally, in 1795, to Armagh. He died in 1800. A writer of some chapters of bishop Newcome's life assures us that he "diligently and

faithfully discharged the duties of his episcopal office, and secured the respect of all parties and of all religious persuasions by the affability, prudence, candor, and moderation which were the invariable guides of his conduct." But his chief title to remembrance is that he was during the whole of his life a most assiduous Biblical student, and that he did not suffer those studies to end in themselves, but laid before the world results which ensued upon them. He did not do this till he had maturely considered them, for he was nearly fifty before he printed any considerable work. His first book was *The Harmony of the Gospels* (Dublin, 1778, fol.; an edition of the *Harmony*, in the Engl. trans., was published in 1802, 8vo), a work the title of which affords but an inadequate idea of its nature and contents, as, besides the results of his inquiries on a very difficult and important point of sacred history, it contains a great mass of valuable criticism and useful information. Out of this work arose a controversy with Dr. Priestley on the duration of Christ's ministry; bishop Newcome contending for three years, and Dr. Priestley limiting the time to one year. In 1782 Dr. Newcome published his *Observations on our Lord's Conduct as a Divine Instructor, and on the Excellence of his Moral Character* (Lond. 1782, 4to), a work of great beauty; and in 1785 a new version, with critical remarks, of the *Twelve Minor Prophets*. This was followed in 1788 by a similar work on the prophet *Ezekiel*. Of these works, Horne says that "as a commentator the learned prelate has shown an intimate acquaintance with the best critics, ancient and modern," and adds that "his own observations are learned and ingenious." Though the notes are very copious, they are pertinent, and untainted by an ostentatious display of criticism, and abound with such illustrations of Eastern manners and customs as are best collected from modern writers. Later Newcome sent out a *Review of the chief Difficulties in the Gospel History relating to our Lord's Resurrection* (1791, 4to), and *An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations* (Dublin, 1792, 8vo). This was his latest publication, except an *Episcopal Charge*; but after his death there was given to the world a very important work, which he had himself caused to be printed four years before his decease, entitled *An Attempt towards Revising our English Translation of the Greek Scriptures* (Dublin, 1796, 2 vols. royal 8vo); this the Unitarians made the basis of such unscholarly changes in the English version as the Greek text with the critical examination of existing manuscripts would hardly authorize. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica*, 2:2172; Horne, *Bibl. Biblia*, p. 304; Pye-Smith, *Introd. to Theology*, p. 511, 515; *London Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 70.

## Newcomen, Matthew, M.A.,

an English Nonconformist divine, was born near the opening of the 17th century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He became vicar of Dedham, Essex, from which he was ejected, in 1662, for nonconformity. He then retired to Leyden, where he was minister of a congregation, and died in 1668 or 1669. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and assisted in drawing up their Catechism, and was also present at the Savoy Conference. He was one of the authors of the celebrated answer to bishop Hall on Episcopacy (Lond. 1641, 4to). He wrote also, *The Duty of such as would walk worthy of the Gospel to endeavor Union, not Division nor Toleration* (a sermon on <sup><1027></sup>Philippians 1:27 [Lond. 1646, 4to]): — *Sermon on* <sup><1018></sup>*Revelation 2:3: — Farewell Sermons*. See Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica*, 2:2173; and *Sermons* on his death by J. P. (Lond. 1679, 4to); Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 1:156, 165, 170. (J. N. P.)

## New Connection General Baptists

SEE BAPTISTS.

## New Connection Methodists

SEE KILHAMITES; SEE WESLEYAN METHODIST NEW CONNECTION. See also article METHODISTS SEE METHODISTS in vol. 6, especially p. 156 (3).

## New Creation

a term denoting the theory of a restoration of the physical universe as the final abode of glorified humanity.

**I.** *Argument for the Doctrine.* — Predictions of a great and universal renovation are, in a more or less direct form, an almost invariable feature of Biblical Eschatology. Such was the tone of prophecy before Christ's first advent, such that of the apostolic writings, and such that of our Lord's own words as recorded in the Gospels and the Apocalypse. This may be shortly indicated by the words of an ancient prophecy, "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (<sup><2357></sup>Isaiah 65:17; comp. 66:22); those of an apostolical epistle, "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein



shall be burned up... Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (~~610~~2 Peter 3:10-13); and those of the great Christian prophecy, “I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new” (~~620~~Revelation 21:1, 5).

That these predictions of a new creation are figurative is an easy explanation, and it may be in some slight degree corroborated by the fact that the kingdom of Christ is a re-creation of human nature in his own person by his incarnation, and of the souls of mankind by their regeneration in holy baptism. Such an explanation, however, reaches but a little way towards drawing out the meaning of the predictions in question, for even if they include that which it refers to (as is not likely from the analogy of our Lord’s own prophetic language), they yet undoubtedly look beyond it, and point unmistakably to a new creation, not of souls, but of the material earth, its surrounding “Heaven” or heavens, and the works as well as the beings which it contains.

The chief difficulty in the way of belief in such a renovation is probably that which arises from the accompanying prediction of a preceding destruction. Looking on the changes which are wrought on the surface of the earth, or which have been wrought during the historic ages, we observe that the whole sum of them, after all the ordinary and all the convulsive operations of the physical forces which affect them, falls far short of anything approaching the magnitude of so stupendous a change as that which would be made by a destructive catastrophe, such as is predicted. The terrific operation of fire on the body of the sun is now, however, well known to scientific observers, as well as the vast and most rapid changes which it effects. There is no difficulty in believing that such changes may be effected on the body of the earth, when we observe enormous craters to be almost instantly created on that of the sun — so enormous that many planets as large as the earth might be engulfed in them, and so intensely heated that the very granite would melt in the midst of them.

A more formidable objection is one drawn from the moral aspect of such a destruction. Allowing that it is reasonable to set aside the physical difficulty as being confuted by scientific knowledge not less than by a *priori* reasonings as to Almighty Power, is it consistent with our ideas of God’s attributes that the magnificent works of man — works of architecture,

engineering, art, and skill — works that betoken the use of God’s own gifts of intellect, and the progress of humanity in the development of those powers and the application of those materials with which the Creator has provided it — that these should be utterly destroyed? Can there be no consecration of man’s handiwork by which it may be symbolically renovated? Must the very foundations of the earth and all that rests upon them be utterly broken up before the palace of the New Creation can be erected? Would not such a destruction, we are almost tempted to say, be a kind of waste, and contrary to the first principles on which God’s providence is ever working?

No doubt such objections as these, and many more such, will arise in thoughtful minds; and no doubt they will be accompanied by a wish to understand the statements of the Bible in some easier way; to adopt a metaphorical meaning, for example, such as would take the new creation of heaven and earth to be a moral regeneration, and the passing away of the old creation as the cessation of sin. But St. Peter appears to have been inspired to meet such objections with a plain contradiction beforehand; for when he is about to speak of the destruction of the earth and the heavens in a manner that quite shuts out the idea of his words being intended to be metaphorical, he prefaces the awful statement by predicting that in the last days there will come scoffers, arguing that, from the apparent firmness and permanence of all things for so many ages, there is no probability of their future actual destruction. The apostle therefore warns us off from such objections, and leaves us little rational ground for supposing a metaphor to have been intended by the words “new heaven and new earth.” Perhaps we may be better reconciled to a literal sense of these words if we take into account a few considerations respecting the power and authority of the Creator and his probable purpose in organizing a new creation.

**(1.)** It is manifest that all things belong to God to deal with as he may think proper: there is no known law by which he binds himself to preserve as it now stands either the creation of his own hands or the handiwork of the race that he has created.

**(2.)** He infinite power of an Almighty Creator, that can call forth a new creation at his will, makes the destruction of many worlds a matter of no importance in the vast scheme of his general purposes and his eternal existence. “Behold, the nations are as a drop in a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very

little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity” (<sup>2015</sup>Isaiah 40:15-17). Or, to use a homely simile, as we often see portions of beautiful columns, moldings, and carvings built into the rubble of mediaeval churches as if they were common stones of no value, and are aware that this was done by buillers who knew that they could produce better work than that which they were concealing or partially destroying—so we know the great Architect of the universe can replace all that he causes or suffers to be destroyed with a new creation of still greater beauty, glory, magnitude, and use, without effort and at any moment.

**(3.)** This seems to lead up to the object of so wide a destruction as that implied by the words of Holy Scripture, the “whole creation groaneth and travaileth together,” fallen with fallen man, even in Christ’s dispensation degenerating age by age, and removing further and further from the high standard of perfection in which it first came forth from the hands of the Creator. It is to make room for a perfect creation that this degenerated one is to pass away — to make room for one in which there will be no capacity for degeneration, no trace of imperfection, no stain of a will adverse to the will of God.

By the consideration of truths such as these we may fortify our faith in the word which God has four times spoken by his prophets; and believing that we can see some reason why there should be a new heaven and a new earth, believe also that there are many others which are beyond our knowledge, and that therefore our safest course is to take the divine proclamation simply and literally as it stands. Whether by an utter destruction and an entirely new creation, or whether (as is more probable) by a regeneration and purification effected by fire, in some way or other God will cause the heavens and earth that now are to pass away; and will fulfill his own words, “Behold, I make all things new,” in the sense of a material renovation. *SEE CONFLAGRATION, GENERAL.*

**II. Material Renovation.** — *Theory as to the State.* Although it would be venturesome to pursue this idea of a new creation into details, by speculating as to the new features that will characterize the abode of mankind and its celestial surroundings, we are fully justified in following it up as regards our own nature. Respecting human nature, there is no room whatever for doubt. It will be taken into the presence of its Creator after

having passed again under his creating hand, renovated into a perfectness of condition even greater than that which belonged to it in its most perfect temporal condition.

**(1.)** First it is to be considered that there will be a new creation of the body. “Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption” (~~1~~1 Corinthians 15:20). Such is the truth which St. Paul declares to us when he is dealing theologically with the question of the resurrection. Such also is the truth that we are taught by the very instinct of self-consciousness. It is not bodies such as we are provided with for the work of this world that will be suited to inhabit a new earth, or to stand in the immediate presence-chamber of the all-glorious and all-holy God. Such bodies as these can never be dissociated from imperfection and degeneration, disease, decay, and dissolution. They are endowed with functions that are evidently incompatible with a never-ending immortality; and we cannot imagine hunger, thirst, and the capacities and desires which are most characteristic of bodily life as it now is to have any place in heaven. They exist under laws that involve the loss of strength, vigor, and beauty after the lapse of a few score years; and we cannot imagine the wrinkles or weakness or decrepitude of old age to have any consistency with the perpetual youth of a renovated creation.

Hence the same inspired teacher tells us that the body which is sown in corruption is raised in incorruption, that which is sown in dishonor is raised in glory, that which is sown in weakness is raised in power, that which is sown a natural body is raised a spiritual body;... this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. These are most wonderful statements; but can we gain from them, from other light of Holy Scripture, or from the light of our own experiences, observations, and reasonings, any definite ideas on the subject of this renovated body which is to find itself fit for making a home of a renovated world? It is almost impossible to do so except by a series of negatives. For the spiritual body of the resurrection sera there will be no hunger nor thirst, no marrying nor giving in marriage, no pain, no suffering, no decay, no dissolution. It will answer to the great Catholic dogma, “I believe in the resurrection of the body.” “the resurrection of the flesh,” in such a manner that every one will have a ready consciousness of identity, as of something restored which had long been lost, and yet it will be “a spiritual body,” one of which, if we can positively say “it is the same,” we must also say with equal certainty “it is not the same.” Perhaps the very phrase “spiritual body,” which sounds like

a contradiction of terms, contains the real explanation as far as we can now reach it. That which we think of in this life as the human body is a complex structure of substances and organs whose principal purposes are those of sense; but even as it now exists we can discover traces of a lower organization and a higher organization. There is that which seems at once to be of the earth earthly that which the Scripture calls “flesh and blood” — the grosser organization associated with the maintenance of animal life and action; and there is also that which we find little difficulty in associating with spiritual life and action — the nervous system, or that portion of it which is connected with the organs and faculties whereby the mind works and communicates with the world around. The one seems to belong to our bodies in common with the bodies of creatures lower than ourselves in the scale of creation, the other to belong to those bodies in common with beings higher than ourselves. We easily believe of angels that they speak and think and reason; that they see and hear; that they remember and increase in knowledge; that they love and adore; and some of these properties which belong to men and angels we dare to think of as belonging even to God. Is there not, then, in that part of our bodily system which enables us to do all this which is done even by angels and by One higher than angels, the germ of that spiritual body “which can inherit the kingdom of God?” And may we not venture to think of the resurrection of the body as a clothing again of our souls and spirits with all the organization that belongs to the higher part of our being, while that which belongs to the lower part lies forever in the dust with which it has mingled ?

It is not difficult to imagine bodies so regenerated that they find their original pattern in the body that rose from the grave three days after death, and afterwards ascended into heaven. It is, in fact, most easy and most rational to believe that as the Incarnation of the Son of God was the new creation of a Man perfect in body and soul, so it was the first step in the new creation of all human nature; and that as we have borne in our bodies the image of the earthly, which is the First Adam, so in our bodies also we shall bear the Image of the heavenly, which is the Second Adam. *SEE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.*

Thus, when the word has gone forth, “Behold, I make all things new,” this will be a part of that new creation, that the bodies of the redeemed will be as the glorified body of Him who is not ashamed to call them brethren; bodies such as were laid in the grave, and with something about them yet

which will identify them with a former life, and yet spiritual bodies on which the incarnation will have done its thorough work by restoring to them their share in the Image of God; making them ever pure, ever incapable of evil, of degeneracy, or of decay.

(2.) As the external features of human nature will be thus renovated, so also will there be a renovation of all that belongs to its mental and spiritual faculties. Towards such a new creation it is easy to see that the work of the incarnation has ever been tending. What man lost by the fall he regains by his restoration in Christ. Man lost the image of God, but the express Image of the Father took upon him the fallen nature, raised it to its first estate in his own person, and made it possible for it to regain that position in the persons of all men. Man lost by the fall the spirit which was breathed into him so that he became a living soul, but the Holy Spirit descended to dwell in the Church on earth, and to continue the power of the incarnation; and now each sacramentally built up man has the loss repaired, and becomes once more body, soul, and spirit. as in his first creation. *SEE SPIRIT.*

But this is a gradual. not a sudden work, and although in the first regeneration of human nature at conversion, and in all the stages of sanctifying edification, the Lord is causing it to go through a process of renovation and re-creation, the climax of that building up of the restored spirit of man will only be attained when the final fiat of re-creation goes forth. Under the operation of such a re-creation, that which we sometimes call “the religious faculty” will become supreme among all the mental qualities of our nature. Then, too), all evil passions, all sorrows, all cares, having passed away as part of the former things that have no place in the renewed world, it is reasonable to believe that other mental faculties will have room to develop in a degree for which there has been no sufficient opportunity in this life; so that the intelligence of each one of the renovated persons will be like the intelligence of an angel. Thus all that is good and noble in the spiritual and intellectual part of human nature will become infinitely more good and noble still. The humblest sinner of this life who attains to the life everlasting will stand as a glorious saint before the throne of God. The lowliest intellect will be so cleared, so vivified and developed, by the making of all things new, that there will be no such thing as ignorance-as we now understand it-possible, nor any bar set up by the will to the attainment of an exalted reach of knowledge.

It seems, then, that we must blend together the highest earthly saintliness and the highest earthly intelligence if we seek for a type of the perfectly renovated inner nature of man; and when we have thus gained some idea of what will be effected by the new creation, we still have to remember that this type of the newcreated mind and spirit of man places us only on the threshold of his future life. He will go on, without limit of time and age, dwelling in close communion with the all-holy and all-knowing God; and from the perpetual shining of that "light which no man," in his mortal condition, "can approach unto," there must be a never-ceasing growth of saintliness and intelligence, a development of each which can find no limit short of the holiness and knowledge of the One who is without bounds.

**III. *Spiritual Surroundings.*** — As the renovation of the material world, and of the corporeal and incorporeal parts of man's nature, will alter all the conditions of what we should call from our present standpoint man's existence and work *in the world*, so also it will alter those of his existence *in the Church*, since among the revelations of that future life which were made to St. John there was a special one of a "New Jerusalem coming down from God, out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (ⲙⲓⲃ Revelation 21:2). We are all familiar with the glorious things which are spoken of this city of our God. In wrought with our habitual devotions as they dwell on the future are such words as

*“With jasper glow thy bulwarks,  
Thy streets with emeralds blaze;  
The sardius and the topaz  
Unite in thee their rays.”*

But we are probably disposed to dwell on these glorious pictures of the holy city without a sufficient recognition of the fact that they represent a development and new creation of the religious life, and especially of that part of it which is associated with divine worship. For this renovation of the religious life and of divine worship is also the glorious climax of our Lord's incarnation; and therefore the coming down of the New Jerusalem from God is followed by "a great voice out of heaven," which recalls to our mind the fact that our Lord's incarnation was a tabernacling of the Deity in the humanity. "I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God" (ⲙⲓⲃ Revelation 21:3). That same presence of God, therefore, which has

been at once the great power of the religious life and the great object of divine worship in the Church militant, will be the same in the Church triumphant. As God is now with his people in worship, the virtue of which is derived from the incarnation, so will he be with them in a direct presence, the power of which will be to them a perpetual light and an inexhaustible life; and as now God is in his holy temple, and thither we gather that before his altar we may bow down in adoration of his mystical presence, so then, when there shall be no temple in the holy city — “for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it” (~~66122~~ Revelation 21:22) — the glorious and visible presence of him that sitteth on the throne will be that before which the elders will cast down their crowns, and the vast multitude of the redeemed sing forth their hallelujahs.

Thus the Church militant will develop into the Church triumphant; Christ’s first and his second advent will prove to be two stages in the mighty work of new creation. The former things that are to pass away—a degenerate world, a fallen man, an imperfect religious life, a halting worship—all these having derived what good there has been in them from the first stage of the new creation, that good will still remain, even though their distinctive characteristics of evil, weakness, and imperfection will have been burned out and annihilated. But God is pleased that there should be a degenerate world, and a fallen man, and an imperfect religious life, and a halting worship no longer, and therefore the second stage of the mighty work of the incarnation will be attained in the complete fulfillment of the words, “Behold, I make all things new.”

## New Divinity

*SEE EDWARDS, JONATHAN, SEE PRESBYTERIANISM; SEE THEOLOGY (NEW ENGLAND).*

## Newell, Ebenezer Francis

a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Brookfield, Mass., Sept. 1, 1775; joined a Methodist society in St. Stephen’s, New Brunswick, June 29, 1800; was licensed as a local preacher, and appointed to Centre Harbor Circuit by the London Quarterly Meeting March 23, 1806; was licensed as a travelling preacher July 25, 1807, and successively held the following appointments: Pembroke, March 20, 1806; Centre Harbor, 1806; Landaff, 1807; Huftonboro, 1808; Hallowell, 1809; Norridgewock, Vt., 1810; Danville, Vt., 1811; Barre, Vt.,



1812; Barnard, Vt., 1813; Pittstown, Me., 1814; Bristol, Me., 1815; Durham, 1816; Readfield, 1817; St. Croix, 1818. Located, 1819; Thomaston Circuit, 1821; Norridgewock, 1822; Pittstown, 1823; Dennisville, 1824. In 1825 he was made supernumerary, and employed as Conference missionary in behalf of Maine Wesleyan Seminary, resuming work again in 1826-7, and was appointed to Bethel, Me.; Kennebunkport, 1828-9; Kittery, 1830; Brookfield and Belchertown, 1831; Northbridge and Uxbridge, 1832; Brookfield and Belchertown, 1834; Spencer and Leicester, 1835; Hopkinton, 1836; Marlboro and Harvard, 1837; Harvard and Leominster, 1838; North Brookfield, 1839; North Brookfield and Paxton, 1840; Charlton and Springfield, 1841-2. He was finally superannuated in 1842, and died March 8, 1867, at Johnsville, S. C., where he was staying with his son.

### Newell, Harriet

the wife of Samuel Newell (q.v.) and daughter of Moses Atwood, of Haverhill, Mass., a celebrated American female missionary, was born Oct. 10, 1793, and received an excellent education. She was naturally cheerful and unreserved, possessed a lively imagination and great sensibility, and at a very early age evinced a retentive memory and a taste for reading. Before the age of thirteen she received no particular or lasting impressions of religion, but was uniformly obedient, attentive, and affectionate. In the summer of 1806, while at a school at Bradford, she was the subject of those solid and serious impressions which laid the foundation of her Christian life. At the age of fifteen she made a profession of religion. When Mr. Newell, along with Messrs. Judson and others, offered himself a missionary to the General Association at Bradford, and was about to sail for India, he asked Miss Atwood in marriage. Her own heart was prepared to quit her native land, and to endure the sufferings of a Christian among heathen people. She therefore readily determined to go, and sailed June 19, 1812, for Calcutta. Finding on their arrival that the Bengal government would not grant them permission to reside within their territories, the missionaries chose different places of destination, and Mr. and Mrs. Newell proceeded to the Isle of France, Aug. 4 ensuing. There she employed herself assiduously and with earnestness in the promotion of her Redeemer's cause, and by her conduct and advice became an honorable and truly valuable member of society. The uniform piety and seriousness of her mind are forcibly displayed in her letters to her young friends and in her diary. Her health was delicate, but she bore indisposition with that

calmness and submission to the dictates of Providence which always signalized her character. She complained much of the want of humility, and lamented her deficiency in that Christian grace: "she longed for that meek and lowly spirit which Jesus exhibited in the days of his flesh." Mrs. Newell died of consumption Nov. 30, 1812. She departed in the peace and triumph of an eminent Christian. Her *Life*, written by Dr. Woods, to which are appended several of her letters and the sermon preached at her funeral, has passed through many editions in its English dress, and has also been translated into foreign languages. The cause of missions has been greatly promoted by the delineation of her character and the description of her sufferings. Says Dr. Whedon, of the *Meth. Qua. Rev.* (April, 1875, p. 346): "Both Samuel J. Mills and Harriet Newell perhaps accomplished more by their early death in the mission field than they would have done by the most efficient life. Their memories shed a sacredness over their work. There was a pathos in the life and death, especially, of Harriet Newell that touched the heart. The Church at home saw that her missionaries were capable of the most heroic self-sacrifice, and could meet death in triumph; and how could she shrink from the enterprise to which she was so evidently called?" See Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Mod. Religious Biography*, s.v.; Pierson, *Amer. Miss. Memorial*, s.v.; also *Menmoirs of Harriet Newell*, by Samuel Newell; Eddy, *Daughters of the Cross*; *Heroines of the Missionary Enterprise*; *Women of Worth*; Anderson, *Hist. of the Missions of the A. B. C. F. I. M. in India* (Bost. 1874). (J. H.W.)

### Newell, Samuel

a noted American missionary and Congregational minister, was born July 24, 1784, at Durham, Me. He graduated at Harvard College, class of 1807, and studied theology at Andover. He was, with four others, ordained a missionary Feb. 6, 1812, in Salem, whence, with the Rev. Mr. Judson, he sailed for Calcutta, where they arrived June 18, but were ordered to leave the country. Mr. Newell sailed for the Isle of France, and arrived Oct. 31. Feb. 24, 1813, he went to Ceylon, where he remained until early in 1814, when he removed to Bombay, where he labored faithfully for the Christian cause until removed by sudden death from cholera, March 29, 1821. In connection with Mr. Hall he wrote *The Conversion of the World, or the Clarins of Six Hundred Millions* (Andover, 1818), and a *Memoir of Harriet Newell* (q.v.). Mr. Newell was one of the first of the American missionaries in foreign fields, and a signer of the paper which led to the

formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. See Sprague, *Annals of the Times. Pulpit*, 2:538.

## Newell, Thomas Marquis

an American Presbyterian minister, was born at Cross Creek, Washington County, Pa., Oct. 16, 1815. He made an early profession of religion and joined the Church. In 1834 he graduated at Washington College, Pa., and in 1836 at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa. Soon after he was licensed, and in 1843 was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Wellsburg, Va. In 1851 he removed to Jacksonville, Ill., where he taught in the Deaf and Dumb Asylum, meanwhile preaching in the surrounding destitute regions. In 1857 he took charge of the Church of Waynesville, where he labored until his death, May 10, 1865. Mr. Newell was one of the original members in the organization of Bloomington Presbytery in 1859, and was the first commissioner from that presbytery to the General Assembly. As a man, he was naturally modest and unassuming; as a preacher, clear, pointed, and experimental; as a citizen, intensely interested in national affairs, giving all his influence against slavery. See Wilson, *Fresh. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 139. (J. L. S.)

## New England Theology

*SEE THEOLOGY, N.E.*

## New Fire

a term for the fire kindled on Easter Eve in Romish and Anglican churches for relighting the church lamps, which were extinguished on Good Friday, though in some places the upper candle of the tonebrae was reserved for the purpose, and in others, as at Rome in 750, in the pontificate of Zozimus, three lamps were concealed, emblematical of the three days in which Jesus lay in the tomb; but usually the new flame was kindled by a burning-glass from the sun, as a type of the Orient on high, or, as mentioned by Leo IV in the 9th century, from a flint, symbolical of the Rock (<sup>4510b</sup>1 Corinthians 10:4), as at Florence, from one brought from Jerusalem in the time of the Crusaders. The rekindling represented both the resurrection and the fire which Christ came to cast upon the earth (<sup>412b</sup>Matthew 12:49). The fire was used to light three tapers branching from a common stock in the form of a lance. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 397, 398.

## Newfoundland

an island and British colony of North America, lies in the Atlantic Ocean, at the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, separated from Labrador on the north by the Strait of Belle Isle (about twelve miles broad), and extending in lat. from  $46^{\circ} 38'$  to  $51^{\circ} 37'$  N., and in long. from  $52^{\circ} 44'$  to  $59^{\circ} 30'$  W., is 370 miles in length, 290 miles in breadth, about 1000 miles in circumference, and has an area of 38,850 square miles, or about 23,000,000 acres, of which only about 3,000,000 are set down as good for cultivation, and even of these but little has thus far been much tilled. In 1845 the only crops raised were oats and hay; but within recent years large supplies of grain and vegetable and garden seeds have been imported, and in 1869 the number of acres under cultivation was 41,715. It will now probably not run far from 50,000 acres. The population of Newfoundland has increased rapidly in recent times, and will no doubt in a short time greatly enlarge the figures for land under cultivation. In 1763 Newfoundland only counted about 7500 souls; in 1884 it reported by census 197,332, from which, however, 8651 must be deducted for settlers of the French shores, and 1211 for Labrador. The main employment of these people is fishing, which has proved a very profitable source of income. The mineral wealth of the country is also very great, and has in recent times been greatly developed. Newfoundland's surface is diversified by mountains, marshes, barrens, ponds, and lakes. The mountains in the Avalon Peninsula (stretching southeast from the main portion of the island, and connected with it by an isthmus of only about three miles in width) rise in some cases to 1400 feet above sea-level; while, both here and along the western shore, the height of 1000 feet is frequently reached. 'The number of the lakes and "ponds" (the latter name being used indiscriminately for a large or a small lake) is remarkable, and it has been estimated, though perhaps with some exaggeration, that about one third of the whole surface is covered with fresh water. The "barrens" occupy the tops of hills. The coast-line is everywhere deeply indented with bays and estuaries, many of which are spacious enough to contain the whole British navy. Of these inlets, the principal, beginning from the northern extremity of the island, are Hare, White, Notre Dame, Bonavista, Trinity, Conception, St. Mary's, Placentia, Fortunle, St. George's, and St. John's bays. These bays vary in length from twenty-five to seventy miles, are of great breadth, and are lined — as indeed the whole coast is — with excellent harbors. The rivers, none of which are navigable for any distance, communicate between the lakes of

the interior and the shore, and are narrow and winding; occasionally, however, they are turned to account in driving machinery. The main streams are the Exploit, with its affluent the Great Rattling, and the Humber. The climate of the island is very moderate. In the summer the thermometer rarely ranges above 70°, and in winter it seldom falls below zero; yet the cold weather remains so steady for seven or eight months that the winters are pronounced severe. Very little activity is manifest during that period of the year.

The early history of Newfoundland is involved in obscurity. It was discovered June 24, 1497, in the reign of Henry VII, by John Cabot; and the event is noticed by the following entry in the accounts of the privy-purse expenditure: "1497, Aug. 10. To hym that found the New Isle, £10." It was visited by the Portuguese navigator, Gaspar de Cortereal, in 1500; and within two years after that time regular fisheries had been established on its shores by the Portuguese, tncscayans, and French. In 1578, 400 vessels, of which 50 were English, were engaged in the fishery. Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with his ill-fated expedition, arrived in St. John's harbor in August, 1583, and formally took possession of the island in the name of queen Elizabeth. In the return voyage the expedition was scattered by a storm, and the commander lost. In 1621 Sir George Calvert (afterwards lord Baltimore) settled in the great peninsula in the south-east, and named it the *Province of Avalon*. The history of the island during the 17th and part of the 18th centuries is little more than a record of rivalries and feuds between the English and French fishermen; but by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) the island was ceded wholly to England, the French, however, retaining the privilege of fishing and drying their fish on certain portions of the coast. A governor was appointed in 1728. The present form of government, established in 1855, consists of the governor, a legislative council (appointed by the crown), and a general assembly (elected by the people). The bast of Labrador on the mainland, and the island of Anticosti, have been included since 1809 within the jurisdiction of the governor of Newfoundland. The question of annexation to Canada is now greatly agitated in the British dominions in America, but it is very doubtful whether the Newfoundlanders will yield their independence. The probability is that this island will soon become an important commercial center. There is some prospect of a railroad connection with the United States to facilitate travel to Europe, shortening the ocean voyage by four days. If accomplished, the social coloring of this now but sparsely settled

country will change considerably. There are as yet no railroads in the island, and its peculiar configuration renders even roadmaking a matter of great difficulty. There are no roads across the island; they are confined chiefly to the southeastern and south-western seaboard. There is fortnightly communication in summer between St. John's and Halifax by steamer. On the colony, and connected with it, 400 miles of lines of telegraph have been constructed, 50 miles of which, from Cape Bay to Cape Breton, are submarine.

The aborigines of Newfoundland, who called themselves Beoths, and painted themselves with red ochre, whence they were called Red Indians, are supposed to have become extinct. There are a few Micmac Indians who came there from New Brunswick, and were mainly instrumental in extirpating the Beoths. The present inhabitants of Newfoundland, therefore, are mainly Europeans, and principally from England and Ireland. Those from the last-named country predominate to such an extent as to stamp the island with their own especial mark. "Unlike their countrymen in the United States, who, in the course of two or three generations, lose their accent, religion, improvidence, and all other national traits, and become assimilated by the predominant population into Americans, the Irish here, having been long almost a majority of the entire population, perpetuate all their peculiar characteristics, and even, to some extent, impregnate the rest of the population with them. Thus the Newfoundland accent is a distinctly Irish one, though those who betray it may have no Irish blood in their veins, and never have been in Ireland in their lives. All along the coast the little huts erected near the fishing-stages for the fishermen to live in in summer time have a strong family resemblance to those of the poorer peasantry in the 'ould country;' and there is a sort of general air of slovenliness which the Celtic race seems to have a specialty for imparting to any community in which they preponderate." The signs and tokens, moreover, of Roman Catholics constituting the prevailing religionists of the island are apparent in many respects. Here, as elsewhere, it is the peculiarity of Romanism that, while its adherents seem povertystricken, the Church is rolling in wealth. The Roman Catholic cathedral is by far the most imposing structure in the city of St. John, the principal place of the island, and is the first object that strikes the eye on entering the harbor. Besides the cathedral and college, there are upwards of fifty churches and chapels, and no fewer than twelve convents, in that town. On all the island there were in 1874 64,486 Roman Catholics to 59,605 Episcopalians,

35,551 Wesleyan Methodists, and 1813 of other sects, such as the Baptists, Presbyterians, etc. Newfoundland contains two Romish bishoprics, St. John's and Harbor Grace, two Wesleyan superintendencies, and an Episcopal bishopric, with a bishop and a coadjutor. The number of places of worship in 1869 was 188, viz. Episcopalian, 81; Roman Catholic, 59; Wesleyan, 42; other, 6. For school purposes the island is divided into districts, and in each a board of education, consisting of Romanists for the Catholic schools, and another, consisting of Protestants, for the Protestant schools, is appointed by the governor in council. These boards have the general management of the schools in their respective districts, subject to the approval of the governor in council. The governor, with the advice of the council, also appoints a Roman Catholic and a Protestant superintendent to inspect the schools, and report on their condition. The sum of £750 (£400 for Protestants and £350 for Catholics) is appropriated annually for the training of teachers. Two scholars from each electoral district are entitled to £25 each for their board, lodging, and tuition in one of the academies or higher schools of the island. The money appropriated by the Legislature for educational purposes has hitherto been divided between the Protestants and Catholics in proportion to their numbers; the act of April 29, 1874, provides for a further division among the various Protestant sects. This act did not go into effect until July 1, 1875, after a census had been taken, upon which and subsequent decennial censuses the denominational appropriations are to be based. It increases the number of inspectors to three. In the schools under government control a small tuition fee is required of pupils able to pay. Besides those established by the governmental boards, the schools of the Colonial Church and School Society (an English association under the auspices of the Established Church), and several established and controlled by the different religious denominations, receive aid from the government. The amount expended for educational purposes in 1872 was £14,852; in 1873, £15,316. The number of schools in operation in 1874 was 293, with a total attendance of 13,597 pupils, of which 157, with 7805 pupils, were Protestant, and 136, with 5792 pupils, Roman Catholic. Besides these there are grammarschools at Harbor Grace and Carbonear; an Episcopal, a Wesleyan Methodist, and a general Protestant academy at St. John's; and at the same place an Episcopal theological institute and St. Bonaventure College (Roman Catholic). See *Blackwood's Magazine*, July, 1873, art. iv; Anderson, *Hist. of the Colonial Church* (see Index in vol. iii); St. John, *Catechism of the History of Newfoundland* (1855); Anspach, *Hist. of Newfoundland* (Lond.

1819); Pedley, *Newfoundland* (1863). See also the illustrated papers in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, vol. xii and xxii.

## New Greek Church

is the term sometimes applied to the Eastern Church, as it was constituted after the subjugation of Greece by sultan Mohammed II in 1453, and continued in full power until the Greek Revolution of 1831-33 brought about the independent establishment of a state Church for Greece. *SEE GREECE; SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE NAUPLIA.*

## New Grenada

*SEE COLOMBIA.*

## New Guinea

*SEE PAPUA.*

## New Haven Theology

*SEE THEOLOGY (NEW ENGLAND).*

## New Hebrides

### Picture for New Hebrides

a group of volcanic islands situated in the South Pacific Ocean, to the north-east of New Caledonia, and to the west of the Fijis, extending in S. lat. between 140 and 200, and in E. long. between 166° and 170°, and having a total area estimated at 5700 square miles, are regarded as the most easterly point of the western division of Polynesia. The group, which was discovered by Quiros in 1606, but not fully known until explored by Cook in 1773, embraces Espiritu Santo (65 miles long by 20 broad), Mallicollo (60 miles long by 28 broad), Ambrim, Annatom or Aneityum, Erromango, Tanna, with an active volcano, and Aurora. Most of the group are hilly and well wooded, some even mountainous, and present a luxuriant vegetation. The only animal of consequence is a diminutive species of hog, which when full grown is no larger than a rabbit. The inhabitants, who are of the Papuan Negro race, number less than 100,000. They are less intelligent than the other South Sea Islanders, very fierce and excessively dirty. Erromango is a well-known name in missionary history, being the scene of the barbarous massacre of the Rev. John Williams — generally



called the Martyr of Erromango (Nov. 20, 1839). Two years after the death of Williams the London Missionary Society sent native teachers from the eastern group of Polynesia, and they met a hearty welcome, especially in Annatom. In 1842 European missionaries attempted work at Tanna, but the hostility of the natives to all whites because of fear lest they should take them into slavery for Australia, as was so frequently done, prevented any successful issue. Several of the native teachers were murdered (at Futuna); others remained and labored but without any apparent result. But the London Society would not see the work abandoned, and frequently sent the mission-ship to the New Hebrides, and furnished teachers when there seemed to be an opening. A new aera dawned in 1848, when the Reformed Presbyterians established their mission. By 1852, when only two laborers occupied the field, Christianity gained its first real strong footing, and by 1860 all Annatom, then 3500 inhabitants strong, was free from the cruelties and extravagances of heathenism, and in close alliance with Christian morals and measures. "Instead of a number of naked savages on the beach, armed with clubs and spears, to dispute your landing, you see a number of quiet, peaceable men and women, with children, in front of their houses, engaged in domestic occupations. The husband may be seen feeding a litter of pigs with cocoanuts, and the wife kindling the fire to cook the meal for dinner or supper, while the children all have the look of happiness and contentment in their countenances. The most conspicuous among the houses and villages are the church and school-houses and mission premises. The church is itself a wonder of architecture, constructed by native workmen, under the missionary's superintendence. It is built of stone obtained on the island, and is beautifully plastered and whitewashed. Lime is obtained from the coral which abounds on the shore. This church is capable of accommodating a thousand natives, when seated closely together, and is pronounced by competent judges to be one of the finest places of worship in the South Seas. The teachers are expected to give instruction in reading, spelling, writing, and arithmetic. The book used all over the island is the New Testament, or some Gospel in a separate form, such as Mark or Luke, which were printed in a detached form before the New Testament was printed in full. Almost all the natives can read, and some of them very fluently." (*Boston Traveller*, June, 1875.)

In 1876, the mission was transferred to the Free Church of Scotland, from whose report for 1893 we cite the following particulars:

ANEITUM ISLAND: ANELCUAHAT (south side), *Unwej, Atnumej, Myathpoeg*; ANAME (Fourth side), *Itan, Uca*. — Rev. James Lawrie, ordained missionary; 32 native teachers; 34 elders and deacons. FUTUNA ISLAND: *Ipau, Isia*. — Dr. William Green, medical missionary; 3 male native teachers, 1 deacon. The Presbyterian Churches of Canada, Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and Otago support 17 missionaries, besides the above. There are thus in all 19 European missionaries, and about 150 native teachers. The vernacular languages are the *Aneytumese* and the *Futumese*.

In Erromango missionary Gordon sought a foothold in 1856, but in 1861 he and his wife fell martyrs to their faith, while many natives who had embraced Christianity were persecuted. Yet Christian teachers and missionaries continue their work, among them a brother of Gordon, and of the population, which in 1867 amounted to upwards of 5000. 100 had accepted Christianity and 15 submitted to baptism. Tanna, with its 1500 inhabitants, has had missionaries since 1858, though native teachers advocated Christianity before that time. Much opposition was encountered there, too, and only recently the work opens more favorably. There are now two stations. Vati is now also subject to missionary labors, and very recently mission work has been attempted on the largest island of the group. This important mission work of the New Hebrides is now virtually under control of the Presbyterian denomination. A missionship, entitled the *Dayspring*, serves this field, and sustains connection with the Australian colonies. See Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, pt. 3, No. 4; Inglis, *New Hebrides* (Lond. 1890, 8vo); Paton, *Autobiography* (N. Y. 1891, 2 vols. 12mo).

## New Holland

SEE AUSTRALIA.

## New Ireland

a long, narrow island in the Pacific Ocean, lying to the north-east of New Britain (q.v.). from which it is separated by St. George Channel; lat. 20° 40' - 40° 52' S., long. 150° 30' - 152° 50' E. Length: about 200 miles; average breadth, 20 miles. The hills rise to a height of from 1500 to 2000 feet, and are richly wooded. The principal trees are cocoas on the coast, and in the interior forests of areca-palm. The chief products are sugar-cane, bananas, yams, and cocoa-nuts. Dogs, pigs, and turtles abound. The natives are

apparently of the same race as the Australian *Negritos* (q.v.), but our information about them is extremely scanty. No missionary labors have thus far been attempted among them worth mentioning.

### New Israelites

is the name of a religious sect founded by Joanna Southcott (q.v.), a fanatical woman, near the opening of this century in England. Joanna declared herself impregnated by the Holy Ghost with a child who should prove the Shiloh of the world, and, in order to prepare the way for the new dispensation, ordered the strictest observance of the Jewish law. Although, after waiting for a long time, she died in 1814 in her delusion, and the splendid cradle which had been prepared for the expected Messiah still remained empty, the New Israelites continued till 1831 to observe the Jewish Sabbath and the ceremonials of the law, in order to receive the hoped-for Messiah in a worthy manner. See Mathias, . . . *Southcott's Prophecies and Case Stated* (Lond. 1832, 12mo).

### New Itinerancy

*SEE WESLEYAN NEW CONNECTION METHODISTS.*

### New Jerusalem Church

a title assumed by a body of Christians adopting the views taught in the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg (q.v.). They are theosophists, and their fundamental opinion is that the last judgment took place in the year A.D. 1757, when "the Old Church," or Christianity in its hitherto received form, passed away, and all things became new through revelations made to Swedenborg. This is the reason why the body calls itself "The New Church," or "The New Jerusalem Church."

#### **I.** *Theory and Doctrines.* —

**1.** *Of God.* — The New Jerusalem Church maintains the strictly personal unity of God: one will, one understanding, one operating energy or producing power. Only prominent ideas can be given in so brief a sketch as the present. The infinite, eternal Being, Jehovah, the Lord, is essential divine love or goodness, and essential divine wisdom or truth. From these two fundamental faculties or qualities proceed all his other attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. He is self-existent, before all worlds, and before the times or spaces were brought forth; therefore is "in

space without space, and in time without time.” He cannot be apprehended by a merely natural idea, but only by a spiritual idea; nature is separate from him, and yet he is omnipresent in it. His love operates by his wisdom to produce all things.

**2. *Of Man.*** — The end, or divine purpose, in creation is a heaven out of the human race. For this object and use the worlds were made, and are now sustained, and to the same end are directed all operations of divine Providence: namely, to fill heaven with free, intelligent beings, who can reciprocate his love, who can live in increasing purity and mutual love to each other, and be growing in true blessedness forever, and whom he can gift with light, happiness, and every good continually.

Man was made in the image and likeness of God, with finite faculties corresponding to his infinite faculties: a will, to be the receptacle and seat of good affections; and an understanding, to be the receptacle and seat of true knowledge and ideas. Man is not the possessor of life, as a property inhering in himself, but is created an organism recipient of life, which is constantly communicated by the Creator. Thus the Lord God breathed into man the breath of lives — namely, a life of affection and a life of thought — and man thereby became a living soul, and is a present and constant truth. The fundamental human endowments are freedom of will, by which is meant freedom of moral choice, and rationality, or the capacity of acquiring knowledge and exercising discriminating thought. These are carefully guarded and respected in all the operations of Providence. At the solicitation of the sensual principle of his own mind, and in the abuse of his freedom, man turned aside into transgression, and fell from his primitive integrity. The fall was not a necessity of man’s freedom, but only an incident on this earth; there may be men on other planets, free, and yet who have not fallen. Evil has its origin in the will of man; sufficient freedom and sufficient power to produce it, and increase it from age to age, being a part of his original constitution. Without such freedom and power man would not be human, not a moral agent, but a machine or a creature of instinct. Entirely free moral agents could not be created without involving the possibility of transgression, and without freedom, moral and spiritual, good cannot be appropriated.

The sin of our first parents is not judicially imputed to their descendants, but in natural generation the seed, both of the mental and material organism, is transmitted, a living unit, composed of soul and body; and in

the seed are treasured, latent, all the tendencies and capacities of life possessed by the parents. Hence the bias, tendency, or inclination to sin becomes native, and is inherited, growing stronger as the wickedness of each generation increases. Sin is predicable only of acts committed after the individual has begun to exercise some degree of rationality and freedom. Hence in the divine economy all who die infants, as well of Gentile as Christian parents, are saved, being received by the Lord, and instructed in the spiritual world, and prepared for heaven. In this connection is developed an encouraging view of the future of the Church. The entire tendencies of character being transmitted, by the same law there is hereditary good as well as hereditary evil; hence as the true Christian life is incorporated into the character of the parents, the evil tendencies of offspring will be modified; and as the life of the Church becomes progressively purified and sanctified, constantly better tendencies will be transmitted, the hereditary burden will be lightened, by the divine blessing on the Church, as the generations succeed, the new life in Christ Jesus coming in by degrees to replace the old corrupt life of the first Adam. Thus will come a basis for the fullness, for the latter-day glory of the Church. As hereditary evil is no further imputed than as it is made one's own by actual life, so with hereditary good, it is only bias that is inherited, and must be made actual to be appropriated. Thus the life of repentance, obedience, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and regeneration, will be just as requisite as ever to every member of the race.

The fall brought in spiritual death only, and not physical death, which was a law of organized bodies from the first. At the decease of the mortal part, men have in all ages risen almost immediately into the spiritual world, and to life and consciousness among the departed. That world is not a locality in some part of the material universe, but a plane of being above, and perpetually distinct from it. The spiritual body is a part of the man here, contained within the material body, the living form which gives life and shape to the outward body; consequently, when the outward body is laid aside at death, the man comes consciously into the spiritual world in perfect human form, as the blade of new grain comes forth from within the kernel of seedcorn cast into the ground, and so lives to eternity. Hence all spirits and angels are in human form, with indestructible bodies fitted to their mode of existence, and to the substances of their world, with every sense and faculty in full development. No deceased person ever returns to this world, or resumes a physical body.

**3. *The Spiritual World.*** — This is distributed into three great divisions: heaven (*ozranos*), the world of spirits (*hades*), and hell (*gehenna*). At death all at first go into the world of spirits (*hades*), intermediate between heaven and hell, where all are together until the judgment, when a separation between the good and evil is effected, the good being elevated into heaven, the wicked finding their abodes in hell.

Heaven and hell are constituted by corresponding states of mind and life. The heavens are founded on obedience to divine truth as expressed in the precepts of the Word of God — a life of love to God and one's neighbor; while the communities of the wicked are founded on the principles of selfishness and disorder. The blessedness of the former is communicated from the Lord through the medium of their orderly and obedient states of life; and the miseries of the other all flow as natural results from their evil states of life and companionship. The divine mercy extends even to those in hell, desiring to elevate all to itself, but the bad quality of their life and disposition constantly prevents.

Judgment in the world of spirits is not effected at once; the very good go sooner to heaven, the very bad sooner to hell. The mixed classes often remain in the intermediate state for long periods, accumulating there sometimes in immense numbers. At the end of each dispensation there is a judgment, which divides this multitude, and for the time empties the world of spirits of inhabitants. At the close of the antediluvian period there occurred such a judgment, at the time of the deluge, and another at the close of the Jewish dispensation, when our Lord was on earth. Many of the scenes depicted in the Revelation by John are incidents of such a judgment, the last one foretold by Daniel, and coincident with the Lord's second advent.

The association between the spiritual and natural worlds is so close that the state of the world of spirits powerfully affects the state of the world of men. When wicked multitudes accumulate there, supernatural influences of the worst kind flow back into this world and grievously afflict mankind. This was the condition of things in an eminent degree before Christ came. Mankind were almost entirely given over to wickedness. The world of spirits was full of demons, trying to gain full possession of men. The powers of hell abounded, usurping the whole field to themselves in both worlds. "A universal destruction stood before the door and threatened." Without divine interposition, all mankind would have perished, both as to

soul and body. No flesh could have been saved, the race at length would have been swept from the earth and gone into hell.

**4. *The Incarnation of Jesus Christ.*** — Jehovah himself descended, the Lord, our Father, and assumed the human nature, that he might redeem and save men. This was accomplished by the miraculous conception in the womb of the Virgin. In Jesus Christ the fullness of the entire Godhead dwells bodily. The divine Trinity, of essential constituents, is all in him in one person. The two natures, divine and human, are together in him in perfect union; his divine part he calls “the Father,” the human part, assumed in order to appear in the world, and born in time, is called “the Son.” The angel said to Mary, “that *holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*” and this is the *only begotten* of the Father.” The Holy Spirit, the Comforter, is the new divine influence which the Lord sheds upon the believer and the Church through his glorified human nature.

The glorification of the humanity thus assumed by the Lord is believed to be a doctrine peculiar to this system. This was a progressive work, effected by temptations admitted into his human part. The divine could neither suffer nor be tempted. There was human parentage on one side only, hence the strictly human elements naturally derived in ordinary generation, liable to temptation, and of disorderly bias, existed in him as coming from the mother only, forming thus only an exterior clothing or covering to his interior soul, which was the very indwelling of the Father. The external human elements were one by one successively removed and rejected; while the divine elements from within as successively came forth, and down, occupying their places, until every part of his humanity was glorified and made over anew. Thus God became Man, and Man God, in one person. Thus the two natures became and remain perfectly united; Father and Son became one. Hence, since his resurrection and ascension above all the heavens, the Lord’s humanity is no longer like the humanity of another man, but essentially divine in all its constituents; a glorified, transfigured form, in which, and in which alone, supreme Divinity dwelland is manifested, as a man’s soul dwells in his own body, and is manifested through that. Thus “the Lamb” becomes the only object of Christian adoration and worship, as he declares to John in Revelation, “I am He who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty.” He alone is worshipped by angels.

The Lord's glorification being thus a real *incarnation*, the Divinity coming down *into the flesh* is the grand archetype of the Christian's regeneration and sanctification, and the procuring means by which it is wrought out. "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth." It is ours to "follow" him "in the regeneration," and "overcome even as" he "overcame." From those states of temptation, resistance to the influences of hell, combat, and victory in himself, he gives the Holy Spirit, which is a powerful spiritual influence, flowing from his own exercise of love, power, and will in similar states; aiding, strengthening, and healing the faithful believer in his states of trial, temptation, and combat. He took not on him *the nature of angels*, but the seed of Abraham. "For that he himself hath suffered. being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." He "was in all points *tempted like as we are*, yet without sin." Thus he took on our infirmities and bore our sicknesses. Thus he sacrificed himself day by day; his whole life was a sacrificial offering for our sakes, and by his stripes we are healed. Such was the work of reconciliation or atonement.

By this process of glorification he effected also the work of redemption, which was a purely divine work, consisting of a subjugation of the powers of hell, represented and embodied in hosts of personal wicked spirits or demons, which held mankind in spiritual bondage, and, without relief, would have utterly destroyed them. He executed a judgment in the world of spirits, casting down Satan and his crew. The passion of the cross was the last great temptation which he as greatest Prophet endured, and which completed the work of his own glorification and of the subjugation of the powers of hell, so as to keep them in subjection to his humanity forever, to the perpetual liberation of mankind.

**5. The Bible.** — The plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture is maintained in a supereminent sense. The Lord is believed to be immanently present in his Word by his Spirit. A clear distinction is made between the two kinds or modes of inspiration, the mediate and the immediate, or between that which is dictated or spoken to the prophet and that which is given by influx (infused); thus, in the Old Testament, between "the Word of the Lord" and the "Kethubim" of the Jewish Church. The whole "prophetic Word" is held to have been spoken by a living voice from on high, and contains everywhere within it a spiritual, heavenly, or true Christian sense. The whole "Word," while it is true, literal history, is at the same time what the apostle calls the history of Sarah and Hagar, viz. a divine "allegory;" in



which lessons of heavenly wisdom are constantly taught under a veil of natural thoughts and imagery. The law of this figurative or symbolical mode of expression is simple, according to the universal analogy of nature, expressed by the apostle, “the invisible things of the Creator are seen in the things that are made,” and is called the “law of correspondences.” Many applications of this law are so obvious that the Church in all ages has understood portions of the Word according to it. In this system it is applied to the whole “Word,” and its universality and uniformity maintained by an extensive citation of texts. The term “prophetic” is here used in its widest sense, including the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Psalms, and all the prophets. The writers had “open vision,” having immediate communication with heaven. The letter is sometimes expressed according to apparent truths, or the appearances of truth, while the spiritual sense is always according to genuine truth. To the remaining books nearly coincident with the “Kethubim” of the Jews, a similar style and meaning is imputed to that generally held among Christians, their entire meaning is conveyed in their plain, grammatical sense. A similar distinction is carried forward into the New Testament. The four Gospels and the Revelation are held to be pre-eminently “the Word of the Lord,” and to contain “a wheel within a wheel,” a spiritual meaning within the letter; while the apostolical writings, penned by the men filled with the Holy Spirit” and communicating with heaven, yet do so less immediately than the others, and convey all their meaning in the letter.

**6. *The Divine Government.*** — The providence of the Lord is his government of the world, exercised from love and guided by infallible wisdom; most scrupulously preserving man’s freedom in everything, while directing all affairs to the greatest possible good. Eternal ends are constantly kept in view by the Lord, temporal things being regarded only as they may be made subservient to the interests of the soul. The divine inspection and operation descend to the minutest particulars of every man’s life, the object being to regenerate every one who in freedom will allow himself to be regenerated, and so to bring him to heaven at last, if possible.

**7. *Salvation.*** — In order to be saved, all men require spiritual regeneration, in which the desires of the heart and the ideas of the thought are entirely renewed. This is effected altogether by divine influence upon the soul, producing a new creation or new birth, mall all the while cooperating by shunning in his life whatever is sinful in the sight of God. While man works externally, God works internally. All merit belongs to the Lord, there is

none in man. The super-abounding divine goodness or mercy is the imputative ground or forensic basis of forgiveness, which is freely accorded to all, under every dispensation, on the simple condition of repentance and departure from evil. “All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him” (<sup>261822</sup>Ezekiel 18:22). As soon as sins are forsaken in the name of the Lord they are remitted. “Election” is conditional, being the result of man’s own free choice of life; and “effectual calling” depends upon his own perseverance in the way of a righteous life. First comes reformation of conduct, and then regeneration of the heart, or, as it is sometimes called, sanctification, a progressive work, continuing to eternity.

The means of salvation, on the part of man, is a life according to the divine precepts contained in the Word. This form of expression is believed to be most comprehensive, and the only truly comprehensive one that can be used; for he who lives in the effort to obey what is commanded in God’s holy Word will be in the right way to procure every element of a pure and righteous life. He will believe the Gospel, have faith in Christ, possess charity in the affections of the will, and show forth good and acceptable works. Religion in the heart, which is love or charity, religion in the understanding, which is faith in genuine truth, and religion in the actions, which are good works, are held to be unitedly and equally necessary to the Christian life or character; and the degree of purity is marked by the degree of conformity to the precepts of truth one yields in actual life.

**8. Sacraments.** — Baptism and the Holy Supper are the only two sacraments; they are of divine institution, of permanent obligation, and, like the Word in which they are commanded, both have interior, spiritual significations, communicating with heaven. They are means of actual grace, being media of bringing down renewing and sanctifying influences into the minds of worthy recipients. Hence to these they are signs and seals of divine blessing, but bring no good to the unworthy.

**9. Eschatology.** — One of the most noticeable features of this theology is its doctrine of eschatology. It is maintained that angels and devils, all inhabitants of the other world, indeed all finite spiritual beings, are men, and have originated in material bodies on some earth or planet. Heaven, therefore, owes its increase to the Church on this and other earths. The physical globe being thus needed as a seminary for mankind, where they can be born and instructed and prepared for heaven, will never come to an

end, nor be destroyed, nor have the historical continuity of its affairs broken up, but, with the starry heavens above, will perpetually remain for this use, a monument of the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. The “consummation of the age” spoken of in the Gospel refers to the end of the first Christian age, or closing up of the apostolical dispensation, the second coming of the Lord, and a consequent judgment. These events, it is alleged, have already taken place, or are now in process of being fulfilled. The things foretold in the Book of Revelation by John are at this day receiving their fulfillment. The end of the former dispensation came about the middle of the last century, after all things in the divine providence had been prepared. As explained above, the judgment is a process belonging to the unseen world, being effected only in the world of spirits intermediate between heaven and hell. Consequently it is an event not of this visible world, and which no mortal eyes can behold—an event, a knowledge of which, whenever it does occur, cannot possibly become known to men, except by the testimony of some one raised up by the Lord, and gifted with seership or “open vision” to witness and record it, as John was shown the vision which foretold it. And this is the claim made by Emanuel Swedenborg; that he was so gifted and commissioned by the Lord to witness, describe, and declare it, as a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. The judgment occurred in 1757, and marked the change from the apostolic to the apocalyptic dispensation. Since then we have been living under the new order.

The second coming of the Lord is not personal, visible, but spiritual. As to its outward means or instrumentality, it consists of a body of new truth or doctrine, disclosed from the true meaning of his own Word. The entrance of this body of doctrine into our world is prefigured by the birth of the man-child in Revelation, and the opening of the book sealed with seven seals symbolizes the opening or explanation, the spiritual or heavenly meaning of the Bible. The Lord comes thus to the rational thought of mankind, creating a new dispensation of light.

The execution of the judgment in the world of spirits in 1757 removed many infernal and obstructing influences which hindered the progress and improvement of mankind. A vast dark cloud of evil hovering over Christendom in the invisible world was dissipated, and better influences from heaven began at once to flow in, taking effect over the whole Church, and in all parts of the world. The extraordinary changes that have since taken place, and the new age of light and progress since inaugurated, are

regarded as proceeding from this cause, as being visible tokens of the Lord's second advent, and as striking confirmations of Swedenborg's representations. The presumption is that the changes will continue, the opinions of men gradually modifying, until these truths are generally recognized and accepted.

From the divine Word thus opened, explained, and interpreted comes the system of divinity here taught, a revealed system, the one meant by the Lord, and believed and understood by the angels, and thus taught in the Church in heaven. The institution of a Church on earth having the heavenly platform, and therefore endeavoring to establish the heavenly truths in the world, is what is meant by the New Jerusalem which John saw, and is described in Revelation 21 and 22, and also meant in Daniel by the "kingdom" to be set up in the latter days — to be the crown and completion of all churches, and to last forever. The glory and honor of the nations are to flow into it, while those who are saved will walk by the light of it. It will be composed of all those who acknowledge and approach the Lord Jesus Christ alone as the only God of heaven and earth, and lead a life of obedience to his precepts. It is called the Bride, the Lamb's wife, because it worships the Lord Jesus only, being spiritually conjoined to none but him. As this earth is needed as a seminary for the propagation and instruction of the human race, marriage is the divinely appointed means to that end; in itself a holy institution, the very foundation of heaven and the Church. The union of one man with one woman is essential to its very existence. By shunning every impurity as a sin against God, the love for each other in the minds of such partners becomes constantly cleaner and purer; the distinction of sex pertains to the soul, the two minds are exactly fitted to form a union, and the spiritual love and friendship of a pair remaining obedient to the divine precepts may continue to eternity. Wedlock is not only more useful than celibacy, but to those who follow a life of righteousness is spiritually purer, and more conducive to regeneration. Every departure from strict conjugal chastity, even in thought, is a divergence towards hell. By some reviewers, Swedenborg has been charged with looseness in this respect. Nothing can be further from the truth. He discriminates very clearly and justly the different degrees of disorder and criminality, but affords not the slightest plea for the least latitude on the part of a Christian. (See the editorial additions below.)

The difficulty, or rather impossibility, of giving an adequate idea of this system, or any of its parts, in a mere statement, arises from its

comprehensiveness, and its exhaustive thoroughness in all its particulars. It is pervaded throughout by a profound philosophy of man, the soul, human society, and the universe, which cannot be wholly transferred to other pages than those on which it is originally found. It is alleged by its most intelligent students to be perfectly consistent and coherent throughout, and to answer satisfactorily every question which the rational religious mind desires to ask. It has undoubtedly definite teaching on a larger number of points than any other system of theology or philosophy that has ever appeared in the world. For some account of the writings in which it is contained and the literature of Swedenborgians, *SEE EMANUEL SWEDENBORG* in this work.

**II. History and Organization.** — Swedenborg took no steps towards an ecclesiastical organization, nor was there any movement of the kind until many years after his death, the first notices of it appearing about 1780. Since then there has been a steady and nearly uniform increase, zealous advocates of these doctrines being now found in all parts of the Christian world, and to some extent in regions beyond. They are making progress in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Russia, France, Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain, South Africa, Australia, and the East Indies, as well as in America. In Great Britain Swedenborgianism found its earliest organization under the name of “Theosophical Society” in 1783, and thus continued until 1788, when Robert Hindmarsh (q.v.) and friends hired a chapel in London, and established public worship and preaching according to Swedenborg’s doctrines. The example was soon followed in other places, and there is in that country since the beginning of this century a General Conference, which was composed in 1873 of 58 societies, 26 ministers, and 4019 members, holding annual sessions, maintaining publishing and missionary societies and periodicals, besides many churches or congregations not in connection with the general body. There are numbers, too, of clergymen and laymen adopting a large portion of the views while retaining their connection with the other denominations. In Canada there is an association, composed of several ministers and churches, with scattered members, having an “ordained minister,” or presiding bishop.

In the United States, where the first Swedenborgian Church was organized in 1792, at Baltimore, Md., a General Convention exists since 1817, incorporated under the law, having associations, societies, or members in nearly all the states in the Union; in 1890 it reported 113 ministers, 154 societies, and 7095 members; it holds annual sessions in different cities,

maintains a Board of Publication, with a publishing-house in New York, issues three periodicals, sends out missionaries, has a theological school at Waltham, Mass., an American New-Church Sunday-School Union, and a New-Church National Church Music Society. No very precise ecclesiastical forms are prescribed in these doctrines, much freedom being allowed in this respect to the genius and wants of different nations, and the practical wisdom of the Church, the power being vested in the whole body of membership. The form principally assumed in this country is a modified or moderate episcopacy, with a ministry in three orders. Each state association has its “ordaining minister,” or ecclesiastical overseer, whose office is permanent. In most of the congregations the worship has assumed a partially liturgical form, and a variety of liturgies, books of worship, and manuals of devotion have been issued in this country and in England. Each congregation is free to adopt its own mode, and hence all forms are found in use, from the simple, extemporaneous modes of the Puritans, to the ritual services of the prelatical churches. In all, however, forms expressed in the exact language of Scripture are preferred. In the General Convention the lay and clerical delegates meet and vote in one body. The accredited organ of the New Jerusalem Church in Great Britain is the *Intellectual Repository*, published in London; in Germany, the *Wochen Schrift fur die Neue Kirche*, at Stuttgart; in Italy, *La Nuova Epoca*; in the United States, the *Jerusalem Messenger*, at New York, and *Bote der Neuen Kirche*, at Baltimore. In England there is also published the *Juvenile Magazine*, and in this country the *Little Messenger*, for the youth.

There is also a “New-Church Congregational Union,” composed of ministers and churches, with an aggregate membership of about 1000, preferring that form of organization, having its headquarters at Philadelphia, and maintaining its own Board of Publication, Tract Society, and periodical. There are, too, independent societies or churches, not in association with any general body, with numbers of believers communing in other denominations, and others not in connection with any Church.

*Articles of Faith.* — The Scriptures, as interpreted by the voluminous and verbose writings of Swedenborg, are taken generally as the standard of Swedenborgian doctrine; but a synopsis of their founder’s opinions was made at the first organization of the sect in the form of forty-two propositions, taken from his works, and these propositions were embodied in thirty-two resolutions, which were agreed to at the first Conference on April 16, 1789. These thirty-two “Resolutions” have again been condensed

into twelve “Articles of Faith,” which now form the standard of doctrine in the “New Church.” They are as follows:

“**1.** That Jehovah God, the creator and preserver of heaven and earth, is love itself, and wisdom itself, or good itself, and truth itself: that he is one both in essence and in person, in whom, nevertheless, is the divine Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which are the essential Divinity, the Divine-Humanity, and the Divine Proceeding, answering to the soul, the body, and the operative energy in man: and that the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is that God.

“**2.** That Jehovah God himself descended from heaven as divine truth, which is the Word, and took upon him human nature, for the purpose of removing from man the powers of hell, and restoring to order all things in the spiritual world, and all things in the Church: that he removed from man the powers of hell by combats against and victories over them, in which consisted the great work of redemption: that by the same acts, which were his temptations, the last of which was the passion of the cross, he united in his humanity divine truth to divine good, or divine wisdom to divine love, and so returned into his divinity in which he was from eternity, together with and in his glorified humanity, whence he forever keeps the infernal powers in subjection to himself; and that all who believe in him with the understanding, from the heart, and live accordingly, will be saved.

“**3.** That the sacred Scripture, or Word of God, is divine truth itself, containing a spiritual sense heretofore unknown, whence it is divinely inspired and holy in every syllable, as well as a literal sense, which is the basis of its spiritual sense, and in which divine truth is in its fullness, its sanctity, and its power, thus that it is accommodated to the apprehension both of angels and men: that the spiritual and natural senses are united by correspondences like soul and body, every natural expression and image answering to and including a spiritual and divine idea; and tinius that the Word is the medium of communication with heaven and of conjunction with the Lord.

“**4.** That the government of the Lord’s divine love and wisdom is the divine providence, which is universal, exercised according to certain fixed laws of order, and extending to the minutest particulars of the life of all men, both of the good and of the evil: that in all its operations it has respect to what is infinite and eternal, and makes no account of

things transitory, but as they are subservient to eternal ends; thus, that it mainly consists with man, in the connection of things temporal with things eternal, for that the continual aim of the Lord by his divine providence is to join man to himself, and himself to man, that he may be able to give him the felicities of eternal life; and that the laws of permission are also laws of the divine providence, since evil cannot be prevented without destroying the nature of man as an accountable agent, and because also it cannot be removed unless it be known, and cannot be known unless it appear: thus that no evil is permitted but to prevent a greater, and all is overruled by the Lord's divine providence for the greatest possible good.

**“5.** That man is not life, but is only a recipient of life from the Lord, who, as he is love itself, and wisdom itself, is also life itself, which life is communicated by influx to all in the spiritual world, whether belonging to heaven or to hell, and to all in the natural world, but is received differently by every one, according to his quality and consequent state of reception.

**“6.** That, man, during his abode in the world, is, as to his spirit in the midst between heaven and hell, acted upon by influences from both, and thus is kept in a state of spiritual equilibrium between good and evil, in consequence of which he enjoys free-will, or freedom of choice, in spiritual things as well as in natural, and possesses the capacity of either turning himself to the Lord and his kingdom, or turning himself away from the Lord, and connecting himself with the kingdom of darkness; and that, unless man had such freedom of choice, the Word would be of no use, the Church would be a mere name, man would possess nothing by virtue of which he could be conjoined to the Lord, and the cause of evil would be chargeable on God himself.

**“7.** That man at this day is born into evil of all kinds, or with tendencies towards it: that, therefore, in order to his entering the kingdom of heaven, he must be regenerated or created anew, which great work is effected in a progressive manner by the Lord alone, by charity and faith as mediums during man's co-operation: that as all men are redeemed, all are capable of being regenerated and consequently saved, every one according to his state; and that the regenerated man is in communion with the angels of heaven, and the unregenerate with the spirits of hell: but that no one is condemned for hereditary evil any further than as he



makes it his own by actual life; whence all who die in infancy are saved, special means being provided by the Lord in the other life for that purpose.

**“8.** That repentance is the first beginning of the Church in man, and that it consists in a man’s examining himself, both in regard to his deeds and his intentions, in knowing and acknowledging his sins, confessing them before the Lord, supplicating him for aid, and beginning a new life: that to this end all evils, whether of affection, of thought, or of life, are to be abhorred and shunned as sins against God, and because they proceed from infernal spirits, who, in the aggregate, are called the Devil and Satan; and that good affections, good thoughts, and good actions are to be cherished and performed, because they are of God and from God: that these things are to be done by man as of himself; nevertheless, under the acknowledgment and belief that it is from the Lord operating in him and by him: that so far as man shuns evils as sins, so far they are removed, remitted, or forgiven; so far also he does good, not from himself, but from the Lord; and in the same degree he loves truth, has faith, and is a spiritual man; and that the Decalogue teaches what evils are sins.

**“9.** That charity, faith, and good works are unitedly necessary to man’s salvation, since charity without faith is not spiritual but natural, and faith without charity is not living but dead, and both charity and faith without good works are merely mental and perishable things, because without use or fixedness; and that nothing of faith, of charity, or of good works is of man, but that all is of the Lord, and all the merit is his alone.

**“10.** That Baptism and the Holy Supper are sacraments of divine institution, and are to be permanently observed — baptism being an external medium of introduction into the Church, and a sign representative of man’s purification and regeneration, and the Holy Supper being an external medium, to those who receive it worthily, of introduction as to spirit into heaven, and of conjunction with the Lord, of which also it is a sign and seal.

**“11.** That immediately after death, which is only a putting off of the material body never to be resumed, man rises again in a spiritual or substantial body, in which he continues to live to eternity, in heaven if

his ruling affections and thence his life have been good, and in hell if his ruling affections and thence his life have been evil.

“**12.** That now is the time of the second advent of the Lord, which is a coming, not in person, but in the power and glory of his holy Word: that it is attended, like his first coming, with the restoration to order of all things in the spiritual world, where the wonderful divine operation, commonly expected under the name of the Last Judgment, has in consequence been performed, and with the preparing of the way for a new Church on the earth — the first Christian Church having spiritually come to its end or consummation through evils of the and errors of doctrine, as foretold by the Lord in the Gospels; and that this new or second Christian Church, which will be the crown of all churches, and will stand forever, is what was representatively seen by John when he beheld the holy city, New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.”

It will be noticed by our readers that the view taken by the New Jerusalem Church of the person and work of Christ, as God, is fundamentally at variance with the opinions of all other Christian churches, whether Romanist or Protestant. The language of Scripture concerning justification and redemption is invested with a meaning altogether different from that which is usually assigned to it. It is denied, according to the Swedenborgian system, that the Son descended from the Father, and, further on, that the Father in his wrath condemned the human race, and in his mercy sent his Son to bear their curse. It is denied, and declared to be a fundamental error to believe, that the sufferings of Christ on the cross were the redemption of his people. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is distinctly denied. and declared to be a subversion of the divine order. Mediation, intercession, atonement, propitiation, are alleged to be forms of speech “expressive of the approach which is opened to God, and of the grace communicated from God, by means of his humanity.” Swedenborg taught that in the fullness of time *Jehovah* assumed human nature to redeem and save mankind, by subjugating the hells and restoring to order the heavens. Every victory gained by Christ over the temptations to which he was exposed weakened the powers of evil everywhere. The victory of the Savior is our victory, in virtue of which we are able, believing in him, to resist and vanquish evil. Redemption Swedenborg believed to be wrought for us only in so far as it is wrought *in* us: and that our sins are forgiven just in proportion as we are reclaimed from them.

In regard to the future state, and the condition of the soul after death, it must have occurred to our readers that the doctrines of Swedenborgians differ greatly from those of all other churches. Thus the Swedenborgians maintain that there is a last judgment, both particular and general; the former relating to an individual of the Church, and the latter to the Church considered collectively. The last judgment, as it relates to an individual, takes place at death; the last judgment, as it relates to the Church collectively considered, takes place when there is no longer any genuine faith and love in it, whereby it ceases to be a Church. Thus the last judgment of the Jewish Church took place at the coming of Christ, and accordingly he said, "Now is the judgment of this world, now is the prince of this world cast out." The last judgment of the Christian Church foretold by the Lord in the Gospels, and by John in the Revelation, took place, according to Swedenborg, in A.D. 1757; the former heaven and earth are now therefore passed away; the "New Jerusalem" mentioned in the Apocalypse has come down from heaven in the form of the "New Church;" and consequently the second advent of the Lord has even now been realized in a spiritual sense by the exhibition of his power and glory in the New Church thus established. Another important divergence in Swedenborgian belief from other Christians is that respecting holy Scripture, which is so stated by Mr. Hayden as hardly to convey clearly the belief of his Church. A reference to the third article of the Articles of Faith will make it clearer, and yet even it does not fairly cover it, for it omits the statement of the twelfth proposition taken from Swedenborg's *Arcana Coelestia* and other "revelations." This statement is "that the books of the Word are all those which have the internal sense, which are as follows, viz., in the O.T., the five books of Moses, called Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; the book of Joshua, the book of Judges, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the Psalms of David, the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; and in the N.T., the four evangelists — Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—and the Revelation. And that the other books, not having the internal sense, are not the Word" (*Arcana Coelestia*, n. 10,325; *New Jerusalem*, p. 266; *White Horse*, n. 16), Thus ten books of the O.T., the Acts of the Apostles, and all the epistles of Paul and the other apostles, are set aside as no part of "the Word of the Lord."

The remaining articles of the Swedenborgian Confession may be passed over without comment, since they deal more with theosophical views of love, wisdom, repentance, charity, faith, good works, etc., than with important articles of faith. It may be added here that when, in 1788, it was determined to effect a permanent religious organization of all Swedenborgians, it was thought expedient to establish a settled ministry, and it was arranged, by drawing of lots, that Robert Hindmarsh, the printer, should ordain his father, James Hindmarsh, and Samuel Smith, both of them being Methodist preachers who had seceded from Wesley's society. In the year 1818 the eleventh General Conference of the sect settled some doubts which had been raised as to the competency of Robert Hindmarsh to ordain others, seeing he had not himself been ordained, by determining unanimously "that Mr. Robert Hindmarsh was virtually ordained by the divine auspices of heaven" (see Hindmarsh. *Rise and Progress of the New Church*, p. 72, 310). In 1815 "a trine, or threefold order" of the ministry was established. It consists of the ordinary ministers, ordaining ministers, and a minister superintendent over and in behalf of the New Church at large.

### New-Light Antiburghers

*SEE ANTIBURGHERS.*

### New-Light Burghers

*SEE ANTIBURGHERS.*

### New Lights

a name frequently given to the early Christians in contempt. In modern times the expression has been applied to some seceding ecclesiastical bodies in Scotland, as, e.g. *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (q.v.). *The Separates* (q.v.), a sect of Calvinistic Methodists organized in this country near the middle of last century, were at first known also as *New Lights*.

### Newlin, Thomas, B.D.

an eminent English divine, was born at Winchester in 1689. In 1706 he was elected demy of Magdalen College, Oxford; became M.A. in 1713, and actual fellow in 1718. He was presented to the living of Beeding, Sussex, in 1720, and died in 1743. He was a divine of great worth and remarkable abilities, and was especially esteemed for his simplicity of manners and

integrity of life. His sermons have always been greatly admired. "There is a zeal and pathos in them which rank them among the most useful sermons and elegant compositions in the language" (Clapham). Many of them are inserted in Dr. Vicesimus Knox's *Family Lectures*, and in Clapham's *Collection*. Newlin published five separate *Sermons* (1718-1736): — *Eighteen Sermons on Several Occasions* (Oxf. 1720, 8vo): — *One and twenty Sermons on Several Occasions* (Oxf. 1726, 8vo): — and translated from the Latin bishop Thomas Parker's *History of his Own Times* (1727, 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 2:2174. Newman, Francis William, an eminent English speculative writer, perhaps the ablest and most noted of modern theists, was born in London in 1805. He received his preparatory training in his own home and at the school of Ealing, and thence passed to Worcester College, Oxford, where he obtained first-class honors in classics and mathematics in 1826, and in the same year a fellowship in Baliol College. This fellowship, however, he resigned; and he withdrew from the university in 1830, at the approach of the time for taking the degree of M.A., declining the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, which was then required from candidates for the degree. He set out on a lengthened tour in the East, and spent nearly three years (1830-1833) in various parts of Turkey, starting, as some will have it, to engage in missionary work in the East, but finally relinquishing this work for philological and social studies of the Turks. As the result of his observations in that country we have from his pen letters sent at the time but not made common public property until 1856, when they were sent forth, entitled *Personal Narrative in Letters, principall from Turkey, in the years 1830-1833*. Shortly after his return home he was appointed classical tutor in Bristol College (1834). In 1840 he accepted a similar professorship in Manchester New College; and finally, in 1846, his great reputation for scholarship, and his general accomplishments, led to his appointment to the chair of the Latin language and literature in the London University, which position he held until 1863, when his numerous literary engagements made it necessary for him to quit the school-room. Yet even while in the professorial chair Mr. Newman was engrossed by numerous and varied engagements; thus he not only became an active contributor to several literary and scientific periodicals, and to various branches of ancient and modern literature, but took also a leading part in the controversies on religion, in which he chose the line directly opposite to that taken by his elder brother, proving no less ardent as a disciple of the extreme rationalistic school than John Henry Newman of the dogmatical. Indeed,

Francis William Newman is chiefly known to-day on account of the peculiar opinions he held on religious questions. These opinions, and the system founded upon them, form the subject of his well-known work, *Phases of Faith, or Passages from the History of My Creed* (1850, and often; replied to from the orthodox standpoint in Rogers's *Eclipse of Faith*, which Mr. Newman answered in his second edition [1853], which in turn elicited a response from Rogers, entitled *A Defence of the Eclipse of Faith* [2d ed. 1854]), and of many essays in the *Westminster, Eclectic*, and other reviews; but he is also the author of very many separate publications. Of these, several relate to the fundamental questions of the controversy to which we have referred, as *Catholic Union: — Essays towards a Church of the Future* (1844): — *A State Church not Defensible* (1846): — *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy* (1847): — *The Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations* (1849): — *Solomon's Song of Songs*, a new translation (1857): — *Theism, Doctrinal and Practical, or Didactic Religious Utterances* (1858). Few men have labored as successfully as F. W. Newman in speculative theological fields. A scholar and a thinker of first-class order, his utterances and publications have commanded the respect of his contemporaries. In England especially he has exerted a widespread and powerful, though it must be confessed, sad as it may seem, a baneful influence. Rather mystical in his religious notions, his life spoke most decidedly in favor of the highest types of Christian manhood, and a personal forgetfulness for Christ's sake. His declarations, however, would, if successful, take from us the foundations of the Christian religion; thus strongly and strangely contrasting, by his tenacious clinging to its highest as well as humblest associations, with his strong but inconsistent love for the very letter of Scripture, and his profound conviction of the essential truth of Christianity. With him religion is wholly subjective and innate, and thus incapable of deriving its ideas of divine truth from any revelation or external source whatever. Not only does he distinguish between religion and theology, as he should do, but, like our own theist, Theodore Parker (q.v.), he separates the one from the other, and flings the former with contempt away altogether. His logical consistency we cannot call in question. Indeed, his power of reasoning has been commended alike by friend and foe, but there is the more fault to be found with his premises, which are chiefly some palpable and isolated sophisms. He denies the doctrine of the Trinity, rejects that of eternal punishment, and assails the canon of Scripture; but he more wisely espouses the Arminian view on the doctrine of the will. Indeed, it is generally and reasonably asserted that his estrangement from

orthodox Christianity was caused by the radical Calvinistic training which he received in his youth. While his early religious views are laid down in *Phases of Faith*, his work on the *Soul* is the most complete and the latest exposed of the views in his maturer years. That work treats first of the "Sense of the Infinite without us." It shows how this sense is the joint fruit of awe and wonder and admiration, as these emotions are begotten by the soul's consciousness of the mysterious and sublime and lovely in the facts of its environment. These are the preparation of the heart for love; for they are antagonistic to our selfishness. Even the domestic affections tend to multiply self, rather than to kill out selfishness. Enthusiasm is wanted. Enthusiasm is the life-blood of morality. The sense of order marks the next stage of human aspiration; and this, in turn, is followed by the sense that the eternal order is both good and wise. The sense of personality, which glimmers in the first sentiment of awe, now floods the spirit with its beams, and culminates in the soul's sense of sin and longing for enfranchisement, evolving under natural and regular conditions a sense of personal relationship with God. Out of this sense of personal relation comes "the prayer of faith," addressed to God in perfect confidence that he will hear and answer it, and from this sense is born the sweet assurance of immortal life. Such is the scheme, and it is carried out with a great deal of force and earnestness. This work was superseded by *Theism*, which did not prove so satisfactory to his own school of thought as the former work (see *Christian Examiner*, May, 1866, art. 4). Newman's proof of God is presented as follows: His first axiom is that the omnipresent law, which we discern as animating the universe, is not blind, but intelligent; the second, that God must have all the human spirit's faculties, and more besides; the third, that God observes our moral actions, approves the right and disapproves the wrong; the fourth, that if he approves our rectitude, his must be perfect; the fifth, that adoration of God is intrinsically suitable to man; therefore such adoration is pleasing to God. These axioms are intuitive, but they are capable of being verified; and, before stating them as axioms, Mr. Newman seeks to verify them. His first test is that of congruity; Are they self-consistent, and consistent with known facts? His second test is that of universal reason; the common consciousness of mankind. His third is that of practical experience. A postulate from these axioms is that God gives spiritual strength to them that ask for it in prayer. He does not claim this for an intuition. But we pray instinctively, and experience tells us that we never pray in vain.

“Who, then — having faith that God is the fountain of holiness, and approves of our virtue, and enjoins its advancement — can doubt that when we pray and surrender our worse, not only thereby do we welcome the better that *was* within, but the living Source of that better swells the flood of his presence: so that the conscience itself becomes sounder and purer and stronger, broadening, deepening, enlivening the inward moral forces.” — *Theism*. P. 195.

It will be seen from this synopsis that there is much that authorizes our likening him to the American theist Parker. In many respects, however, Newman was the superior of Parker. The latter’s method of reasoning was less formal and exact, and the life, too, not quite so Christ-like as that of the English theist. Newman died in 1875. Aside from Mill, no other English writer should claim so much of the attention of the theological student as F.W.Newman. He was possessed of that unusual breadth of intellectual tastes and accomplishments which gave such eminence to Mill; and, unlike the latter, he did service to Christian theology by his valuable contributions to the evidences for a deistic faith. Like Mill, Newman shone conspicuously as a political writer. He also figured prominently by his philological attainments, and was especially noted for his mastery of the Oriental tongues, particularly the Arabic. For a list of his publications in these departments we must refer to secular cyclopaedias. See *London Quarterly Review*, 1854, July, p. 234 sq.; Oct. art. i; *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1858; Oct. 1870, p. 220; *Eclectic Review*, 4th ser., 28:257 sq.; *Fraser’s Magazine*, 33:253 sq.

### Newman, Jonathan

a noted pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, flourished near the opening of this century. Of his early personal history we know scarcely anything. In 1791 we find him laboring in the Wyoming valley, which unites Pennsylvania and New York, and later in Otsego County, N. Y., where he was instrumental in forming the district. This county was at that time wild and sparsely settled, with scarcely any roads and many destitute people. Newman by indefatigable industry succeeded in rallying many to the Christian work, and when the district was formed eighty members were reported as belonging to it. He next extended his labors over the Mohawk valley, and when Garrettson (q.v.) came into that region Newman’s preparatory work proved more service, able than had been expected. He was “a mighty preacher, and usually in the advance line of



attack," and wherever he went he made friends and converts. Newman died and was buried on the Otsego Circuit about the opening of the present century. See Peck, *Early Methodism*, p. 174 sq.; Stevens, *Hist. M. E. Ch.* 2:329, 330. (J. H. W.)

### Newman, Samuel

a minister of colonial days in this country, was born at Banbury, England, in 1602, and was educated at Oxford University, where he graduated in 1620, and immediately took holy orders in the state establishment. In 1636 he emigrated to America, and, after staying a short time at Dorchester, now Boston, Mass., was chosen minister of the Church at Weymouth. In 1644 he removed to Rehoboth, and there preached until his death, which occurred July 5, 1663. Newman compiled a concordance of the Scriptures which passed through several editions, under the title of the *Cambridge Concordance* (5th ed. Lond. 1720, fol.).

### Newman, Samuel P.

an American educator and rhetorician, was born at Andover, Mass., in 1796, and was educated at Bowdoin College, where he graduated in 1816. In 1824 he was made a professor of rhetoric and oratory in his alma mater, and he held that position until 1839. He then became principal of the State Normal School in Mississippi, and died while in the discharge of the duties of that office at Barre, Mo. Feb. 10, 1842. He published a *Rhetoric*, a treatise on *Political Economy*, and a series of *Southern Eclectic Readers*.

### Newman, Selig

a noted Jewish scholar, eminent as an Hebraist, was born in the city of Posen, Prussian Poland, in 1790, and received the best education that could be procured in various Jewish colleges in Prussia. He decided to devote himself to Biblical studies, and even at an early age his renown was so great that he was given an office in the chief synagogue of Berlin. He went to London when about twenty-eight years of age, and was soon afterwards appointed minister to the congregation at Plymouth by the late chief rabbi, Dr. Solomon Herschell. Afterwards, for many years, he taught Hebrew in the University of Oxford, and would have had the title and salary of the professorship had not his religion debarred him from accepting, there being an old law in that university which precludes all other than Protestants from holding that office. Yet for many years the heads of that university, by

their own example, encouraged all requiring instruction in Hebrew to study under him. When at length several converted Jews came to the university, he was compelled to leave, and to seek a home in America at an advanced age. Among the eminent men who were his pupils in England was Dr. Tait, the present archbishop of Canterbury, who no doubt, had Newman been in England, would have placed him upon the mixed learned commission of Christians and Jews now engaged in revising the authorized translation of the Bible. Competent authorities pronounce him to have been the best Hebrew scholar of the present day, and learned rabbis did not think it derogatory to their position to take instruction of him in the higher branches of Hebrew literature. The late Rev. Dr. Raphall, Prof. Marks, of London, and other eminent Israelites, were among his pupils. In the United States Newman found no official employment. He had many pupils in the Hebrew, but busied himself mainly with his own writings, on which he was engaged until the hour of his death, Feb. 20, 1871, at Brooklyn, . Y. His works consisted of a *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, an *English and Hebrew Lexicon*, a *Hebrew Grammar*, a popular work, entitled *The Challenge Accepted*, being in the form of a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian, and *Emmendations of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament*. His last work, which he had but just completed, is still in manuscript, and is an abridged translation of the Bible, with copious notes, intended for the use of Jewish schools and private families. There is every reason to believe that, at his advanced age, the close application he gave to this work hastened his end. His intellect was clear and vigorous to the last. Selig Newman was an enlightened man, opposed to bigotry, but at the same time a staunch Jew, firmly wedded to the orthodox principles of his faith, and always ready to battle for Judaism. At one time, when the conversionists were most active in England, they selected their most competent advocate to challenge the Jews to a public discussion. Selig Newman was selected by such Israelites in London as felt an interest in this discussion to meet the Christian advocate, and he did so, the discussion being carried on for many nights in public at the Freemasons' Hall Tavern. He afterwards delivered sermons to the Jews for many Sabbaths at the Jews' Free School, the building being always crowded by anxious listeners, but his duties at Oxford compelled him to relinquish this, to him, pleasurable task. His views on Christianity are embodied in his *The Challenge Accepted*, a book worthy the study of Christian Apologists. (J. H. W.)

## Newmarket

an English market-town, situated in the county of Suffolk, is noted in English ecclesiastical history as the seat of a Church council which is reported to have been held there in July, 1161, by Henry II, king of England, and is denominated *Concilium apud Novum Mercatum*. This ecclesiastical gathering is said to have recognized the papal authority of Alexander III (q.v.), and to have declared against the antipope Victor. Binius and others call this an English council, but Labbe (*Concil.* 10:1406) contends that the Novum Mercatum is the Neufranche in Normandy, in the diocese of Rouen. Inett, in his *History of the English Church*, ignores this council altogether.

## New Moon

(**vdj** ρcho'desh, strictly *newness*; fully **vdj** ρvarq *beginning of the month* [as in <sup><0400></sup>Numbers 10:10; 28:11], since **vdj** ρ stands likewise for “a month” [q.v.]; Sept. νεομηνία or νοομηνία; Vulg. *calendae, neomeni*), FESTIVAL OF, a regular observance among the Jews. Many ancient nations celebrated the returning light of the moon with festivities (Isidor. *Orig.* v. 33; Macrobian. *Sat.* 1:15, p. 273, Bip. ed.; Tacitus, *Germ.* vol. ii) — offered sacrifices (Suid. s.v. ἀνάστατοι; Meursii *Graecia Ferial.* v. 211 sq.) and prayers (Demosth. *In Aristog.* 1:799; Horace, *Odes.* 3:23, 1 sq.), feasted (Hor. *Ov.* 3:19, 9 sq.; comp. *Concil. Trul.* can. 62; Mansi, 10:974), and made merry (Theophr. *Char.* 5; Doughtaei *Annal.* 2:133; Spencer, *Legg. rit.* 3:4, p. 1045 sq.). In the following account of this usage we bring together the Scriptural and the almidlical notices.

**1. Celebration and Sanctity of this Festival.** — All that the Mosaic code says on the subject is contained in the two passages enjoining that two young bullocks, a ram and seven lambs of the first year as a burnt-offering, with the appropriate meat-offerings and drink-offerings, and a kid as a sin-offering, are to be offered on every new moon in addition to the ordinary daily sacrifice, and that the trumpets are to be blown at the offering of these special sacrifices, just as on the days of rejoicing and solemn festivals (<sup><0400></sup>Numbers 10:10; 28:11-15). It is, however, evident from the writings of the prophets, and from post-exilian documents, that the new moon was an important national festival. It is placed by the side of the Sabbath (<sup><2013></sup>Isaiah 1:13; <sup><2400></sup>Ezekiel 46:1; <sup><2013></sup>Hosea 2:3), and was a day on which the people neither traded nor engaged in any handicraft-work (<sup><2013></sup>Amos 8:5), but had

social gatherings and feastings (<sup><0215></sup>1 Samuel 20:5-24), resorted for public instruction either to the Temple (<sup><2313></sup>Isaiah 1:13; 66:23; <sup><5411></sup>Ezekiel 46:1, 3), or to the houses of the prophets and other men of God (<sup><1123></sup>2 Kings 4:23); and no national or private fasts were permitted to take place, so as not to mar the festivities of the day (Judith 8:6; Mishna, *Taanith*, 2:10). The *Hallel* (q.v.) was chanted in the Temple by the Levites while the special sacrifices were offered; and to this day the Jews celebrate new moon as a minor festival. The day previous to it, i.e. the 29th of the month, which is called **br [ çdj çar**, *New Moon Eve*, **ἡ προνουμηνία** (<sup><0215></sup>Judges 8:6), is kept by the orthodox Jews, in consequence of a remark in the Mishna (*Shebaoth*, 1:4, 5), as the *minor day of atonement*, and is devoted to fasting, repentance, and prayer, both for forgiveness of the sins committed during the expiring month, and for a happy new month. It is for this reason denominated **^f q rwpyk μwy**, since they say that, just as the great day of atonement is appointed for the forgiveness of sins committed during the year, this minor day of atonement is ordained for the remission of sins committed during each month. They resort to the synagogue, put on the fringed wrapper, or *Tallith*, **SEE FRINGE**, and the phylacteries; whereupon the leader of the service recites Psalm 102, offers a penitential prayer (**hz μwy**), after which he recites Psalm viii, the prayer called *Ashre* (**yrça**), and *the half Kadish*. The scroll of the Law (**hrwt rps**) is then taken out of the ark, **l j yw**, or <sup><0221></sup>Exodus 32:11-15; 34:110, with the *Haphtarah* (q.v.), <sup><2315></sup>Isaiah 4:6; 56:1-8, are read, being the appointed lesson for fasts, after which other appointed penitential prayers, together with the ordinary daily afternoon service, conclude the vespers and the fast, when the Feast of the New Moon is proclaimed, which, like all the feasts and fasts, begins on the previous evening. On the morning of the new moon they resort to the synagogues in festive garments, offer the usual morning prayer (**tyrj ç**), inserting, however, <sup><0231></sup>Numbers 28:11-15 in the recital of the daily sacrifices. and the prayer **awbyw hl [y** in the eighteen benedictions. The phylacteries which are worn at the ordinary daily morning service are then put off, and the *Hallel*, with its appropriate benediction, is recited, all the congregation standing; after which the scroll of the Law (**hrwt rps**) is taken out of the ark, and <sup><0231></sup>Numbers 28:1-15 is read in four sections: the first section (i.e. ver. 1-3) being assigned to the priest; the second (ver. 3-5) to the Levite; the third (ver. 6-10) to an Israelite; and the fourth (ver. 11-15) to any one. If new moon happens on a

Sabbath, two scrolls of the Law are taken out of the ark, from the first of which the ordinary Sabbatic lesson is read, and from the other <sup><043D></sup>Numbers 28:9-15, or *Maphtir*; and if it happens on a Sunday, <sup><00B></sup>1 Samuel 20:18-42 is read as the *Hatphtarrah* instead of the ordinary lesson from the prophets. Unlike their brethren in the time of the prophets (<sup><10B></sup>Amos 8:5), the Jews of the present day work and trade on new moon.

The new moons are generally mentioned so as to show that they were regarded as a peculiar class of holy days, to be distinguished from the solemn feasts and the Sabbaths (<sup><2617></sup>Ezekiel 45:17; <sup><3231></sup>1 Chronicles 23:31; <sup><40D4></sup>2 Chronicles 2:4; 8:13; 31:3; <sup><10B></sup>Ezra 3:5; <sup><60B></sup>Nehemiah 10:33). *SEE FESTIVAL.*

The seventh new moon of the religious year, being that of Tisri, commenced the civil year, and had a significance and rites of its own. It was a day of holy convocation. *SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.*

**2. Mode of ascertaining, fixing, and consecrating the New Moon.** — As the festivals, according to the Mosaic law, are always to be celebrated on the same day of the month, it was incumbent upon the spiritual guides of the nation to fix the commencement of the month, which was determined by the appearance of the new moon. Hence the authorities at Jerusalem, from the remotest times, ordered messengers to occupy the commanding heights around the metropolis, on the 30th day of the month, to watch the sky; these, as soon as they observed the moon, hastened to communicate it to the synod; and, for the sake of speed, they were even allowed, during the existence of the Temple, to travel on the Sabbath and profane the sacred day (*Mishna, Rosh Ha-Shana*, 1:4). These authorities also ordained that, with the exception of gamblers with dice, usurers, those who breed and tame pigeons to entice others, those who trade in the produce of the Sabbatical year, women and slaves, any one who noticed the new moon is to give evidence before the Sanhedrim, even if he were sick and had to be carried to Jerusalem in a bed (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 1:8, 9). These witnesses had to assemble in a large court, called *Beth Jazek* (qz[y tyb]), specially appointed for it, where they were carefully examined and feasted, so as to induce them to come; and when the authorities were satisfied with the evidence, the president pronounced the word çdwqm, i.e. *It is sanctified*; whereupon all the bystanders had to repeat it twice after him, *It is sanctified! It is sanctified!* and the day was declared New Moon (*Mishna, Rosh Ha-Shanam*, 2:5, 7). On beholding the new moon from his own

house, every Israelite had to offer the following benediction: “Blessed be He who renews the months! Blessed be He by whose word the heavens were created, and by the breath of whose mouth all the hosts thereof were formed! He appointed them a law and time, that they should not overstep their course. They rejoice and are glad to perform the will of their Creator. Author of truth, their operations are truth! He spoke to the moon, Be thou renewed, and be the beautiful diadem (i.e. the hope) of man (i.e. Israel), who shall one day be quickened again like the moon (i.e. at the coming of Messiah), and praise their Creator for his glorious kingdom. Blessed be He who renewed the moons” (*Sanhedrin*, 42 a). Of such importance was this prayer regarded, that it is asserted, “Whoso pronounceth the benediction of the New Moon in its proper time, is as if he had been holding converse with the Shekhinah” (*ibid.*). To this prayer was afterwards added, “A good sign, good fortune be to all Israel! (to be repeated three times). Blessed be thy Creator! Blessed be thy Possessor! Blessed be thy Maker! (repeated three times). As I leap towards thee, but cannot touch thee, so may my enemies not be able to injure me (said leaping three times). May fear and anguish seize them. Through the greatness of thine arm they must be as still as a stone; they must be as still as a stone through the greatness of thine arm. Fear and anguish shall seize them. Amen, Selah, Hallelujah. Peace, peace, peace be with you” (*Sopherimn*, 2:2). This prayer, which during the period of the second Temple was offered up by every Israelite as soon as he beheld the new moon, is still offered up every month by all orthodox Jews, with some additions by the rabbins and the Kabbalists of the Middle Ages, and is called in the Jewish ritual **hnbI c̣wdyq**, *Consecration of the New Moon*. When the moon was not visible on account of clouds, and in the five months when the watchmen were not sent out, the month was considered to commence on the morning of the day which followed the 30th. According to Maimonides, the Rabbinists altered their method when the Sanhedrim ceased to exist, and have ever since determined the month by astronomical calculation, while the Karaites have retained the old custom of depending on the appearance of the moon. Astronomical knowledge was certainly acquired long after the destruction of Jerusalem; liless, with Michaelis and Jahn (*Archaeol.* 3:304), we find a trace of it, sufficiently obscure, in ~~1250~~ 2 Kings 25:27 (comp. ~~2523~~ Jeremiah 52:33. See also Paulus, *Comment.* 3:543 sq.).

**3. Origin of this Festival.** — That the Mosaic law did not institute this festival, but already found it among the people, and simply regulated it, is

evident both from the fact that the time of its commencement is nowhere stated, and from the words in which the sacrifices are spoken of (“And on your new moons ye shall offer,” etc., ~~Numbers~~ Numbers 28:11, etc.), which presuppose its existence and popularity. Several causes cooperated in giving rise to this festival. The periodical changes of the moon, renewing itself in four quarters of 73 days each, and then assuming a new phase, as well as the fact that its reappearance in the nocturnal sky to ancient cities and villages — the inhabitants of which were consigned to utter darkness, great dangers, and “the terrors by night,” during its absence, since they had no artificial means of lighting their roads — combined together to inspire the nations of antiquity both with awe and gratitude when reflecting on these wonderful phenomena, and beholding the great blessings of the new moon. This is the reason why different nations, from the remotest periods, consecrated the day or the evening which commences this renewal of the moon to the deity who ordained such wonders; just as the first and the beginning of every thing were devoted to the Author of all our blessings. There seems to be but little ground for founding on these traces of heathen usage the notion that the Hebrews derived it from the Gentiles, as Spencer and Michaelis have done; and still less for attaching to it any of those symbolical meanings which have been imagined by some other writers (see Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 425). Ewald thinks that it was at first a simple household festival, and that on this account the law does not take much notice of it. He also considers that there is some reason to suppose that the day of the full moon was similarly observed by the Hebrews in very remote times.

**4. Literature.** — *Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Kiddush Ha-Chodesh* (translated into Latin by De Veil [Paris, 1669; Amsterdam, 1701] and by Witter [Jena, 1703]); Abrabanel, *Dissert. de Princilio mnni et consecratione Novilunii* (Hebrew and Latin, appended by Buxtorf to his translation of *The Cosri* [Basle, 1659, p. 431 sq.]); Knobel, *Commentary on Exodus and Leviticus* (in *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alt. Test.* [Leipsic, 1858, p. 531 sq.], where a vast amount of classical information is brought together to show that this festival existed among many heathen nations of antiquity); Carpzov, *Apparat. Hist. Crit.* p. 423; Spencer, *De Leg. Heb.* lib. 3, dissert. 4; Selden, *De Ann. Civ. Heb.* 4, 11; Mishna, *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 2:338, ed. Surenhus.; Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, cap. 22; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 394; Cudworth, *On the Lord's Supper*, cap. 3; Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, cap. 11.

## New Pelagians

is the name of a Christian sect which arose and spread chiefly in Holland after the Reformation, and advocated Pelagian views in grace and free-will. They are sometimes called *Pelagiani Novi*, and sometimes also *Conaristae*, after Theodore Comartius, secretary to the States-general, who died A.D. 1595. *SEE PELAGIANS.*

## New Platonism

*SEE NEOPLATONISM.*

## New-School Presbyterians

*SEE PRESBYTERIANS,* and *SEE THEOLOGY.*

## New South Wales

a British colony in the south-eastern part of Australia, stretches along the South Pacific Ocean from Cape Howe to Point Danger, and is bounded on the north by the colony of Victoria, and on the west by the interior territory of the colony of South Australia. It extends between lat.  $28^{\circ}$  and  $37^{\circ} 30'$  S., and long.  $141^{\circ}$  and  $154^{\circ}$  E. Its greatest length, east and west, is about 780 miles; greatest breadth, north and south, 620 miles. The area, according to an official statement, is 323,437 square miles; according to a planimetric calculation, believed to be more correct, 308 560. The population, according to the census of April 2, 1871. was 503,981; on Jan. 1, 1873, it was computed at 539,190; in 1881 it was 751,468. The colony of Queensland, extending from lat.  $26^{\circ}$  to  $30^{\circ}$  S. was formerly the Moreton Bay district of New South Wales, and was separated from the latter colony in June, 1859. In 1873 New South Wales was divided into 118 counties of which twenty, which have been settled a long time, are called the old counties; the others, called the new counties, are principally in the interior. The coast-line from Cape Howe to Point Danger is upwards of 700 miles long, and presents numerous good harbors formed by the estuaries of the rivers. Owing to the great extent of the colony, stretching as it does over eleven degrees of latitude, the climate is very various. In the northern districts, which are the warmest, the climate is tropical; the summer heat occasionally rising in inland districts to  $120^{\circ}$ , while on the high table-lands weeks of severe frost are sometimes experienced. At Sydney the mean temperature of the year is about  $65^{\circ}$ . The mean heat of summer, which lasts



from the beginning of December to the first of February, is about 80°, but it is much modified on the coast by the refreshing seabreeze. The annual fall of rain is about 50 inches. Rain sometimes descends in continuous torrents, and causes the rivers to rise to an extraordinary height. Sometimes the rains almost fail for two or three years in succession. Along the coast for 300 miles from the northern boundary the soil and climate are peculiarly adapted to the growth of cotton, and that plant has already been cultivated as far south as the River Manning (lat. 32° S.). Farther south the climate is more temperate, and is fitted to produce all the grain products of Europe. Immense tracts of land, admirably adapted to agriculture, occur in the south-western interior; while in the south-east coast districts the soil is celebrated for its richness and fertility. In the north, the cotton and tobacco plants, the vine and sugar-cane are grown, and pine-apples, bananas, guavas, lemons, citrons, and other tropical fruits are produced. In the cooler regions of the south, peaches, apricots, nectarines; oranges, grapes, pears, pomegranates, melons, and all the British fruits, are grown in perfection, and sometimes in such abundance that the pigs are fed with them. Wheat, barley, oats, and all the cereals and vegetables of Europe, are also grown. Hitherto, however, agriculture has been only of secondary importance, the predominating interest being the pastoral. The greatest produce of the colony is wool. In recent years wine-culture has been extensively engaged in, and the mineral wealth of the soil has begun to be developed. The colony is self-governed, with a governor appointed by the queen, a responsible ministry, a legislative council nominated by the crown, and a House of Assembly elected by permanent residents. The capital is Sydney, with a population of 220,429; and the other chief towns are Parramatta, Bathurst, Goulburn, Maitland, Newcastle, Grafton, Armidale, and Albury, with populations ranging from 3000 to 8000.

New South Wales took its origin in a penal establishment formed by the British government in 1788 at Port Jackson, near Botany Bay (lat. 34°). The prisoners, after their period of servitude or on being pardoned, became settlers, and obtained grants of land; and these “emancipists” and their descendants, together with free emigrants, constitute the present inhabitants. Since the establishment of the colony in 1787-8, the total number of convicts sent into it from Great Britain up to 1840, when the importation ceased, amounted to 60,700, of whom only 8700 were women. They were assigned as bond-servants to the free settlers, who were obliged to furnish them with a fixed allowance of clothing and food.

In 1833 there were 23,000 free males and 13,560 free females, to 22,000 male and 2700 female convicts; and of the free population. above 16,000 were emancipists. Many whose progenitors went to New South Wales as prisoners are intelligent and estimable members of the community. Some of the emancipists, and several of their descendants, are among the wealthiest people in the colony. According to the census of 1856, barely a third of the population of New South Wales was born in Australia; about 75,000 were supplied by England and Wales, 50,000 by Ireland, 16,000 by Scotland, 5000 by Germany, and 2000 by China. The population now (1874) includes a large admixture of Chinese, many Americans, and some of almost all nationalities. From 1866 to 1872 the total number of immigrants exceeded 150,000, while about 100,000 emigrated. The emigration included 4917 Chinese, while the number of Chinese immigrants was only 1520. The number of births in each of the seven years from 1856 to 1872 was more than double that of the deaths, and in 1870 and 1871 it was three times as large. In appearance and character the native-born part of the community bear a strong resemblance to those of Anglo-Saxon descent of the United States. As regards religion, all sects are on a footing of equality, and each receives aid from the state according to its numbers; but state aid is likely before long to cease. The religious division of the inhabitants in 1871 was as follows: Church of England, 229,243; Presbyterians, 49,122; Wesleyans, 36,277; Congregationalists, 9253; Roman Catholics, 147,627; Mohammedans, and other Asiatic creeds, 7455; the remainder belonged to various minor denominations. For information concerning the aborigines, the native animals, botany, geology, and history of New South Wales, see the article Australia in *The American Cyclopedia*. See also Lang, *New South Wales* (new ed. Lond. 1875, 2 vols.); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1874, p. 155; *Blackwood's Magazine*. 1852, 2:301 sq.; *Mission Life* (Lond. 1866 sq.), 1:210 sq., 251 sq., 355 sq., 405 sq., 487 sq.

## New Testament

THE (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη), the general title appropriated by early and inveterate usage throughout the Western Church to the latter portion of the Holy Scriptures — to the collection of writings forming the authoritative records of the Christian, as contrasted with the earlier Jewish, revelation. As the various questions relating to the genuineness of the several books of the New Testament, their title to a place in the sacred volume, and their special characteristics, are discussed in the separate articles devoted to them, *SEE CANON*, and each book, we have now to speak only of those

matters which relate to the collection as a whole. For the title, *SEE TESTAMENT*.

**I. Contents and Arrangement.** — The New Testament differs remarkably from the Old in this respect, that while the writings comprehended in the earlier collection range over a period of a thousand years, those included in the later were produced almost contemporaneously, within the compass of one generation — most of them probably between A.D. 50 and A.D. 70. The collection consists of twenty-seven writings, proceeding either from apostles or from persons who were intimately associated with the apostles in their labors. Five of the works are in the form of historical narratives; four of which relate the history of the Savior's life on earth with such variety of form, and with such differences in the selection and treatment of materials, as seemed needful to meet the wants of different readers; and the fifth describes the formation and extension of the Church by the ministry of the leading apostles. Twenty-one are epistolary. Thirteen of the letters expressly bear the name of Paul as their author; nine being addressed to various Christian communities, three — called the Pastoral Epistles — to office-bearers in the Church, and one to a private individual (Philemon). An anonymous letter addressed "to the Hebrews" is associated with the Epistles of Paul. Seven other letters — one bearing the name of James, two that of Peter, three that of John, and one that of Jude — are frequently comprehended under the common name of Catholic (that is general) Epistles, as having been intended for the use of Christians in general, or as having (most of them at least) no express individual or local destination. The volume closes with a prophetic vision, the Apocalypse of John.

The writings thus associated in the New Testament seem to have at the first glance a somewhat unconnected and desultory character; and it may readily be admitted that the form in which the inspired records of Christianity have come down to us is not that which the wisdom of man would have conceived or expected. The Christian revelation has not assumed the shape which men might have deemed, *a priori*, probable or desirable — of an abstract system of truth, of a formal didactic treatise elaborately setting forth doctrines in logical order, like the creeds and confessions in which men have striven at different times to define and comprehend the fullness of the scriptural teaching; or enjoining duties in methodical succession, like those codes of law in which men seek to provide beforehand for misery contingency. Its actual form exhibits a far more admirable accommodation to the conditions of human nature — in its

history of a life, its records of personal experience, its teachings by concrete examples, its presenting Christianity in action. The great majority of those for whose benefit a revelation is given have but little interest in pure theory or relish for abstract truth; the pattern affects them more than the precept, and they apprehend the more readily whatever comes into contact with the wants, feelings, and exigencies of their daily life. The form of the New Testament, mainly narrative and epistolary — is one especially fitted to stimulate our attention, to enlist our sympathies, to quicken our human interest in its contents, and to bring the matters of which it treats home to us, not as subjects of theory, but as facts of experience, as personal and practical realities. “The book which shall have a deep and practical influence on real life must reflect its image, must present that real mixture of facts, thoughts, and feelings which is found to exist there.”

But we have to recognize in the composition of the New Testament a further peculiarity, deviating from what we should perhaps have expected, but constituting in reality the most remarkable evidence of the divine superintendence that shaped the whole. The books of the New Testament present no formal bond of unity, profess no absolute completeness, make no direct claim, in most cases, to universal acceptance. On the contrary, they *seem* to have originated independently of each other, and to have been prepared with immediate reference to local or temporary objects — to the special circumstances and wants of churches, or even of individuals. Christ himself wrote nothing; and we do not find in what his disciples have left any professed design of giving a full record of his teaching or a continuous and perfect exposition of his doctrine. No apostle or evangelist avows it as his purpose to furnish an authentic standard of Christian doctrine and duty for all future time. Their works, moreover, bear no traces of mutual concert or prearranged cooperation towards a common object. They address themselves to matters in which they feel a personal interest, and to persons with whom they have more immediate relations; and they write seemingly with reference to these alone, betraying no consciousness of any ulterior aim or further destination. Their writings present the appearance of having been as casual in origin as they are occasional in form. But this very occasional and seemingly accidental character impressed on the individual elements of the New Testament as human writings will be found, when we examine them more closely, to yield the highest evidence of the divine origin and purpose of the whole, and to furnish varied means for the illustration and confirmation of their truth. The parts, regarded in

themselves, seem isolated and fragmentary; but the whole, which results from their combination, reveals a unity and completeness that can only be explained through the hidden but all-pervading agency of one divine Designer. The several narratives and letters have been obviously produced without any concert among the writers; each bears the stamp of individuality and independence; and yet, when they are placed side by side, they are found so marvelously to fit into each other, to sustain such mutually complementary relations, to be knit by so many links of connection, and to exhibit so entire a harmony of general design, that the unbiased reader cannot but recognize in their deeper interdependence a providential arrangement, and refer the whole to the common inspiration of one and the same Spirit guiding the several agents in their parts for the furtherance of his own gracious purposes. These occasional writings, proceeding from different authors, and brought together from different localities, constitute, when combined, an organized body fitly joined together and pervaded by one inward life. “When it is felt,” as has been well said, “that these narratives, letters, visions, do in fact fulfill the several functions, and sustain the mutual relations, which would belong to the parts of one design, coalescing into a doctrinal scheme which is orderly, progressive, and complete, then is the mind of the reader in conscious contact with the mind of God; then the superficial diversity of the parts is lost in the essential unity of the whole; the many writings have become one Book; the many writers have become one Author” (Bernard, *Bampton Lecture* for 1864, p. 235).

The variety of the individual elements that make up the New Testament serves several important ends. The different parts of Scripture thereby illustrate, support, and explain each other; and it thus carries within itself manifold and varied evidence of its truth self-consistent, harmonious, divine. The four narratives of the life of Christ present that combination of substantial unity with circumstantial variety that marks the testimony of independent witnesses; and, written with special reference to the circumstances and wants of their original readers, and bringing into prominence the different aspects of the Savior’s character, they at once supplement and confirm each other. They present to us, as has been observed, “four aspects, but one portrait; for, if the attitude and the accessories vary, the features and the expression are the same.” The Gospel of Matthew — according to early tradition the Hebrew Gospel — exhibits Jesus as the Messiah fulfilling the law and the prophets; that of

Mark, deriving its lifelike details from the communications of Peter, and written primarily for Roman use, depicts to us in rapid but vivid outlines Jesus putting forth his mighty power in action; that of Luke, the close companion of Paul, prepared for the use of the Greek world, portrays Jesus as the Friend of man, the universal Savior while that of John, written late in life at Ephesus for the fuller instruction of those already within the Church, completes the picture by presenting Jesus preeminently as the Son of God, and revealing to us the highest aspect of his teaching in the circle of his chosen disciples. In the book of Acts we find that the facts of the Savior's life and death and resurrection have become the fundamental doctrines of the Church; their significance is proclaimed and their power attested. The foundation of the Church is followed by its organization and training, as developed in the Epistles. The truths announced in the Gospels and proclaimed in the Acts are here expanded, defined vindicated in opposition to error or misunderstanding and brought to bear on the manifold relations of life. In the Epistles we find the different aspects of the truth apprehended and applied by men under various phases of experience and with reference to various exigencies; and while the Epistles thus form a practical supplement to the Gospels, they are complementary to each other, and fill up through their combination the perfect image of the faith, hope, and love represented by Paul, Peter, and John.

From various early notices it would appear that the books were, as was natural, first grouped under the two general divisions of evangelic and apostolic writings (εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος or τὰ ἀποστολικά). The more detailed information which we obtain from the oldest extant MSS., versions, and catalogues of the books given by the fathers exhibits substantially the same arrangement as that now followed in our Bibles. But few copies contained the whole New Testament; most frequently the Gospels were contained in one volume, the Acts and Epistles in another; while the Apocalypse, which was less employed in public worship, was comparatively seldom associated with the other books. The general order of the books was as follows: Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse. From this arrangement there are, no doubt, individual deviations, especially as regards the position of the book of Acts; and several of the ancient versions and most of the catalogues place the Epistles of Paul, as they stand in the English Bible, before the Catholic Epistles. The order followed within these larger groups seems to have been from an early period very much the same as at present. The four Gospels

are almost constantly found in their familiar order; and in the Pauline Epistles the letter to the Hebrews exhibits almost the only variation, being sometimes — and indeed most frequently — inserted before the Pastoral Epistles, sometimes annexed at the close (see Scrivener's *Introd. to Criticism of N.T.* p. 60, etc.). the arrangement, in the case of the Gospels, was probably based on the order in which they were supposed to be written; in the case of Paul's Epistles, on the relative importance of the churches or individuals addressed. The Apocalypse has always, when received, been placed appropriately at the end. We can hardly fail to recognize the Providence by which the Church has been guided in the internal arrangement of her sacred records, so that they shall present a consecutive teaching; the main outlines of which are wellset forth by one who has recently applied himself to illustrate the value of the order of the New Testament in this respect. The New Testament "begins with the person of Christ, and the facts of his manifestation in the flesh, and the words which he gave from his Father; and accustoms us by degrees to behold his glory, to discern the drift of his teaching, and to expect the consequences of his work. It passes on to his body, the Church, and opens the dispensation of his Spirit, and carries us into the life of his people, yea, down into the secret places of their hearts; and there translates the announcements of God into the experiences of men, and discovers a conversation in heaven and a life which is hid with Christ in God. It works out practical applications, is careful in the details of duty, provides for difficulties and perplexities, suggests the order of churches, and throws up barriers against the wiles of the devil. It shows us things to come, the course of the spiritual conflict, the close of this transient scene, the coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the dead, the eternal judgment, the new creation, and the life everlasting. Thus it is furnished for all emergencies, and prepared for perpetual use" (Bernard, *ut sup.* p. 31).

## II. *Early History of the Text.* —

**1. *The Original Autographs.*** — The early history of the apostolic writings offers no points of distinguishing literary interest. Externally, as far as it can be traced, it is the same as that of other contemporary books. Paul, like Cicero or Pliny, often employed the services of an amanuensis, to whom he dictated his letters, affixing the salutation "with his own hand" (1 Corinthians 16:21; 2 Thessalonians 3:17; Colossians 4:18). In one case the scribe has added a clause in his own name (Romans 16:22). Once, in writing to the Galatians, the apostle appears to apologize

for the rudeness of the autograph which he addressed to them, as if from defective sight (<sup><8161></sup>Galatians 6:11). If we pass onwards one step, it does not appear that any special care was taken in the first age to preserve the books of the N.T. from the various injuries of time, or to insure perfect accuracy of transcription. They were given as a heritage to man, and it was some time before men felt the full value of the gift. The original copies seem to have soon perished; and we may perhaps see in this a providential provision against that spirit of superstition which in earlier times converted the symbols of God's redemption into objects of idolatry (<sup><2184></sup>2 Kings 18:4). It is certainly remarkable that in the controversies at the close of the 2d century, which often turned upon disputed readings of Scripture, no appeal was made to the apostolic originals. The few passages in which it has been supposed that they are referred to will not bear examination. Ignatius, so far from appealing to Christian archives, distinctly turns, as the whole context shows, to the examples of the Jewish Church (τὰ ἀρχαῖα - *ad Philad.* 8). Tertullian again, when he speaks of "the *authentic* epistles" of the apostles (*De Proeser. Haer.* 36, "Apud quas ipse *authenticae* littere eorum recitantur"), uses the term of the pure Greek text as contrasted with the current Latin version (comp. *De Monog.* 11, "Sciamus plane non sic esse in Greco *authentico*"). The silence of the sub-apostolic age is made more striking by the legends which were circulated afterwards. It was said that when the grave of Barnabas in Cyprus was opened, in the 5th century, in obedience to a vision, the saint was found holding a (Greek) copy of Matthew written with his own hand. The copy was taken to Constantinople, and used as the standard of the sacred text (Credner, *Einl.* § 39; *Assem. Bibl. Or.* 2:81). The autograph copy of John's Gospel (αὐτὸ τὸ ἰδιόχειρον τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ) was said to be preserved at Ephesus "by the grace of God, and worshipped (προσκυνεῖται) by the faithful there," in the 4th century (?) (Petr. Alex. p. 518, ed. Migne, quoted from *Chron. Pasch.* p. 5); though according to another account it was found in the ruins of the Temple when Julian attempted to rebuild it (Philostorg. 7:14). A similar belief was current even in the last century. It was said that parts of the (Latin) autograph of Mark were preserved at Venice and Prague; but on examination these were shown to be fragments of a MS. of the Vulgate of the 6th century (Dobrowsky, *Fragmentum Praense Ev. S. Marci.* 1778).

In the natural course of things the apostolic autographs would be likely to perish soon. The material which was commonly used for letters, the papyrus-paper to which John incidentally alludes (<sup><6112></sup>2 John 1:12, διὰ



χάρτου καὶ μέλανος; comp. <sup><G01B></sup>3 John 1:13, (διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου), was singularly fragile, and even the stouter kinds, likely to be used for the historical books, were not fitted to bear constant use. The papyrus fragments which have come down to the present time have been preserved under peculiar circumstances, as at Herculaneum or in Egyptian tombs; and Jerome notices that the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea was already in part destroyed (ex parte corruptam) when, in less than a century after its formation, two presbyters of the Church endeavored to restore the papyrus MSS. (as the context implies) on parchment (“in membranis,” Jerome, *Ep.* 34 (141), quoted by Tischendorf in Herzog’s *Encykl.* “Bibeltext des N.T.” p. 159). Parchment (<sup><S01B></sup>2 Timothy 4:13, μεμβράνα), which was more durable, was proportionately rarer and more costly. In the first age the written word of the apostles occupied no authoritative position above their spoken word, and the vivid memory of their personal teaching. When the true value of the apostolic writings was afterwards revealed by the progress of the Church, then collections of “the divine oracles” would be chiefly sought for among Christians. On all accounts it seems reasonable to conclude that the autographs perished during that solemn pause which followed the apostolic age, in which the idea of a Christian Canon, parallel and supplementary to the Jewish Canon, was first distinctly realized.

**2. The First Copies.** — In the time of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303) copies of the Christian Scriptures over sufficiently numerous to furnish a special object for persecutors, and a characteristic name to renegades who saved themselves by surrendering the sacred books *traditores*, August. *Ep.* 76. 2). Partly, perhaps, owing to the destruction thus caused, but still more from the natural effects of time, no MS. of the N.T. of the first three centuries remains. Some of the oldest extant were certainly copied from others which dated from within this period, but as yet no one can be placed further back than the time of Constantine. It is recorded of this monarch that one of his first acts after the foundation of Constantinople was to order the preparation of fifty MSS. of the Holy Scriptures, required for the use of the Church, “on fair skins (ἐν διφθέραις εὐκατασκευόις) by skillful caligraphists” (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* 4:36); and to the general use of this better material we probably owe our most venerable copies, which were written on vellum of singular excellence and fineness. But though no fragment of the N.T. of the 1st century until remains, the Italian and Egyptian papyri, which are of that date, give a clear notion of the caligraphy of the period. In these the text is written in columns, rudely divided, in somewhat awkward capital letters (*uncials*),

without any punctuation or division of words. The *iota*, which was afterwards *subscribed*, is commonly, but not always, *adscribed*; and there is no trace of accents or breathings. The earliest MSS. of the N.T. bear a general resemblance to this primitive type, and we may reasonably believe that the apostolic originals were thus written.

**3. Early Variations.** — In addition to the later MSS., the earliest versions and patristic quotations give very important testimony to the character and history of the ante-Nicene text. Express statements of readings which are found in some of the most ancient Christian writers are, indeed, the first direct evidence which we have, and are consequently of the highest importance. But till the last quarter of the 2d century this source of information fails us. Not only are the remains of Christian literature up to that time extremely scanty, but the practice of verbal quotation from the N.T. was not yet prevalent. The evangelic citations in the apostolic fathers and in Justin Martyr show that the oral tradition was still as widely current as the written Gospels (comp. Westcott's *Canon of the N.T.* p. 125-195), and there is not in those writers one express verbal citation from the other apostolic books. This latter phenomenon is in a great measure to be explained by the nature of their writings. As soon as definite controversies arose among Christians, the text of the N.T. assumed its true importance. The earliest monuments of these remain in the works of Irenaeus, Hippolytus (Pseudo-Origen), and Tertullian, who quote many of the arguments of the leading adversaries of the Church. Charges of corrupting the sacred text are urged on both sides with great acrimony. Dionysius of Corinth († cir. A.D. 176, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* 4:23), Irenaeus (cir. A.D. 177; 4:6, 1), Tertullian (cir. A.D. 210; *De Carne Christi.* 19, p. 385; *A dv. Marc.* iv, v, passim), Clement of Alexandria (cir. A.D. 200; *Strom.* 4:6, § 41), and at a later time Ambrose (cir. A.D. 375; *De Spir. S.* 3:10), accuse their opponents of this offense; but with one great exception the instances which are brought forward in support of the accusation generally resolve themselves into various readings, in which the decision cannot always be given in favor of the catholic disputant; and even where the unorthodox reading is certainly wrong it can be shown that it was widely spread among writers of different opinions (e.g. <sup><412></sup>Matthew 11:27 “nec Filium nisi Pater et cui voluerit Filius revelare;” <sup><413></sup>John 1:13, ὅς-ἐγγνήθη ). Wilful interpolations or changes are extremely rare, if they exist at all (comp. Valent. ap. Iren. 1:4, 5, add. θεότιτες <sup><5016></sup>Colossians 1:16), except in the case of arcion. His mode of dealing with the writings of the N.T. in which he was followed by his school, was, as Tertullian says, to use the knife

rather than subtlety of interpretation. There can be no reasonable doubt that he dealt in the most arbitrary manner with whole books, and that he removed from the Gospel of Luke many passages which were opposed to his peculiar views. But when these fundamental changes were once made he seems to have adhered scrupulously to the text which he found. In the isolated readings which he is said to have altered, it happens not unfrequently that he has retained the right reading, and that his opponents are in error (Luke v. 14 om. τὸ δῶρον; <sup><8105></sup>Galatians 2:5, οἷς οὐδέ; <sup><4045></sup>2 Corinthians 4:5?). In very many cases the alleged corruption is a various reading, more or less supported by other authorities (<sup><2128></sup>Luke 12:38, ἔσπερινῆ; <sup><610></sup>1 Corinthians 10:9, Χριστόν; <sup><5115></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:15, add. ἰδίους). Where the changes seem most arbitrary there is evidence to show that the interpolations were not wholly due to his school (<sup><2889></sup>Luke 18:19, ὁ πατήρ; 23:2; <sup><609></sup>1 Corinthians 10:19 [28], add. ἱερόθυτον). (Comp. Hahn, *Evangelium Marcionis*; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* 1:403-486; Ritschl, *Das Evatn. Marc.* 1846; Volckmar, *Das Evang. Marc.* Leipsic, 1852: but no examination of Marcion's text is completely satisfactory.) Several very important conclusions follow from this earliest appearance of textual criticism. It is, in the first place, evident that various readings existed in the books of the N.T. at a time prior to all extant authorities. History affords no trace of the pure apostolic originals. Again, from the preservation of the first variations noticed, which are often extremely minute, in one or more of the primary documents still left we may be certain that no important changes have been made in the sacred text which we cannot now detect. The materials for ascertaining the true reading are found to be complete when tested by the earliest witnesses. Yet further: from the minuteness of some of the variations which are urged in controversy, it is obvious that the words of the N.T. were watched with the most jealous care, and that the least differences of phrase were guarded with scrupulous and faithful piety, to be used in after-time by that wide-reaching criticism which was foreign to the spirit of the first ages.

**4. First Critical Labors.** — Passing from these isolated quotations, we find the first great witnesses to the apostolic text in the early Syriac and Latin versions, and in the rich quotations of Clement of Alexandria († cir. A.D. 220) and Origen (A.D. 184-254). **SEE VERSIONS.** The Greek quotations in the remains of the original text of Irenæus and in Hippolytus are of great value, but yield in extent and importance to those of the two Alexandrine fathers. From the extant works of Origen alone no inconsiderable portion

of the whole N.T., with the exception of James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the Apocalypse, might be transcribed, and the recurrence of small variations in long passages proves that the quotations were accurately made, and not simply from memory.

The evangelic text of Clement is far from pure. Two chief causes contributed especially to corrupt the text of the Gospels — the attempts to harmonize parallel narratives, and the influence of tradition. The former assumed a special importance from the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (cir. A.D. 170. Comp. Westcott, *N.-T. Canon*, p. 358-362; Tischendorf on <sup><4174></sup>Matthew 27:49), and the latter, which was, as has been remarked, very great in the time of Justin Martyr, still lingered. The quotations of Clement suffer from both these disturbing forces (<sup><4182></sup>Matthew 8:22; 10:30; 11:27; 19:24; 23:27; 25:41; 10:26, omitted by Tischendorf <sup><4182></sup>Luke 3:22), and he seems to have derived from his copies of the Gospels two sayings of the Lord which form no part of the canonical text (comp. Tischendorf on <sup><4183></sup>Matthew 6:33; <sup><4181></sup>Luke 16:11). Elsewhere his quotations are free, or a confused mixture of two narratives (<sup><4185></sup>Matthew 5:45; 6:26, 32 sq.; 22:37; <sup><4128></sup>Mark 12:43), but in innumerable places he has preserved the true reading (<sup><4184></sup>Matthew 5:4, 5, 42, 48; 8:22; 11:17; 13:25; 23:26; <sup><4184></sup>Acts 2:41; 17:26). His quotations from the Epistles are of the very highest value. In these tradition had no prevailing power, though Tatian is said to have altered in parts the language of the Epistles (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4:29); and the text was left comparatively free from corruptions. Against the few false readings which he supports (e.g. <sup><4181></sup>1 Peter 2:2, **Χριστός** (c; <sup><4185></sup>Romans 3:26, **Ἰησοῦν**; 8:11, **διὰ τοῦ ἔνοικ. πν**) may be brought forward a long list of passages in which he combines with a few of the best authorities in upholding the true text (e.g. <sup><4181></sup>1 Peter 2:2; <sup><4187></sup>Romans 2:17; 10:3; 15:29; <sup><4183></sup>1 Corinthians 2:13; 7:3, 5, 35, 39; 8:2; 10:24).

But Origen stands as far first of all the ante-Nicene fathers in critical authority as he does in commanding genius, and his writings are an almost inexhaustible storehouse for the history of the text. In many places it seems that the printed text of his works has been modernized; and till a new and thorough collation of the MSS. has been made, a doubt must remain whether his quotations have not suffered by the hands of scribes, as the MSS. of the N.T. have suffered, though in a less degree. The testimony which Origen bears as to the corruption of the text of the Gospels in his time differs from the general statements which have been already noticed as being the deliberate judgment of a scholar, and not the plea of a

controversialist. “As the case stands,” he says, “it is obvious that the difference between the copies is considerable, partly from the carelessness of individual scribes, partly from the wicked daring of some in correcting what is written, partly also from the changes made by] those who add or remove what seems good to them in the process of correction” (Origen, *In Matt.* t. xv, § 14). In the case of the Sept., he adds, he removed, or at least indicated, those corruptions by a comparison of “editions” (ἐκδόσεις), and we may believe that he took equal care to ascertain, at least for his own use, the true text of the N.T., though he did not venture to arouse the prejudice of his contemporaries by openly revising it, as the old translation adds (*In Matt.* xv, *vet. int.* “In exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi”). Even in the form in which they have come down to us, the writings of Origen, as a whole, contain the noblest early memorial of the apostolic text. Although there is no evidence that he published any recension of the text, yet it is not unlikely that he wrote out copies of the N.T. with his own hand (Redepenning, *Origenes*, 2:184), which were spread widely in after-time. Thus Jerome appeals to “the copies of Adamantius,” i.e. Origen (*In* ~~408B~~ *Matthew* 24:36; ~~408B~~ *Galatians* 3:1), and the copy of Pamphilus can hardly have been other than a copy of Origen’s text (Cod. H<sub>3</sub> Subscription). From Pamphilus the text passed to Eusebius and Euthalius, and it is scarcely rash to believe that it can be traced, though imperfectly, in existing MSS. as C L (comp. Griesbach, *Symbole Criticae*, 1, 76 sq.; 130 sq.). In thirteen cases (Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, 1:234-236) Origen has expressly noticed varieties of reading in the Gospels (~~408B~~ *Matthew* 8:28; 16:20; 18:1; 21:5, 9, 15; 27:17; ~~408B~~ *Mark* 3:18; ~~4046~~ *Luke* 1:46; 9:48; 14:19; 23:45; ~~400B~~ *John* 1:3, 4, 28). In three of these passages the variations which he notices are no longer found in our Greek copies (~~421D~~ *Matthew* 21:9 or 15, οἶκω for υἱῶ; Tregelles, *ad loc.*; ~~408B~~ *Mark* 3:18 [2. 14], Λεβὴν τὸν τοῦ Ἄλφ [?]; ~~4046~~ *Luke* 1:46; Ἐλισάβετ for Μαριάμ; so in some Latin copies); in seven our copies are still divided; in two (~~408B~~ *Matthew* 8:28, Γαδαρηνῶν; ~~402S~~ *John* 1:28, Βηθαβαρᾶ) the reading which was only found in a few MSS. is now widely spread; in the remaining place (~~4277~~ *Matthew* 27:17, Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν) a few copies of no great age retain the interpolation which was found in his time “in very ancient copies.” It is more remarkable that Origen asserts, in answer to Celsus, that our Lord is nowhere called “the carpenter” in the Gospels circulated in the churches, though this is undoubtedly the true reading in ~~408B~~ *Mark* 6:3 (Origen, *c. Cels.* 6:36). The evangelic quotations of Origen

are not wholly free from the admixture of traditional glosses which have been noticed in Clement, and often present a confusion of parallel passages (~~4154~~ Matthew 5:44; 6:[33]; 7:21 sq.; 13:11; 26:27 sq.; ~~5001~~ 1 Timothy 4:1); but there is little difficulty in separating his genuine text from these natural corruptions, and a few references are sufficient to indicate its extreme importance (~~4040~~ Matthew 4:10; 6:13; 15:8, 35; ~~4002~~ Mark 1:2; 10:29; ~~4219~~ Luke 21:19; ~~4173~~ John 7:39; ~~4400~~ Acts 10:10; ~~4838~~ Romans 8:28). In the Epistles Origen once notices a striking variation in ~~8019~~ Hebrews 2:9, χαριςθεοῦ for χάριτι θεοῦ, which is still attested; but, apart from the specific references to variations, it is evident that he himself used MSS. at different times which varied in many details (Mill, *Proleg.* § 687).

Griesbach, who has investigated this fact with the greatest care (*Meletema*, i, appended to *Comm. Crit.* 2, 9-40), seems to have exaggerated the extent of these differences, while he establishes their existence satisfactorily. There can be no doubt that in Origen's time the variations in the N.-T. MSS., which we have seen to have existed from the earliest attainable date, and which Origen describes as considerable and widespread, were beginning to lead to the formation of specific groups of copies.

Although the materials for the history of the text during the first three centuries are abundant, nothing has been written in detail on the subject since the time of Mill (*Proleg.* p. 240 sq.) and R. Simon (*Histoire Critique...* 1685-93). What is wanted is nothing less than a complete collection at full length, from MS. authority, of all the ante-Nicene *Greek* quotations. These would form a center round which the variations of the versions and Latin quotations might be grouped. A first step towards this has been made by Anger in his *Synopsis Evv. Matthew Marc. Luc...* 1851. The *Latin* quotations are well given by Sabatier (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, 1751).

**III. Characteristics of the Early Copies.** — From the consideration of the earliest history of the N.T. text we now pass to the aera of MSS. The quotations of Dionysius Alex. (i A.D. 264), Petrus Alex. († cir. A.D. 312), Methodius (t A.D. 311), and Eusebius (t A.D. 340), confirm the prevalence of the ancient type of text but the public establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire necessarily led to important changes. Not only were more copies of the N.T. required for public use, but the nominal or real adherence of the higher ranks to the Christian faith must have largely increased the demand for costly MISS. As a natural consequence, the rude Hellenistic forms gave way before the current Greek, and at the same time

it is reasonable to believe that smoother and fuller constructions were substituted for the rougher turns of the apostolic language. In this way the foundation of the Byzantine text was laid, and the same influence which thus began to work continued uninterrupted till the fall of the Eastern empire. Meanwhile the multiplication of copies in Africa and Syria was checked by Mohammedan conquests. The Greek language ceased to be current in the West. The progress of the Alexandrine and Occidental families of MSS. was thus checked; and the mass of recent copies necessarily represent the accumulated results of one tendency.

The appearance of the oldest MSS. has already been described. The MSS. of the 4th century, of which *Cod. Vatican.* (B) may be taken as a type, present a close resemblance to these. The writing is in elegant continuous (capitals) uncials, in three columns, without initial letters, or *iota subscript* or *ascript*. A small interval serves as a simple punctuation; and there are no accents or breathings by the hand of the first writer, though these have been added subsequently. *Uncial* writing continued in general use till the middle of the 10th century. One uncial MS. (S), the earliest dated copy, bears the date 949; and for service-books the same style was retained a century later. From the 11th century downwards *cursive* writing prevailed, but this passed through several forms sufficiently distinct to fix the date of a MS. with tolerable certainty. The earliest cursive Biblical MS. is dated A.D. 964 (Gosp. 14, Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 36, note), though cursive writing was used a century before (A.D. 888, Scrivener, 1. c.). The MSS. of the 14th and 15th centuries abound in the contractions which afterwards passed into the early printed books. The material as well as the writing of MSS. underwent successive changes. The oldest MSS. are written on the thinnest and finest vellum; in later copies the parchment is thick and coarse. Sometimes, as in *Cod. Cotton.* (N=J), the vellum is stained. Papyrus was very rarely used after the 9th century. In the 10th century cotton paper (*charta bombycina*, or *Damascena*) was generally employed in Europe; and one example at least occurs of its use in the 9th century (Tischendorf, *Not. Cod. Sin.* p. 54, quoted by Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 21). In the 12th century the common linen or rag paper came into use; but paper was “seldom used for Biblical MSS. earlier than the 13th century, and had not entirely displaced parchment at the era of the invention of printing, cir. A.D. 1450” (Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 21). One other kind of material requires notice, redressed parchment (*παλίμψιστος*, *charta deleticia*). Even at a very early period the original text of a parchment MS. was often

erased, that the material might be used afresh (Cic. *Ad Fam.* 7:18; Catull. 12). In lapse of time the original writing frequently reappears in faint lines below the later text, and in this way many precious fragments of Biblical MSS. which had been once obliterated for the transcription of other works have been recovered. Of these palimpsest MSS. the most famous are those designated by the letters C, R, Z, **Ξ**. The earliest Biblical palimpsest is not older than the 5th century.

In uncial MSS. the contractions are usually limited to a few very common forms (**ΘC**, **IC**, **ΠHP**, **Δ A Δ**, etc., i.e. **θεός**, **Ἰησοῦς**, **πατήρ**, **Δαυεῖδ**; comp. Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 43). A few more occur in later uncial copies, in which there are also some examples of the ascript *iota*, which occurs rarely in the Codex Sinaiticus. Accents are not found in MSS. older than the 8th century. Breathings and the apostrophe (Tischendorf; *Proleg.* p. 131) occur somewhat earlier. The oldest punctuation after the simple interval is a stop like the modern Greek colon (in A, C, D), which is accompanied by an interval, proportioned in some cases to the length of the pause. In E (Gosp.) and B<sub>2</sub> (Apoc.), which are MSS. of the 8th century, this point marks a full stop, a colon, or a comma, according as it is placed at the top, the middle, or the base of the letter (Scrivener, p. 42). The present note of interrogation (;) came into use in the 9th century. A very ingenious attempt was made to supply an effectual system of punctuation for public reading by Euthalius, who published an arrangement of Paul's Epistles in clauses (**στίχοι**) in 458, and another of the Acts and Catholic Epistles in 490. The same arrangement was applied to the Gospels by some unknown hand, and probably at an earlier date. The method of subdivision was doubtless suggested by the mode in which the poetic books of the O.T. were written in the MSS. of the Sept. The great examples of this method of writing are D (Gospels), H<sub>3</sub> (Ep.), D, (Ep.). The *Cod. Laud.* (E<sub>2</sub> Acts) is not strictly stichometrical, but the parallel texts seem to be arranged to establish a verbal connection between the Latin and Greek (Tregelles, in Horne's *Intod.* 3:187). The **στίχοι** vary considerably in length, and thus the amount of vellum consumed was far more than in an ordinary MS., so that the fashion of writing in "clauses" soon passed away; but the numeration of the (**στίχοι**) in the several books was still preserved, and many MSS. (e.g. **Δ** Ep., K Gosp.) bear traces of having been copied from older texts thus arranged.

The earliest extant division of the N.T. into sections occurs in Cod. B. This division is elsewhere found only in the palimpsest fragment of Luke, **Ξ**. In the Acts and the Epistles there is a double division in B, one of which is by



a later hand. The Epistles of Paul are treated as one unbroken book divided into 93 sections, in which the Epistle to the Hebrews originally stood between the Epistles to the Galatians and the Ephesians. This appears from the numbering of the sections, which the writer of the MS. preserved, though he transposed the book to the place before the Pastoral Epistles. Two other divisions of the Gospels must be noticed. The first of these was a division into “chapters” (κεφάλαια, τίτλοι, *breves*), which correspond to distinct sections of the narrative, and are on an average a little more than twice as long as the sections in B. This division is found in A, C, R, Z, and must therefore have come into general use some time before the 5th century. The other division was constructed with a view to a harmony of the Gospels. It owes its origin to Ammonius of Alexandria, a scholar of the 3d century, who constructed a Harmony of the Evangelists, taking Matthew as the basis round which he grouped the parallel passages from the other Gospels. Eusebius of Caesarea completed his labor with great ingenuity, and constructed a notation and a series of tables, which indicate at a glance the parallels existing to any passage in one or more of the other Gospels, and the passages which are peculiar to each. There is every reason to believe that the sections as they stand at present, as well as the ten “Canons,” which give a summary of the Harmony, are due to Eusebius, though the sections sometimes occur in MSS. without the corresponding Canons. The Cod. Alex. (A) and the Cottonian fragments (N) are the oldest MSS. which contain both in the original hand. The sections occur in the palimpsests C, R, Z, P, Q, and it is possible that the Canons may have been there originally, for the vermilion (κιννάβαρις, Euseb. *Ep. ad Carp.*) or paint with which they were marked would entirely disappear in the process of preparing the parchment afresh.

The division of the Acts and Epistles into chapters came into use at a later time. It does not occur in A or C, which give the Ammonian sections, and is commonly referred to Euthalius, who, however, says that he borrowed the divisions of the Pauline Epistles from an earlier father; and there is reason to believe that the division of the Acts and Catholic Epistles which he published was originally the work of Pamphilus the Martyr (Montfaunon, *Bibl. Coislin.* p. 78). The Apocalypse was divided into sections by Andreas of Caesarea about A.D. 500. This division consisted of 24 λόγοι, each of which was subdivided into three “chapters” (κεφάλαια).

The titles of the sacred books are from their nature additions to the original text. The distinct names of the Gospels imply a collection, and the titles of

the Epistles are notes by the possessors and not addresses by the writers (Ἰωάννου α", β", etc.). In their earliest form they are quite simple, *According to Matthew*, etc. (κατὰ Μαθθαῖον, κ. τ. λ.); *To the Romans*, etc. (πρὸς Ρωμαίους, κ. τ. λ.); *First of Peter*, etc. (Πέτρου α"); *Acts of Apostles* (πράξεις ἀποστόλων); *Apocalypse*. These headings were gradually amplified till they assumed such forms as *The Holy Gospel according to John*; *The first Catholic Epistle of the holy and all-praiseworthy Peter*; *The Apocalypse of the holy and most glorious Apostle and Evangelist, the beloved virgin who rested on the bosom of Jesus, John the Divine*. In the same way the original subscriptions (ὑπογραφαί), which were merely repetitions of the titles, gave way to vague traditions as to the dates, etc., of the books. Those appended to the Epistles, which have been translated in the A. V., are attributed to Euthalius, and their singular inaccuracy (Paley, *Hlore Paulinoe*, ch. 15) is a valuable proof of the utter absence of historical criticism at the time when they could find currency. Very few MSS. contain the whole N.T., "twenty-seven in all out of the vast mass of extant documents" (Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 61). The MSS. of the Apocalypse are rarest; and Chrysostom complained that in his time the Acts was very little known. Besides the MSS. of the N.T., or parts of it, there are also Lectionaries, which contain extracts arranged for the Church-services. These were taken from the Gospels (εὐαγγελιστάρια), or from the Gospels and Acts (πραξαπόστολοι), or rarely from the Gospels and Epistles (ἀποστολοευαγγέλια). The calendars of the lessons (συναξάρια, are appended to very many AMSS. of the N.T.; those for the saints'-day lessons, which varied very considerably in different times and places, were called μνηολόγια (Scholz, *N.T.*, p. 453-493; Scrivener, p. 68-75).

When a MS. was completed, it was commonly submitted, at least in early times, to a careful revision. Two terms occur in describing this process, ὁ ἀντιβάλλον and ὁ διορθωτής. It has been suggested that the work of the former answered to that of "the corrector of the press," while that of the latter was more critical (Tregelles, *ut. sup.* p. 85, 86). Possibly, however, the words only describe two parts of the same work. Several MSS. still preserve a subscription which at tests a revision by comparison with famous copies, though this attestation must have referred to the earlier exemplar (comp. Tischendorf, *Jude subscript.*); but the Coislinian fragment (H<sub>3</sub>) may have been itself compared, according to the subscription, "with the copy in the library at Caesarea, written by the hand of the holy Pamphilus" (comp. Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 47). Besides this official

correction at the time of transcription, MSS. were often corrected by different hands in later times. Thus Hirschendorf distinguishes the work of two correctors in C, and of three chief correctors in D2. In later MSS. the corrections are often much more valuable than the original text, as in 67 (Ep.); and in the *Cod. Sinait.* the readings of one corrector (2 b) are frequently as valuable as those of the original text.

The work of Montfaucon still remains, the classical authority on Greek Palaeography (*Palaeographia Graeca*, Paris, 1708), though much has been discovered since his time which modifies some of his statements. The plates in the magnificent work of Silvestre and Champollion (*Paliographie Universelle*, Paris, 1841; Eng. transl. by Sir F. Madden, London, 1850) give a splendid and fairly accurate series of facsimiles of Greek MSS. (Plates, 54-95). Tischendorf has published facsimiles of several important texts, especially the Codex Sinaiticus, and furnished in the *Prolegomena* to his *N.T.* valuable information on this subject. Scrivener's *Introduction* gives specimens of many venerable MSS. For other topics relating to the character, form, and preservation of the N.T. text, *SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL; SEE GREEK LANGUAGE; SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL; SEE RECENSION; SEE VARIOUS READINGS.*

**IV. Commentaries.** — The following list comprises nearly all the strictly exegetical helps on all the N.T. separately, exclusive of introductions (q.v.); to the most important we prefix an asterisk (\*): Chrysostom, *fonmilime* (in Gr., in *Opp.* 3:1 sq.); Augustine, *Exegetica* (in *Opp.*; also tr. *Sermons*, Oxf. 1844-5, 2 vols. 8vo); Damianns, *Excepta* (in Mai, *Script. t. t.* VI, 2:226 sq.); Alulfus, *Expositio* (in Gregory Magn. *Opp.* IV. 2); Cramer, *Catena* (Oxf. 1844, 8 vols. 8vo); Valla [Romans Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Par. 1505, fol.; Basil. 1526, 1541, 1545; Amst. 1638, 8vo); Erasmus, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1516, fol., and often later; also in separate parts); Cajetan [R. C.], *Commentarii* (Ven. 1530-1, 2 vols. fol., and often later); Zeger [R. C.], *Scholia* (Colon. 1553, 8vo; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Zwingli, *Adnotationes* [on most of the books] (in *Opp.* iv); Bullinger, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1554, 1587, 1593, 1600, fol.); \*Beza, *A cnotationes* (Genev. 1556, 1565, 1582, 1588, 1598; Ca.mbr. 1642, fol.; Par. 1594, 8vo); \*Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1561, 1564, 1570; Genev. 1583, 1585, 1593, 1596, 1620; Heidelb. 1604, fol.); Strigel, *Hypomemnata* (Lips. 1565, 2 vols. 8vo; also 4to; 1583, 4to); Flacius, *Glossa* (Basil. 1570, 1659, Francf. 1670, fol.); Montanus [R. C.], *Elucidationes* (Antw. 1575, 3 vols. 4to); Aretius, *Commentarii* (Morg. 1580-84, 11 vols. 8vo; s. . 1589-96;

Par. 1607, fol.; Bern. 1612; Par. 1618, 2 vols. fol.); Salmeron [R. C.], *Commentaria*, (Madrid, 1597-1602; Colossians Ag. 1604, 6 vols. fol.); Tossanus, *Commentarii* [on certain books] (Hanov. 1604, 1614, 4to); Drusius, *Adnotationes* (Franeck. 1612; Amst. 1632, 4to); also his *Commentarimus Duplex* (Franeck. 1616, 2 vols. 4to); De Dieu, *Animadversiones* (Lugd. Bat. 1633-46, 3 vols. 4to; also in *Commentary on the Bible*, Amst. 1693, fol.); Piscator, *Commentarii* (Herb. 1638, fol.); Ileinsius, *Exercitattiones* (L. B. 1639, fol.; Cambr. 1640, 4to); Camerarius, *Commentarius* (Cambr. 1642, fol.); Leigh, *Annotations* (Lond. 1650, fol.; also in Latin by Arnold, Lips. 1732, 8vo); Hammond, *l'Paraphrase* (Lond. 1653, 1659, 1660, 1680), 1681, 1689, 1702, fol.; Oxf. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo; in Latin by Le Clerc, Amst. 1798, fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (Lond. 1656, fol.; 1868, 8vo; also in his *Commentary on the whole Bible*); Crell [Socinian], *Commentarii* [on most of the N.T.], supplemented by Schlichting (Amst. 1656, fol.; also in other forms); J. Capellus, *Observationes* [includ. L. Capellus's *Spicilegimtm*] (Amst. 1657, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Schmidt, *Notte* (Norib. 1658, fol.); Price, *Commentarii* (Lond. 1660, fol.; also in the *Crit. Sac.*); Morus, *Noto* (Lips. 1661, fol.); Pean [R. C.], *Commentaire* (Par. 1670, 8vo); Quesnel, *Reflexions* (Paris, 1671 sq.; Amst. 1736, 8 vols. 12mo; tr. *Reflections*, Lond. 1719-25, 4 vols. 8vo); Bauller, *Miark und Kern* (Ulm, 4to, vol. 1:1683; vol. 2:1684); Baxter, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1685, 4to; 1695, 1702, 1810, 8vo); Przipcov [Socinian], *Cogitationes* (Amst. 1692, fol.); Knatchbull, *Annotations* [on certain texts] (Camb. 1693, 8vo); Hure, *Canones* (Par. 1696, 12mo); Paulutius iR. C.], *Commentarius* (Romans 1699, 2 vols. fol.); \*Whitby, *Commentary* (Lond. 1703, 1705, 1708, 1718, 1728, 1744, 2 vols. fol.; 1760, 2 vols. 4to; also in several other forms); \*Burkitt, *Notes* (Lond. 1704, and often, fol. and in other forms); Laurent, *Erklarung* (Goth. et Hal. 1705-26, 4to); \*Michaelis, *Note* (ed. fil. et Fecht, Rost. 1706, 1728, 4to); Hunnius, *Thesaurues* (Vitemb. fol., vol. 1:1706; vol. 2:1707); Fabricius, *Observationes* [on certain passages] (Hamb. 1712, 8vo); Hombergh, *Observationes* [on certain passages] (Traj. 1712, 4to); Bos, *Exercitationes* (Franc. 1713; Leov. 1731, 8vo); Beausobre, *Notes* (Amst. 1718, 2 vols. 4to); also *Remarques* (La Haye, 1742, 4to); Scultetus, *Paraphrasis* (ed. Borcholt, Lumneb. 1720, fol.); Fox, *Explanation?* (Lond. 1722-42, 2 vols. 8vo); Albert, *Observationes* (L. B. 1725, 8vo); \*Wolf, *Culr* (Hamb. 1725-35; -Basil. 1741, 4 vols. 4to); Schittgen, *Horme Hebr.* [Talmudic illustrations] (Lips. 1733, 2 vols. 4to); Wall, *Notes* [critical] (Lond. 1730, 8vo); Simon [R. C.], *Remarks* (from the

French, Lond. 1730, 2 vols. 4to); Lindsay, *Notes* [extracted from earlier writers] (Lond. 1736, 2 vols. fol.); Meuschen, *N.T. ex Talm. illustr.* (Lips. 1736, 4to); \*Doddridge, *Expositor* (Lond. 1738-47, 3 vols. 4to; and in many other forms since); Guyse, *Expositor* (Lond. 1739-52, 3 vols. 4to; 1775, 1814, 6 vols. 8vo); Hardouin [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Amst. 1751; Haj. 1741, fol.); \*Bengel, *Gnomon* (Tubing. 1742, 1759, 4to; and often later, both in Lat. and Germ.; transl. in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1857-8, 5 vols. 8vo; and enlarged, Phila. 1860-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Marchant, *Exposition* [extracted] (Lond. 1743, fol.); Gill, *Exposition* (Lond. 1748, 3 vols. fol.); Heumann, *Erklärung* (Hanov. 1750-63, 8vo); \*Wetstein, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1751-2, 2 vols. fol.); Palairet, *Observationes* (L. B. 1752, 8vo); Munthe, *Observationes* [illustr. fr. D. Siculus] (Hafn. 1755, 12mo); Keuchen, *Adnotata* (L. B. 1755; 8vo); Kvppe, *Observationes* (Vratisl. 1755, 8vo); Krebs, *Observationes* [illustr. fr. Josephus] (Lips. 1755, 8vo); Damm, *Anmerk.* (Berlin, 1765, 3 vols. 4to); Grotius, *Annotationes* (ed. Windheim, Bel. 1769, 2 vols. 4to; Gron. 1826, 8 vols. 8vo); Lisner, *Observationes* [illustr. fr. Philo] (Lips. 1777, 8vo); Ashdowne, *Key* [on most of the books] (Canterb. 1777, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Norimb. 1777-1831, and several eds. intermediate, 5 vols. 8vo); Kuttner, *Scholia* (Lips. 1780, 8vo); Seiler, *Erklar.* (Erlang. 1782, 1822, 8vo); Fischer [R. C.], *Erkliar.* (Prag, 1782; Trier, 1794, 8vo); Langendults [Socin.], *Aanteekeningen* (Amst. 1787, fol.); Moldenhauer, *Erkliar.* (Quedl. 1787 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Roper, *Exeg. landbuch* (Lpz. 1788 sq., and later, 19 pts. 8vo); Wesley, *Notes* (Lond. 1790, and often since, 12mo); Gilpin, *Exposition* (Lond. 1790, 4to, and often since); Rullmann, *Anmerk.* (Lemgo, 1790 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Thiess, *Erklar.* [Gosp. and Acts] (Hamb. 1790-1800, 4 vols. 8vo; also as *Commentar*, Halle, 1804, 6 vols. 8vo); Bolten, *Anmerk.* (Altona, 1792-1805, 8 vols. 8vo); Kuhnol, *Observationes* [illustr. fr. Apocrypha] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Weston, *Comments* [on various passages] (Lond. 1795, 4to); Wilson, *Illustration* [archaeological] (Lond. 1797; Camb. 1838, 8vo); Schnappinger [R. C.], *Erklad.* (Minch. 1797-9, 1807, 4 vols. 8vo); Bahor [R. C.], *Anmerk.* (Vien. 1805 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); \*Koppe, *Annotationes* [completed by others] (Gott. 1809-21, and several eds. intermediate, 10 vols. 8vo); Preisso, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1811, 2 vols. 8vo); Kistemaker [R. C.], *Erklar.* (Miinst. 1825 sq., 8vo); \*Bloomfield, *Critical Digest* (Lond. 1826 sq., 8 vols. 8vo); also *Notes* (Lond. 1830, and often later, 3 vols. 8vo); Boys, *Exposition* (Lond. 1827, 4 vols. 8vo); Scholz [R. C.], *Erluut.* (Frkf. 1828-30, 2 vols. 8vo); Holdenl, *Expositor* (Lond. 1830, 12mo); Marks, *Reflections* (Lond. 1830, 4to); \*Olshausen,

*Commentar* (Konigsb. 1830 sq., and later, 7 vols. 8vo; tr. in Clarke's *Cabinet*, Edinb. 1847-53, 9 vols. 8vo; repub. [except. Rev.], ed. Kendrick, N. Y., 1856-8, 6 vols. 8vo); Hardman, *Commentary* (Dublin, 1830-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Mrs. Thomson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Bliss, *Notes* (Lond. 1832, 12mo); Bockel, *Evlaut.* (Altona, 1832, 8vo); \*Meyer, *Kommentar* (Gott. 1832 sq., and later, in 18 pts.; tr. Edinb. 1873 sq., 8vo); a Clergyman, *Comments* (Dublin, 1833-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Patten, *Notes* (N.Y. 1834, 18mo); Lisco, *Erklar.* (Berlin, 1834, 1836, 8vo); Keyworth, *Expositor* (Lond. 1834, 18mo); De Wette, *IHandbuch* (Lpz. 1836, 2 vols. 8vo); Penn, *Annot(ations)* (Lond. 1836-8, 2 vols. 8vo); Alt, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1837-9, 4 vols. 8vo); Dallas, *Guide* (Lond. 1839-45, 6 vols. 12mo); Dalton, *Commentary* (Lond. 1840, 1844, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1840 sq.; Lond. 1850 sq., 12 vols. 12mo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Exeg. Schriften* (Jena, 1844-8, 3 vols. 8vo); Bisping, *Handbuch* (Miinch. 1864 sq., 8vo); Morrison, *Commentary* (Lond. 1868 sq., 2 vols. 8vo). *SEE COMMENTARY.*

### Newton, Alexander D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in North Carolina, Dec. 15, 1803. In 1808 his father removed to Bedford Co., Tenn. Under a careful training at home his studies were carried forward, both classical and theological; and thus fully prepared for the ministry, he was ordained in 1824 by Shiloh Presbytery. In 1829 he emigrated to Livingston, Madison Co., Miss., where he taught school and preached until 1835, after which time he was employed in the work of the ministry, as stated supply to the following churches successively: viz., Osborne, Spring Ridge, Shongalo, Oxford, Middleton, Grenada, Clinton, and Brandon. He was a close attendant upon all the judicatories of the Church, and took an active part in all the subjects brought before Presbytery, Synod, or General Assembly, in all of which he was acknowledged to be a leader. He died Nov. 27, 1859. Dr. Newton possessed genius, with a large amount of common-sense. His attainments were varied: an accurate scholar, an original thinker, and a terse writer. At one time he edited a periodical entitled *The True Baptist*. He wrote much for the various papers, religious and secular, and in *The Eagle of the South* he published a series of articles on the Presbyterian Church (O. S.); these he afterwards issued in a pamphlet form. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 192. (J. L. S.)

## Newton, Ephraim Holland D.D.,

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Newfane, Vt., June 13, 1787. He spent the early part of his life in labor with his father in the blacksmith-shop. He had a special fondness for books, and while at work making axes he always had a book before him on the forge. He fitted himself for college at the Wendhaam County Grammar School in Newfane; graduated at Middlebury College in 1810, and at the theological seminary in Andover, Mass., in 1813; was soon after licensed to preach by the Haverhill (Mass.) Association of Congregational Ministers, and in 1814 was ordained and installed pastor of a Congregational Church in Marlborough, Vt. His ministry in Marlborough continued for nearly twenty years, and was very successful. In 1833 he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Glen Falls, N. Y., and in 1836 of the Church in Cambridge, N. Y.; in 1843 he was elected principal of Cambridge Washington Academy, and filled this position with great efficiency and success until August, 1848. -Having a fondness for the natural sciences, Dr. Newton gave his attention early in life to mineralogy and geology; and, availing himself of the opportunities he had to collect specimens in these departments, he gathered one of the largest and most valuable private cabinets in the land. In 1857 he presented this cabinet of about ten thousand specimens to the theological seminary in Andover, Mass., and there spent the summer months of several successive seasons in arranging and preparing a catalogue. He afterwards gave his library of about one thousand volumes to Middlebury College. In 1860 he returned to Marlborough, Vt.; and, finding his former parish destitute of the Word of life, he consented to occupy the pulpit for a time, while at the same time he engaged in gathering materials for a history of that township. In 1862 he was elected to represent that people in the Legislature of Vermont. While in the discharge of his duties there he was attacked with a severe sickness, from which he never fully recovered. During 1863 and 1864 he was the acting pastor at Wilmington, Vt., and labored there until his death, Oct. 26, 1864. Dr. Newton was tall in person, dignified in appearance, and genial in manner. As a preacher he was plain and scriptural. His sermons were models of system and Scripture illustration. He was always a man of great industry, and, apart from the duties of the ministry, he devoted much of his time to the cause of education, and to every interest designed to benefit the community in which he lived. He took a great interest in agricultural matters, and introduced many beneficial changes in the mode of farming, especially in sheepraising. He contributed

many articles for publication in the agricultural journals, and at the time of his death was president of the Washington County Agricultural Society. He excelled in the natural sciences. He delivered several sermons on the first chapter of Genesis, in which he displayed great ability in reconciling geology with revelation. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 108. (J. L. S.)

### Newton, George

a Puritan preacher, flourished near the middle of the 17th century at London. In 1655 he was minister of St. Mary's at Maunton, and later was the pastor of a nonconforming congregation, when, in 1662, this good man, "a noted gospeller" and remarkable for his missionary zeal, was displaced for a minister of cavalier sympathy. We know but little else of George Newton. He died near the close of the 17th century. See Stanford, *Life of Joseph Colleine*, p. 200; Stoughton, *Eccles. list. of Eng. (Ch. of the Restoration)*, 1:274 ii, 494.

### Newton, Sir Isaac

#### Picture for Newton 1

#### Picture for Newton 2

the great English philosopher, noted for his unrivaled attainments in mathematics and natural science, and his many discoveries of the laws of nature, figures conspicuously also in the department of metaphysics, and even in theology. Indeed he was as great a writer in the last-named field as his generation produced, and though not always in strict accordance with the most conservative Christian orthodoxy, he shone especially as a worthy example of Christian life, and, notwithstanding a most unfaltering inquiry into nature's law, stood fast always in his faith in the Holy Scriptures, which he made as much the subject of study as any field of science to the development of which he devoted himself. Newton was born at Woolsthorpe, Lincolnshire, Dec. 25, 1642. That year was remarkable in English history for the breaking out of the civil war between Charles I and the Parliament, and is notable in the history of science, too, by the birth of this afterwards so wonderful and many-sided man. It is remarkable also as the year in which Galileo died. Newton's father, who was proprietor and farmer of Woolsthorpe Manor, had died a few months before Isaac's birth; and it is said also that Isaac came into the world prematurely, and was so



small at his birth that “they might have put him into a quart mug,” but he gradually attained size and strength, destined to enjoy a vigorous manhood, and to survive even the average term of life. Three years after his birth his mother married again, and in consequence of this marriage Newton was left under the care of his grandmother, and was sent at the usual age to the day school at Skillington and Stoke. At the age of twelve he went to the public school of Grantham, where he was boarded with Mr. Clark, the apothecary. Here he was at first very inattentive to his studies, and was low in the school till a quarrel with a boy above him in the class, who had used him ill, led him to diligence in his lessons, and he rose above his rival, and reached the head of the class. During his leisure hours he occupied himself with all sorts of mechanical contrivances, windmills, water-clocks, carriages, and paper kites; and among his early tastes may be mentioned his love for drawing and writing verses, in neither of which he was destined to excel. On the death of his stepfather in 1656, his mother came to reside at Woolsthorpe with her three children and Isaac, who was now in his fifteenth year. He was recalled from school to assist in the management of the farm. Accordingly on market-days he was sent to Grantham, accompanied by an -aged domestic, either to dispose of farm produce, or to purchase such things as were needed by the family. But on these occasions it more frequently happened that Isaac stopped by the way-side, watching the motions of a water-wheel, or some other piece of machinery; or, if he reached the town of Grantham, it was only to resort to the apothecary’s garret in which he had resided while he attended the grammar school, and where a few old books afforded him ample entertainment until his trusty companion summoned him to return home. On one occasion, having been sent to market with corn and other products of the farm, young Newton left the sale of his goods to a servant, while he himself retired to a hav-loft at an inn in Grantham, to ruminate over the problems of Euclid and the laws of Kepler, in which situation his uncle happened to find him, probably meditating discoveries of his own which should eclipse the glory of his predecessors. These and other instances having shown the inutility of thwarting his studious disposition, he was shortly after sent back to Grantham school. How long he remained at school this second time does not appear, but when he had attained his seventeenth year it was determined to send him to Trinity College, Cambridge, at the recommendation of his uncle, the Rev. W. Ayscough, who had been himself educated there. Isaac’s matriculation took place on June 5, 1660, the year in which Dr. Barrow was appointed to the Greek professorship.

This learned man became young Newton's most trusted friend and adviser, and no doubt stimulated the earnest student to the closest application to his books. Newton especially devoted himself to the study of mathematics, and attained a great proficiency. In 1664 he took the degree of bachelor of arts; but the following year he was obliged to remove from Cambridge on account of the plague. This temporary interruption of his studies is most singularly connected with one of his most important discoveries; for in his retirement, sitting alone one day in his garden, the accidental observation of some apples falling from a tree excited in his mind a train of reflection on the cause of so simple a phenomenon, which he pursued until he finally elaborated his grand theory of the laws of gravitation. Returning to the university in 1667, he obtained a fellowship; in 1669, the mathematical professorship; and in 1671 he became a member of the Royal Society. It was during his abode at Cambridge that he made his other two great discoveries of fluxions, the nature of light and colors; and as the result of his scientific studies finally brought out, in 1687, his *Philosophice Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, which unfolded to the world Newton's theory of the universe. In that year also Newton was chosen one of the delegates to defend the privileges of the university against James II; and in 1688 and 1701 he was elected one of the members of the university. He was appointed warden of the mint in 1696; was made master of it in 1699; was chosen president of the loyal Society in 1703; and was knighted in 1705. When George I ascended the throne in 1714, Newton, although then a very aged man, was a great favorite at court. His character, his reputation, and his piety had especially gained him the favor of the princess of Wales, afterwards queen-consort to George II. The princess was the admirer and friend of students generally, and at home and abroad enjoyed the society of the learned. Among others Leibnitz corresponded with her, and when the two philosophers got at loggerheads, because each claimed the priority of discovery of the differential calculus, or the method of fluxions, though in truth each invented independently of the other, Leibnitz ungraciously used his influence with the princess to injure the character of Newton, by representing the Newtonian philosophy as false and hostile to religion. Locke was involved in the same charge, and the king being made acquainted with the accusation requested an answer to be prepared by Sir Isaac and Dr. Clarke which proved satisfactory to the king, or at least overcame all royal scruples for tolerating heresy in the British realm. Newton continued to enjoy also the favor of the princess, and as a mark of respect for her Sir Isaac entrusted her with a MS. which he called a

*Chronological Index.* By Some means a copy was secured by abbe Conti, and he published it in Paris without the knowledge or leave of Sir Isaac, and the latter in consequence became much involved in controversy. He was finally induced to prepare for the press his posthumous work, entitled *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms*, which appeared in 1728. Dr. Hutton says with reference to it, "It is astonishing, what care and industry Newton employed about the papers relating to chronology, Church history, etc.; as, on examining them, it appears that many are copies over and over again, often with little or no variation." Says Hagenbach of these labors of Newton: "His predilection for the Apocalypse, and the precarious calculations that he made in this department, have been lamented as a sort of wandering of his great mind. Possibly he did err here, as every mortal does, but this preference for the Revelation of John was intimately connected with his reverence for the divine revelation of Christianity in general. The proofs by which he supported Christianity were possibly not always valid, because mathematical demonstration is not always sufficient in this department, and leads us astray rather than advances us. But his most eloquent apology is finished us in the simple phenomenon itself, that the man who measured and weighed the highest laws of nature with gigantic intellect humbly submitted in that department where the secular wisdom which derives all its knowledge of nature from lexicons and penny magazines lifts its head in extreme pride" (*Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:326). Sir Isaac died March 20, 1727. According to Biot, he was out of his mind more or less in the years 1692 and 1693 while a resident at Cambridge; yet this statement seems unreasonable, however much credit it may have received in this or in the last century, for it was during the time that Biot claims Newton to have been subject to mental aberration that he wrote his four celebrated letters *On the Existence of the Deity*, at the express request of Dr. Bentley, and various scientific essays which Brewster has printed in an appendix to his *Life*. The great philosopher's remains received a resting-place in Westminster Abbey, where a magnificent monument was erected in a conspicuous place to his memory in 1731, with a Latin inscription concluding thus: "Let mortals congratulate themselves that so great an ornament of human nature has existed." A magnificent full-length statue of the philosopher, executed by Roubilliac, was erected in 1755 in the antechapel of Trinity College, Cambridge. This work was assisted by a cast of the face taken after death, which is preserved in the university library at Cambridge.

In person Newton was short but well-set, and inclined to corpulence. His hair was abundant, and white as silver, without baldness. His eye was bright and penetrating till within the last twenty years of his life; but his countenance, though thoughtful, seldom excited much expectation in those to whom he was unknown. In his conversation there appears to have been little either very remarkable or agreeable; but we have the testimony of Dr. Pemberton that “neither his age nor his universal reputation had rendered him stiff in opinion, or in any degree elated.” Ascribing whatever he had accomplished to the effect of patient and continuous thought rather than to any peculiar genius with which nature had endowed him, he looked upon himself and his labors in a very different light from that in which both he and they were regarded by mankind. “I know not,” he remarked, a short time before his death, “what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, while the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me” (Turner, *Collections relative to the Town of Grantham*). But while he thus contrasted the littleness of human knowledge with the extent of human ignorance, he was fully conscious of the importance of his own labors, when compared with those of his predecessors and contemporaries, and evinced a natural readiness to assert and vindicate his rights whenever occasion might require. It were to be wished that, by an earlier publication of his discoveries, he had adopted the most eligible mode of establishing the undoubted priority of his claim. Such a course, by changing the current of events, would have left him less open to the charge of having disregarded the claims of others, or of having suffered their reputation to be prejudiced by his silent acquiescence in the acts of his colleagues. To judge of Newton from the life of him recently published by Sir David Brewster, we should almost infer that his moral character had suffered from no instance of human infirmity, and that every action had been dictated by feelings of benevolence and the love of truth. These were indeed the general motives by which he was actuated.

Sir Isaac’s principal theological works are, *Observations on the Prophecies of Holy Writ, viz. Daniel and the Apocalypse*, and his *Historical Account of two notable Corruptions of Scripture*, mainly composed prior to 1690, but finished in that year, and first published in 1754 under the erroneous title of *Two Letters to Mr. Clarke, late Divinity Professor of the Remonstrants in Holland* (1734). It appears to have been first published

entire in Horsley's edition of Newton's works, under the title, *Historical Account of two notable Corruptions of Scripture, in a Letter to a Friend*. That friend was probably Locke, the philosopher. In this work Sir Isaac considers the two noted texts, ~~<SUB>1~~ 1 John 5:7, and ~~<SUB>1~~ 1 Timothy 3:16. The former he attempts to prove spurious, and the latter he considers a false reading. A portion of the work was commented on by the Rev. E. Henderson, D.D., in *The great Mystery of Godliness Incontrovertible, or Sir I. Newton and the Socinians foiled in the Attempt to prove a Corruption in the Text* ~~<SUB>1~~ 1 Timothy 3:16 (1830, 8vo). Sir David Brewster, in his first edition of his *Life of Newton*, denied that Newton was unorthodox in any respect, but further research has revealed the fact that he speculated much regarding the ὁμοούσιος, and must have entertained Arian views. Yet Brewster insists that Newton "was a sincere and humble believer in the *leading doctrines* of our religion, and lived conformably to its precepts ... Cherishing its doctrines and leaning on its promises, he felt it his duty, as it was his delight, to apply to it (i.e. Christian truth) that intellectual strength which had successfully surmounted the difficulties of the material universe ... He added to the cloud of witnesses the brightest name of ancient or modern times." Sir Isaac's chief contribution to metaphysics was in the form of a scholium to the second edition of the *Principia* (1713) respecting space and duration, which was subsequently expanded into an *a priori* argument by Dr. S. Clarke and the philosophers of his school. It is singular, yet true, that the subsequent deviation from Locke's principles and method, or, more properly, the recognition of an appropriate sphere for *i priori* truth, for which Locke's analysis has failed to provide, should have been largely owing to the influence of these two eminent physicists. The fact cannot be questioned that speculative philosophy asserted a wider range of inquiry for itself under the impulse given to it by Dr. Samuel Clarke and the theologians and philosophers of his school (see Stewart, *Prel. Diss.* pt. ii, sec. 3). The principal works of Newton were collected and published by Dr. Horsley, under the title of *Newtoni Opera quae extant omnia* (Lond. 1779-5, 5 vols. 4to). In the foregoing list, where a work had been reprinted in Horsley's edition, reference is made to the volume. The following were, with few exceptions, first printed in Horsley's edition: tome 1, "Excerpta quadam ex Epistolis Newtoni ad Series Fluxionesque pertinentia; "Artis Analyticae Specimina. vel Geometria Analytica." Tome 3, "Theoria Lunae." Tome 4:" Letters on various Subjects in Natural Philosophy, published from the Originals in the Archives of the Royal Society;" "Letter to Mr. Boyle on the Cause of

Gravitation;” “Tabule duae, Colorum altera, altera Refractionum;” “De Problematibus Bernouillianis;” “Propositions for determining the Motion of a body urged by two Central Forces;” “Four Letters to Dr. Bentley;” “Commercium Epistolicum D. Johannis Collins, et aliorum, de Analysis Promota” (first published by the Royal Society in 1713: a new edition appeared in 1722); “Additamenta Commercii Epistolici.” Tome 5, “A short Chronicle from a Manuscript, the property of the Rev. D. Ekins, dean of Carlisle.” The minor works of Newton have been collected and published under the title of *Opuscula in Mathematica, Philosophica, et Philologica; collegit partimque Latine verlit ac recensuit Joh. Castillioneus* (Laus. et Genev. 3 vols. 4to). After the death of Newton, Dr. Pellet was appointed by the executors to examine his manuscripts and papers, and to select such as he deemed adapted for publication. They are eighty-two in number, and consist of a great number of sheets. But many of those on theological subjects are mere copies over and over again, and with very slight variations. Of these manuscripts the only ones which Dr. Pellet deemed fit to be printed were the “Chronology” and “An Abstract of the Chronology,” the former in ninety-two, the latter in twelve half-sheets folio. At the same time he recommended for further consideration those entitled “De Motu Corporum, ““Paradoxical Questions concerning Athanasius,” “History of the Prophecies,” and a bundle of loose mathematical papers. A catalogue of these manuscripts was appended to a bond given by Mr. Conduit to the administrators of Newton, wherein he binds himself to account for any profit he may make by their publication. A list of them will be found in Hutton’s *Dictionary*. Those on theological subjects are, with many other Newton papers, in the possession of the earl of Portsmouth. The valuable collection of letters between Newton and Cotes, relative to the publication of the second edition of the *Principia*, preserved in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, was published in 1851 under the editorial care of Mr. J. Edleston; the correspondence of Newton with Mr. Pepys and Mr. Millington is in the possession of lord Braybrooke; and other manuscripts are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. See Brewster, *Life of Newton* (Lond. 1831, 12mo); entirely rewritten under the title of *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton* (1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Biot, *Life*, in the *Biog. Univers.* s.v.; Turner, *Collections for the Hist. of Grantham*, containing the papers forwarded to Fontenelle by Conduit, the husband of Newton’s niece, and Dr. Stukeley’s *Account of the Infancy of Newton*, written in 1727; Fontenelle, “thoge de Newton,” (*Euvres diverses* (La Haye, 1729, 4to), t. iii; *Biographia*

*Bnritannaica*, s.v.; Birch, *Hist. of the Royal Society* (Lond. 1756-57, 4to), vols. iii and iv; *Heads of illustrious Persons of Great Britain*, engraved by Houbraken and Vertue, with their *Lives*, by Birch (Lond. 1743, fol.), 1:147. The reader may further consult Montucla, *Hist. des Mathem.* t. 2:iii, iv; Pemberton, *A ccount of Newton's Philosophy*; Maclaurin, *Account of Newton's Discoveries*; Priestley, *Hist. of Optics*; Laplace, *Exposition du Systeme du Monde*, ch. v; lord King, *Life and Correspondence of Locke; Life of Newton*, in the *Library of Useful Knowledge*, etc.; the very brief but excellent memoir of Newton by Prof. De Morgan in *Knight's Cabinet Historical Gallery*, 11:78-118; and that by Allibone in his *Diet. of Brit. and Anmer. Authors*, 2:1414-1421, with its valuable addenda of *Bibliography*. See also *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1832; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1861; *North Brit. Rev.* Aug, 1855; *For. Qu. Rev.* July, 1833; *Littell's Living Age*, Nov. 3, 1855, art. v; Jan. 14, 1856, art. i.

### Newton, James

an English divine and hymnologist, was born in Chenies, England, in 1733. He was early trained in the observance of religious duties. At the age of seventeen he went to London, and became a member of the Church at Mage Pond. He was prepared for the ministry by Dr. Llewelyn, and became about the year 1757 assistant minister in the Pithay Chapel, Bristol. In 1770 he became classical tutor to the Bristol Education Society. This office he filled with honor until his death, April 8, 1790. He published several of his sermons and a few hymns, which have been incorporated in different hymnological compilations. See *Miller's Singers and Songs of the Church*.

### Newton, John

“once an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa,” as he wrote of himself in his epitaph, but afterwards an eminently pious and exemplary servant of God, was born in London, July 24, 1725. He was devoted by his mother, who was a pious dissenter, to the Christian ministry, and his training to that end was begun when he was but four years old. But she died when he was scarcely seven years old, and, neglected by his father and stepmother, he forgot her instructions, fell into the company of idle and vicious boys, and soon learned their ways. Getting hold of lord Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, he was beguiled by its fair words. and gradually settled down a confirmed infidel. Having been accustomed to take voyages with his father, he at last devoted himself entirely to a

seafaring life. Before he was of age he deserted his ship, was brought back to Plymouth as a felon, kept in irons, degraded from his office as midshipman, and publicly whipped. But sin and severe punishment only hardened him the more. While on a voyage he obtained leave to exchange into a vessel bound for the African coast. His purpose, as he afterwards declared, was to be free to sin. He left the ship and lived on the island of Plantains, where he became at last the almost hopeless slave of a slave-trader, who engaged him in the meanest drudgery of his infamous traffic. He was mocked by his master's wife — an abandoned woman — kept almost naked, and half starved. Upon writing to his father, arrangements were made for his return. The voyage homeward was tedious, and from very weariness he read Stanhope's *Thomas a Kempis*, and the thought flashed through his mind, "What if these things should be true?" That very night a terrible storm fell on them; death raged around the sinking ship, and then it was, as he says, "I began to pray. I could not utter the prayer of faith; I could not draw near to a reconciled God, and call him Father. My prayer was like the cry of the ravens, which yet the Lord does not disdain to hear." They escaped the storm, but only to face the danger, by the failure of their provisions, of a more terrible death by starvation. The New Testament now became his constant study; he was especially struck by the parable of the prodigal son, and did not fail to see its similarity to his own case. "I continued," he says, "much in prayer; I saw that the Lord had interfered so far to save me, and I hoped he would do more ... I saw by the way pointed out in the Gospel that God might declare not his mercy only, but his justice also, in the pardon of sin on account of the obedience and sufferings of Jesus Christ... Thus, to all appearance, I was a new man." He reached home in safety, and the change in his life proved real and permanent. For four years longer he engaged in the slave-trade, which he did not then regard as an unlawful occupation; but his eyes being afterwards opened, he did all that he could to expose its cruelties. For eight years he was tide-surveyor at Liverpool. In 1758 he began to attempt to preach, but his efforts were so little successful that he confined himself to a meeting on Sundays with his friends in his own house. He gave himself to careful study, and in 1764, when he was in his thirty-ninth year, he entered upon a regular ministry. He obtained the curacy of Olney, where he remained nearly sixteen years. Here he came into most intimate association with the suffering poet Cowper, and together they produced the *Olney Hymns*. They were written for the use of his congregation, the greater number by himself. In 1779 Newton became rector of St. Mary Woolnoth,



London; there he became generally known, and his Christian usefulness was very great. He died Dec. 21, 1807. His power was not merely in the pulpit, but in conversation and in his correspondence. Several of his works consist of letters; they are rich in Christian experience, and admirable for their clearness and simplicity. His principal works, besides the *Olney Hymns*, were a volume of *Sermons* (1760), before he took orders: — his *Narrative* (published in 1764): — a volume of *Sermons* (1767): — *Omnicon's Letters* (1774): — *Review of Ecclesiastical History* (1769): — *Cardiphonia, or Utterances of the Heart* (1781): — *The Christian Character Exemplified* (1791): — and *Letters to a Wife* (1793). In 1786 he published *Messiah*, being fifty discourses on the Scripture passages in the oratorio of that name. His *Letters to Rev. William Bull* were published in 1847. While the story of Newton's life will always be prized by the Church as affording a marked instance of the power of the grace of God, and will never fail to encourage hope for the most abandoned; and while others of his works are of interest and value, for John Newton was a man of real originality, and his habits of observation were eminently philosophical, yet it is principally in his hymns that he will continue to live in the memory and affection of Christians. On the score of usefulness in this department, judged by the numbers that are found in our best collections, he stands among the first half-dozen hymn-writers of our language. On the score of excellence so high a place could not be given him, although some of our best hymns are from his heart and pen. Among them is that beautiful hymn of experience, "Sweet was the time when first I felt;" and this one, "I asked the Lord that I might grow." This hymn of love to the Savior, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," is his; and this one of worship, "Come, my soul, thy slit prepare." The author of these and of others as good will always hold a high place among the poets of the sanctuary and the closet. In the preface to the *Olney Hymns*, which were published in 1779, he disclaims all pretensions to being a poet, and only claims the "mediocrity of talent which might qualify him for usefulness to the weak and poor of his flock." He further states that his hymns are the "fruit and expression of his own experience." It is this that gives a personal interest and an evident reality to his hymns quite peculiar to them, and is an important element in their value. "We trace in them the indications of his former wayward and miserable course, and at the same time we find in them the expression of the mind and heart of the matured Christian, and of the Christian minister in the midst of his activity, anxiety, and success." He himself has stated his own views of what hymns should be that are designed for use in public

worship, in which the poor and unlearned join as well as the rich and cultivated. "Perspicuity, simplicity, and ease should be chiefly attended to, and the imagery and coloring of poetry, if admitted at all, should be indulged very sparingly, and with great judgment." His own hymns are fit illustrations of these views. He wrote not so much as the poet as the Christian, who must give expression to his own fresh, rich, and abundant experiences, and his hymns will doubtless be used while similar experiences in others demand similar expression. See *Works of John Newton, with Memoirs of his Life*, by Richard Cecil (Phila. 1831; 2d ed. N.Y. 1874, 2 vols. 8vo); *Autobiography and Narrative of John Newton* (Lond. 1869); *Edinb. Rev.* 63:1857; 67. 278; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1874, p. 162; *Lond. Quar. Rev.* 31:26 sq.; Bickersteth, *Christian Student*, p. 321,444; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2185; Christophers, *Hymnwriters and their Hymns*; Miller's *Singers and Songs of the Church*.

### Newton, Richard, D.D.,

a noted English divine, was descended from a family that had long been of considerable repute and of good fortune. His father enjoyed a moderate estate at Lavendon Grange, in Buckinghamshire, which is now in the family. Richard Newton was born at Yardley Chase, in Northamptonshire, in 1676. He was educated at Westminster School, and elected from that foundation to a scholarship of Christ Church, Oxford, where he afterwards taught with great acceptability and honor. He became M.A. on April 12, 1701, and B.D. on March 18, 1707. He was inducted principal of Hart Hall, by Dr. Aldrich, in 1710, where he undertook the degree of D.D. on December 7 of that same year. Dr. Newton was next called into lord Pelham's family to superintend the education of the late duke of Newcastle, and his brother, Mr. Pelham, who ever retained (as many letters now extant show) a most affectionate regard for him; but being a man of too independent and liberal principles to solicit favors for himself, he never met with any return for his sedulous attentions to them until 1752, when he was promoted to a canonry of Christ Church. Some time prior he had been inducted by bishop Compton into the living of Sudbury, in his native county, and he held this living some time after he assumed the principalship of Hertford College, which he filled until his death, April 21, 1753. Newton was honored with the esteem of his contemporaries, and was conceded to be as polite a scholar and as ingenious a writer as any of that age. In closeness of argument and perspicuity and elegance of language he had not his equal. Never did any private person engage in more trusts, or discharge

them with greater integrity. He was a true friend to religion and education, a man of exemplary piety and extensive charity. No one man was called forth so often to preach in the latter end of queen Anne's time and in the beginning of that of king George I as Dr. Newton. During his residence in the rectory at Sudbury he discharged all the parts of his office as parish minister with exemplary care and fidelity. Among other particulars, he read the evening prayers of the liturgy at his church on the week-day evenings at seven o'clock, hay-time and harvest excepted, for the benefit of his parishioners. As principal of Hart Hall he labored faithfully for its prosperity, and in 1740 obtained a charter to convert the school into a college, and thus became the founder, at a considerable expense to himself, of Hertford College, as the institution was named. He obtained great aid from his numerous friends, but contributed himself about £1000 at least, which he derived from a publication of his entitled *Theophrastus*. The famous Dr. Conybeare, rector of Exeter College, afterwards dean of Christ Church and bishop of Bristol, opposed Dr. Newton's project of obtaining a charter; and never, perhaps, were two people better fitted for a controversy, which deserves as much to be collected for the language as Junius's letters. Upon his (death-bed Dr. Newton ordered all his writings to be destroyed, excepting a select number of his sermons, which were published in 1784; a few others had already been published during his lifetime. He also had published *A Scheme of Discipline, etc., (at Hart Hall (Lond. 1720): — University Education (ibid. 1726 and 1733, 8vo): — Pluralities Indefensible (ibid. 1743). A second edition of his Pluralities Indefensible, which was published in answer to the learned Wharton on Pluralities, appeared in 1744. Dr. Newton has not been, and probably never will be answered. The Characters of Theophrastus, with a strictly literal translation of the Greek into Latin, etc., with notes and observations on the text in English, was published from his MSS., as arranged before his death, for the benefit of Hertford College, by his successor in the principalship of that high school in 1754. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:406-408; Chalmers's History of Oxford; London Getlentman's Magazine, 1792; General Biog. Dict. 11:216-220.*

### Newton, Robert D.D.,

a Wesleyan preacher greatly noted for his popular oratory, was born at Roxby, Yorkshire, of poor but pious parents, Sept. 8, 1780. He was early brought under the influence of the Methodists, but was not converted until seventeen years of age, when, after nine weeks of great mental anguish, he

experienced deliverance by Christian faith. In 1798, though possessed of but a limited education, he was received by the British Conference. In 1803 he was appointed to the Glasgow Circuit, and at the same time attended lectures on theology and philosophy at the University of Glasgow. While he received his appointments regularly from the Conference, most of his time was spent in England and Scotland. His appointment, in 1812, to London brought the extraordinary pulpit talents which he possessed more prominently before the public. He there became intimately associated with Butterworth and Coke in behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society. During the rest of his life Robert Newton was the most popular advocate of missions in England. When he began his missionary labor there were but fifty Wesleyan missionaries, with seventeen thousand communicants; he soon increased them to more than three hundred and fifty missionaries and one hundred thousand communicants. The demand for his services became universal throughout England, Ireland, and Scotland. In England and Scotland he was eminently successful, especially in Sheffield, where it is said he broke the spell of Paine's influence which then prevailed among the working classes. During his labor of forty years he probably addressed from year to year a greater number of people than any other man of his time. For forty years he was known in all the cities and large towns of England, and his coming was always hailed with great pleasure by the people. He was four times elected president of the British Conference, and for many years acted as its secretary. In 1839 he was sent as a delegate by the British Conference to the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, and during his visit to this country his popularity as a speaker was so great that he attracted vast crowds whenever he preached. He died April 30, 1854. He was the author of *Sermons on Special and Ordinary Occasions*, edited, with a Preface, by Rev. James H. Rigg, D.D. Lond. 1853, 8vo); these, regarded simply as pulpit compositions, are entitled to be ranked with the best published discourses which this generation has produced. "It has always seemed to us," says the *London Review*, July, 1856, p. 563, "that the great popularity of Dr. Newton was very inadequately explained by referring it to those rare physical characteristics, and to that sympathy and depth of feeling, which contribute mainly to the constitution of one of 'nature's orators,' and which were found pre-eminently in him. Such qualities may for a time give distinction to those who are otherwise slenderly endowed, but their conjunction with intellectual powers of a high order is required to maintain permanently a widespread influence and reputation. That Dr. Newton possessed, with

other essential but inferior qualifications, great mental vigor, we find ample evidence in nearly every page of this volume; and we are at no loss to comprehend the causes which enabled him, for nearly half a century, to gather around him, wherever he went, listening and admiring crowds, and which made him the greatest preacher among a body of ministers unequalled for the power and success of their ministry in any period of the Christian Church." See Jackson, *Life of Dr. R. Newton* (Lond. 1855, cr. 8vo; 1856); *Life, Labors, and Travels of Rev. R. Newton, D.D.* (ibid. 1855, 12mo); Stevens, *Hist. Methodism*, 3:168, 260, 461, 504; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1856, art. 5; *London Quar. Rev.* July, 1855, art. i; *Wesleyan Magazine*, Oct. 1854, and May, 1855.

### Newton, Thomas (1),

a noted English divine and poet, was born near the middle of the 16th century, and flourished as rector of Little ford in Essex. He died in 1607. He is the author of a *Notable History of the Saracens* (Lond. 1575, 4to); published a number of prose and poetical works, and made translations from Seneca and other authors (1571-1604). He was one of the best Latin poets of his age. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Brydges's Phillips's *Theat. Poet.*; Lysons's *Environs*; Pulteney's *Sketches*; *Brit. Bibliog.*; Watt's *Bibl. Brit. s.v.*; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.*

### Newton, Thomas (2), D.D.,

an eminent English prelate, was born at Lichfield in 1704. He was educated there and at Westminster School, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was for some years a city preacher and tutor in the Tyrconnel family, but in 1744 he was appointed rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, London, by his friend and patron, Pulteney, earl of Bath. Thomas Newton afterwards became successively lecturer at St. George's, Hanover Square; prebendary of Westminster in 1757; next dean of Salisbury and sub-almoner, and bishop of Bristol and canon residentiary of St. Paul's about 1761, and dean of St. Paul's in 1768. He died in 1782. "Bishop Newton," says a contemporary, "was a prelate of not very remarkable powers. natural or acquired; but personally he was without reproach, acceptable in the society of the great, and possessed of a certain amount of general and professional knowledge." The fourth edition of his *Works* (3 vols. 1782) is complete; that in 6 vols. 8vo (1787) is only complete with his *Dissertations on the Prophecies which have remarkably been fulfilled*, etc.

(10th ed. Lond. 1804, 2 vols. 8vo), which Bickersteth (*Christian Student*, p. 473) pronounces “a very valuable work;” but which Orme (*Bibl. Bib.* s.v.) pronounces “seldom profound or original, though they contain occasionally some correct views of Scripture.” Jennings, in Kitto (*Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* iii, s.v.), says, “By a certain class, who lag behind their age, it is still read and admired. It may, however, be occasionally consulted with advantage” — he might have added on all except Newton’s interpretation of the Book of Revelation, where he is altogether astray and uncritical. The work has been translated into Danish and German, and found circulation in several thousand copies. As a divine he belonged to the supernaturalistic school of his time, and was more positive than Samuel Clarke (q.v.). Bishop Newton also wrote *On the Anglican Ritual* (*Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*); an *Autobiography*, published by Alexander Chalmers in *Lives of Dr. Edward Pocock, etc.* (Lond. 1816, 2 vols. 8vo); and edited *Milton’s Poetical Works*, with notes from various authors. See J. B. Smith, D.D., *An Analysis of Bishop Newton on the Prophecies* (Lond. 1836, 12mo); Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2188; and the references quoted in the body of this article.

## New Year

### Picture for New Year

or FEAST OF TRUMPETS (h[wrt ʰwrkz hñç çar, h[wrt μwy), though not one of the three great festivals on which the male population appeared before the Lord in Jerusalem, is nevertheless one of the first among the principal holy days, and as such has been celebrated by the Israelites since the giving of the Law, and is observed to the present day.

**1. Name and its Signification, and the Import of this Festival.** — In the two passages where the institution of it occurs, this festival is called h[wrt ʰwrkz, *remembrance blowing*, i.e. of trumpets (<sup>(R23)</sup>Leviticus 23:24; Sept. μνημόσυνον σαλπίγγων; Vulg. *Sabbatum memoriale clangentibus tubis*), and h[wrt μwy, *the day of blowing*, i.e. the trumpets (<sup>(R21)</sup>Numbers 29:1; Sept.) ἡμέρα σημασίας; Vulg. *Dies clangoris et tubarum*). To understand this indefinite appellation, we must examine the import of this festival. As the first of Tisri, on which this festival occurs, besides being the new moon, is the beginning of that month wherein the festivals most distinguished both for holiness and joy are celebrated, it had to be connected in an especial manner with the import of the month itself.

**SEE FESTIVAL.** Hence, as Maimonides observes, it was made, as it were, a stepping-stone to and a preparation for the great Day of Atonement (*More Nebochim*, 3:43). This is not only indicated by the participle!a (<sup><0227></sup>Leviticus 23:27), which forms the transition from the feast of New Year to the Day of Atonement, but has been so understood by the unanimous voice of the Jewish Church, which from time immemorial has observed the ten intervening days between these two festivals as *days of openitence*, and calls them “*the ten days of repentance, or humiliation*” (hbwçt ymy trç[, comp. Talmud, *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 18 a; Maimonides, *ut sup.*; *Orach Chajim*, sec. 582, 602, 603). Being preparatory to it, the festival of the New Year was to draw the attention of the Israelites to the design of the Day of Atonement, by summoning and stirring them up to it. As it is ordained that whenever *all* Israel are to be summoned to general action — e.g. either to a convocation, journey, war, or an assault — the priests are to blow silver trumpets made especially for this purpose (<sup><0400></sup>Numbers 10:1-10), and that these trumpets are especially to be blown at every sacred work in order to summon the people on festivals and new moons to participate in the sacrifices (ver. 10); the festival of the New Year, which is designed to summon the Israelites to the most holy of all works, and to prepare them for the great Day of Atonement, had to be finished with the sign of this summons in an especial manner. Thus the blowing of the trumpets, which was a secondary thing on other festivals, became the chief and distinguishing feature of this festival. Hence its name, h[wrt µwy, *the day on which the trumpets were especially blown*; or, *the day on which the blowingq was peculiarly characteristic* (<sup><0230></sup>Numbers 29:1). Moreover, as this blowing of the trumpets is a summons to the Israelites to enter upon the work of sanctification, it is accounted to them as a merit in the sight of God, and the inspired Word promises them for it a special remembrance before the Lord (<sup><0400></sup>Numbers 10:10) and divine help for this holy life (ver. 9). Hence this festival is also called h[wrt ^wrkz, *the remembrance blowing* (<sup><0234></sup>Leviticus 23:24), i.e. the day on which the blowing of the trumpets, by its summoning the Israelites to effect their reconciliation with God, makes them to be remembered before the Lord, and secures for them divine aid for the holy work before them. The synagogue, however, takes the word ^wrkz more in the sense of *reminding* God of the merits of and his covenant with the patriarchs, and for this reason has appointed <sup><0200></sup>Genesis 21:1-34; 22:1-24, recording the birth and sacrifice of Isaac, as lessons for this festival (comp. Rashi, *On* <sup><0234></sup>Leviticus

23:24, and the article HAPHTARAH *SEE HAPHTARAH* ). That this festival occurs on the day commencing the civil new year, which from time immemorial has been on the first of the seventh month, called Tisri, is not only evident from <sup><011></sup>Exodus 12:1; 23:16; 24:22; Josephus, *Ant.* 1:3, 3; but from the fact that both the Sabbatical year and Jubilee commenced in this month (comp. <sup><020></sup>Leviticus 25:9, 10; and the article JUBILEE *SEE JUBILEE* ). The universal practice of the Jewish nation, who regard and celebrate it as *the Festival of the New-Year's Day*, is therefore rightly supported by Christian scholars; and the name *New Year* (**çar hñçh**), by which this festival is almost universally spoken of in Jewish literature, is far more expressive than the vague appellation, *Feast of Trumpets*.

**2. The Manner in which this Festival was and still is celebrated.** — Like the Sabbath, this festival was to be a day of rest, on which all trade and handicraft works were stopped (<sup><023></sup>Leviticus 23:24, 25). As the new year also is the new moon, a threefold sacrifice was offered on this festival—viz. the ordinary daily sacrifice, which was offered first; then the appointed new-moon sacrifice, *SEE NEW MOON, FEAST OF THE*; and last of all followed the sacrifice of this festival, which consisted of a young bullock, a ram, and seven lambs of the first year, with the usual meat-offerings, and a kid for a sin-offering (<sup><020></sup>Numbers 29:1-6); and which, with the exception of there being one young bullock for a burnt-offering instead of two, was simply a repetition of the monthly offering. All the time that the drink-offering and burnt-offering were offered, the Levites engaged in soul-stirring vocal and instrumental music, singing the eighty-first and other Psalms; while the priests at stated intervals broke forth with awful peals of the trumpets. After the offering up of the sacrifices the service was concluded by the priests, who pronounced the benediction (<sup><002></sup>Numbers 6:23-27), which the people received in a prostrate position before the Lord. Thereupon the congregation, after prostrating themselves a second time in the court, resorted to the adjoining synagogues, where the appointed lessons from the Law and Prophets were read, consisting of <sup><021></sup>Genesis 21:1-34; <sup><020></sup>Numbers 29:1-6; <sup><001></sup>1 Samuel 1:50-2:10; <sup><021></sup>Genesis 22:1-24; <sup><020></sup>Numbers 29:1-6; <sup><010></sup>Jeremiah 31:2-20. Psalms were recited and the festival prayers were offered, beseeching the Lord to pardon the sins of the past year, and to grant to the people a happy new year, which concluded the morning service. The families then resorted to their respective homes, partook, as on other festivals, of a social and joyous repast, and in the evening again went to the Temple to witness the offering of the evening sacrifice and the incense, and to see the lighting of



the candlestick, with which the festival concluded, all wishing each other, “*May you be written down for a happy new year,*” or “*May the Creator decree for you a happy new year;*” to which it is replied, “*And you likewise.*” This wish or prayer to be inscribed on this day in the book of life arises from the fact that the Jews believe that the feast of the New Year is the annual day of judgment, on which all the deeds of man are weighed, whether they be good or evil, the destinies of every individual and every nation are fixed for the ensuing year, and the death and life of every one is determined, as well as the manner of death (Mishna, *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 1:2; Talmud, in loco). Hence the names *Day of Judgment* (יְדִי הַמִּשְׁפָּט) and *Awful Days* (מַיָּרְוֵן מַיָּמִי), by which this festival is sometimes called. It is a remarkable fact that all the ancient astronomers of the different nations have given the figure of an aged man of stern aspect, holding a pair of scales in his right hand and an open book in his left, as the sign of the zodiac for this month, thus expressing the religious idea of this festival.

With the exception of the sacrifices which cannot be offered in consequence of the destruction of the Temple, and a few modifications which have been introduced through the shifting circumstances of the nation, the Jewish ritual for the new year continues to the present day to be essentially the same as it was in the days of Christ. The service comprises prayers of a threefold kind as described in the Mishna, which are as follows:

**(1.)** A series of texts are recited bearing on the supreme rule of God, consisting of, *twba* till *μhrbaA^gm*; *b*, *twrbwg*, commencing with *rbwg hta* till *hyj m μytmh*; and *c*, *μçh tçdq*, beginning from where the last leaves off till *çwdqh l ah*. After these prayers have been offered, in which the speedy approach of the kingdom of God is invoked, when all mankind shall possess the true knowledge of their Creator, and unite in the worship of their supreme Benefactor, and which are called *twwkl m*, of *homage*, a prayer is recited celebrating the holiness of the day (*wntrj b hta*), after which the trumpet is blown.

**(2.)** Then follow prayers acknowledging the omniscience, providence, and supremacy of the Creator, and beseeching him to remember his creatures in pity, and temper his judgment with mercy, which are called *twnrkz*, of *Remembrance*, and after which the trumpet is again blown; and

(3.) Prayers celebrating that future jubilee when all men will be free from the bondage of error, and acquire perfection in the knowledge of their God, which are called **twrpwç**, of *Sounding the Trumpet*, and after which the trumpet is blown a third time. The service is then concluded with the recital of the **hdwb[ hadwh** , and **µynhk tkrb** or the last three blessings of the *Amida* or *Mussaph*, **hxr**, **µydw**, and **µwl ç µyç** (*Rosh Ha-Shanta*, 4:5). Before the destruction of the Temple the trumpets were blown all day by the priests in Jerusalem, from sunrise to sunset, but since the downfall of the city it has been ordained that the trumpet is to be blown in every city during the synagogal service, and that every Israelite is obliged to hear its sound. Though the Bible says nothing about the kind of trumpet to be used on this occasion, yet it is certain that “the cornet used in the Temple on the feast of New Year was,” as the Mishna declares, “a straight horn of a chamois [a kind of antelope, or wild goat], the mouthpiece of which was covered with gold” (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 3:3), and the Jews to the present day use a ram’s horn, to remind God on this occasion of the ram which he sent to be sacrificed instead of Isaac, and of the covenant made with the patriarchs; for which reason also <sup><0220></sup>Genesis 22:1-24, recording the sacrifice of Isaac, forms the lesson of this festival. The horns of oxen or calves are unlawful (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 3:2), as the use of them would remind God of Israel’s sin in making the golden calf, which is also the reason why the Jews in the present day no more gild the mouthpiece of the trumpet. Before sounding the trumpet, which is of this shape, the rabbi pronounces the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined us to hear the sound of the trumpet! — Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and safely brought us to this season!” To this the whole congregation responds “Amen!” The greatest importance is attached to the blowing of the trumpet, as its sound is believed to confound Satan, who on this day of judgment appears before God’s tribunal to accuse the children of Israel (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 16). This explains the otherwise inexplicable rendering of <sup><0290></sup>Numbers 29:1 in the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan b. Uzziel, “*It shall be a day of blowing to confound Satan, who comes to accuse you, with the sound of your trumpets.*” After the *Minchah*, or the afternoon service, they go to a river or stream, which they generally prefer to be out of town, and to contain fish, and recite a prayer called **yl çt**, which consists of the following passages of Scripture:

<sup><378></sup>Micah 7:18-20; <sup><486></sup>Psalm 118:5-9; 33; and with the earnest recitation of <sup><319></sup>Isaiah 11:9, shake their garments over the water. Four reasons are assigned for this service:

- (1.) It is to pray to God to be as fruitful as the fish.
- (2.) To commemorate the sacrifice of Isaac, which, according to an old tradition, Abraham made on this day, in spite of the wiles of Satan, who sought to prevent the patriarch from obeying the Lord, by causing a mighty stream to arise on Abraham's journey to Mount Moriah, which would have drowned both the father and the son but for the prayers of faithful Abraham.
- (3.) To be reminded by the sight of the fish that we are as suddenly deprived of our life as these fish are caught in the net (<sup><102></sup>Ecclesiastes 9:12), and thereby be admonished to repentance.
- (4.) To learn from the fish constantly to direct our eyes upwards.

**3. Literature.** — *Mishna, Rosh ha-Shana*; and the Gemara on that Tractate; the *Siphra on* <sup><123></sup>Leviticus 23:23-25; <sup><101></sup>Numbers 29:1; Abrabanel. *Commentari-on-Exodus* 12, I sq.; <sup><123></sup>Leviticus 23:23-25; <sup><101></sup>Numbers 29:1; the Jewish Ritual entitled *Derech Ha -Chajim* (Vienna, 1859), p. 258 sq.; the *Machsor for Rosh Ha-Shana*; Mever, *De Temporibus Sacris et Festis Diebus Hebraeorum* (1755), p. 300 sq. **SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.**

## New Year, Festival Of The.

The custom of celebrating the first day of the year by some religious observance, generally accompanied by festive rejoicing, is of very ancient origin, and appears to have prevailed generally among the nations of antiquity. The Jews, the Egyptians, Persians, Hindu, Chinese, Romans, and the Mohammedans, although differing as to the time from which they reckoned the beginning of the year, all regarded it as a day of special interest. For the Jewish usages, see the preceding article.

The old Roman year began in March, and on the first day of that month the festival *Ancylia* was celebrated, when the salii or priests of Mars carried the sacred shield in procession through the city, and the people spent the day in feasting and rejoicing. The Romans counted it lucky to begin any new enterprise or to enter upon any new office on new-year's day. The

same sacredness was attached to the first day of the year after the change took place in the Roman calendar that made January the commencing month instead of March; and Pliny tells us that on the first of January people wished each other health and prosperity, and sent presents to each other. It was accounted a public holiday, and games were celebrated in the Campus Martius. The people gave themselves up to riotous excess, and various kinds of heathen superstition. The first Christian emperors kept up the custom, though it tolerated and afforded the opportunity for idolatrous rites. The Church, however, saw itself finally obliged to condemn these, and prohibited Christians from joining in the social celebration, and ended by making it a religious festival. "It was only," remarks Neander, "to oppose a counter-influence to the pagan celebration that Christian assemblies were finally held on the first day of January, and they were designed to protect Christians against the contagious influence of pagan debauchery and superstition. Thus when Augustine had assembled his Church on one of these occasions, he first caused to be sung the words, 'Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us from among the heathen' (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 106:47); and hence he took occasion to remind his flock of their duty, especially on this day, to show that as they had in truth been gathered from among the heathen to exhibit in their life the contrast between the Christian and the heathen temper, to substitute alms for new-year's gifts (the *strenae*), edification from Scripture for merry songs, and fast for riotous feasting. This principle was gradually adopted in the practice of the Western Church, and three days of penitence and fasting were opposed to the pagan celebration of January, until, the time being designated, the festival of Christ's circumcision was transferred to this season (the first day of January being the eighth day after the nativity), when a Jewish rite was opposed to the pagan observances, and its reference to the circumcision of the heart by repentance to heathen revelry" (*Ch. Hist.* 2:314,315). This occurred as early as A.D. 487. In Herrick's *Noble Numbers* are three songs, with choruses, for this day, illustrating the religious ceremony, and drawing a consolation therefrom:

*"Come, thou, and gently touch the birth  
Of him who's Lord of heaven and earth  
And softly handle him: y'ad need,  
Because the pretty babe do's bleed.  
Poore pittied child! who from thy stall  
Bring'st in thy blood a balm that shall  
Be the best New-Year's gift to all."*

In the 6th century it became a solemn festival, the Council of Tours in 566 ordaining that “the chant of litanies should on the first of January be opposed to the superstitions of the pagans,” and that the Eucharist, or Mass of the Circumcision, be celebrated. By the primitive Christians the day was held as a fast, in opposition to the Roman — then pagan — custom of feasting, dancing, and gift-making. In the time of Numa the day was dedicated to Janus, the double-faced deity, who faced the future while he looked back upon the past. The Romans offered him a cake of sifted meal, with incense, salt, and wine. They also did something in the way of their art or calling to begin the year industriously, that they might have good-fortune through it. By degrees, however, as the Christian faith and strength increased, and the necessity for the distinction grew less important, the Church, in the 8th century, abrogated the fast, and the earlier and more congenial jovial customs were gradually resumed, and have continued in one good form or another to the present. (Regarding the observance of new-year’s by the Christian Church, see, especially, Alt, *Der christliche Cultus*. pt. ii, p. 46; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten der christl. Kirche*, 1:311 sq.).

The Hindûs call the first day of the year *Prajapatya*, the day of the Lord of creation. It is sacred to *Ganesh*, the god of wisdom, to whom they sacrifice male kids and wild deer, and celebrate the festival with illuminations and general rejoicings. Among the mountain tribes it is customary to sacrifice a buffalo every new year’s day, in the presence of a multitude assembled to witness the solemn ceremony.

The Chinese begin their year about the vernal equinox, and the festival observed on the occasion is one of the most splendid of their religious feasts. All classes, including the emperor, mingle together in free and unrestrained intercourse, and unite in thanksgiving for mercies received, as well as in prayer for a genial season and an abundant crop. In Japan the day is spent in visiting and feasting. The Sabians held a grand festival on the day that the sun enters Aries, which was the first day of their year, when the priests and the people marched in procession to the temples, where they sacrificed to the planetary gods. Among the ancient Persians prisoners were liberated and offenders forgiven on this day; and, in short, the Persian new-year’s day resembled the Sabbatical year of the Jews. A curious Oriental custom peculiar to this day may be mentioned. It is called by the Arabs and Persians the “Game of the Beardless River,” and consists in a deformed man, whose hair has been shaved and his face ludicrously painted

with variegated colors, riding along the streets on an ass, and behaving in the most whimsical manner, to the great delight of the multitudes that followed him. Thus equipped, he rides from door to door soliciting small pieces of money. A similar custom is still found in various parts of Scotland under the name of “guizzarding.”

On March 10, or the commencement of the year among the Druids, was performed the famous ceremony of cutting the mistletoe (q.v.). Beneath the oak where it grew preparations were made for a banquet and sacrifices, and for the first time two white bulls were tied by the horns. Then one of the Druids, clothed in white, mounted the tree and cut off the mistletoe with a golden sickle, receiving it into a white *sagum*, or cloak, laid over his hand. The sacrifices were next commenced, and prayers were offered to God to send a blessing upon his own gift, while the plant was supposed to bestow fertility on man and beast, and to be a specific against all sorts of poisons.

On the first day of the year, as Humboldt informs us, the Mexicans carefully adorned their temples and houses, and employed themselves in various religious ceremonies. One, which at first perhaps was peculiar to this season, though subsequently it became of more frequent occurrence, was the offering up to the gods of a human sacrifice. The wretched victim, after having been flayed alive, was carried to the pyramidal summit of the sacred edifice which was the scene of these barbarities, and after his heart had been torn out by a priest in presence of assembled thousands, his body was consumed to ashes by being placed on a blazing funeral pile. The Muyscas, or native inhabitants of New Granada, celebrate the same occasion with peaceful and unbloody rites. They assemble as usual in their temples, and their priest distributes to each worshipper a figure formed of the flour of maize. which is eaten in the full belief that it will secure the individual from danger and adversity. The first lunation of the Muysca year is denominated by “the month of the ears of maize.” From the various facts thus adduced, it is plain that the rites connected with New-Year’s day may be traced back to the remotest ages, that they have been celebrated in all nations and ages, and that, though of a festive and cheerful, they have never been uniformly of an essential religious character.

The social observances of the first day of the new year appear to have been in substance the same in all ages. From the earliest recorded celebration, we find notice of feasting and the interchange of presents as usages of the

day. Suetonius alludes to the bringing of presents to the capital; and Tacitus makes a similar reference to the practice of giving and receiving New Year's gifts. Under the Caesars these presents became such a source of personal profit to the sovereign, and so onerous to his subjects, that Claudius limited them by a decree. This custom was continued by the Christian kingdoms into which the Western empire was divided. In England we find many examples of it, even as a part of the public expenditure of the court, so far down as the reign of Charles II; and, as all our antiquarian writers mention, the custom of interchanging presents as common in all classes of society (see Eccleston's *English Antiquities*, p. 317, 443). At present the ringing in of the New Year from the belfry of churches is the only open demonstration of joy at the recurrence of the anniversary. This is now a custom also in other countries. In France it still subsists, unobscured by the still popular practice of Christmas gifts. In many countries the night of New-Year's Eve, "St. Sylvester's Eve," was celebrated with great festivity, which was prolonged till after twelve o'clock, when the New Year was ushered in with congratulations, complimentary visits, and mutual wishes for a "Happy new year." This is an ancient Scottish custom, which also prevails in many parts of Germany, where the form of wish "Prosst (for the Lat. *prosit*) Neu-jahr" — "May the new year be happy" — sufficiently attests the antiquity of the custom. Many religious communions are wont to celebrate the approach of the New Year with a special service, especially the Methodists. In the Roman Catholic Church the *Te Deum* is still sung at the close of the old year; and New-Year's day is a holiday of strict obligation. For monographs on the ancient customs, both among the Jews and other nations, in his respect, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 117, 118.

## New Zealand

is the name of a British colony in the South Pacific Ocean, which consists of three volcanic islands, and of a number of islets scattered around the coasts, having an area of about 106,000 square miles, with a coast-line measuring about 4000 miles, on the best-named account, and a population (in 1886) of 578,482 Europeans, besides 41,969 natives.

*Soil, Climate, and Productions.* — Of the whole surface extent of New Zealand (nearly 70,000,000 acres, little short of the combined area of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland), one fourth is estimated to consist of dense forest tracts, one half of excellent soil, and the remainder

of waste lands, scoriae-hills, and rugged mountain regions. The mountains are mostly clothed with evergreen forests of luxuriant growth, interspersed with fern-clad ranges, and occasionally with treeless, grassy plains. Extensive and rich valleys and sheltered dales abound in North Island; and in the east of South Island there are many expansive plains of rich meadowland, and nearly 40,000,000 acres are estimated to be more or less suitable for agriculture and cattle-breeding. The soil, although often clay, has in the volcanic districts more than a medium fertility; but the luxuriant and semi-tropical vegetation is perhaps as much due to excellence of climate as to richness of soil. Owing to the prevalence of light and easily worked soils, all agricultural processes are performed with unusual ease. The climate is one of the finest in the world. The country contains few physical sources of disease; the average temperature is remarkably even at all seasons of the year, and the atmosphere is continually agitated and freshened by winds that blow over an immense expanse of ocean. In North Island the mean annual temperature is  $57^{\circ}$ ; in South Island  $52^{\circ}$ . The mean temperature of the hottest month at Auckland is  $68^{\circ}$ , and at Otago  $58^{\circ}$ ; of the coldest month,  $51^{\circ}$  and  $40^{\circ}$ . The air is very humid, and the fall of rain is greater than in England, but there are more dry days. All the native trees and plants are evergreens. Forests, shrubberies, and plains are clothed in green throughout the year, the results of which are that cattle, as a rule, browse on the herbage and shrubs of the open country all the year round, thus saving great expense to the cattle-breeder; and that the operations of reclaiming and cultivating land can be carried on at all seasons. The seasons in New Zealand are the reverse of ours: January is their hottest month, and June the coldest. The principal products of the soil are wheat, barley, oats, potatoes, and sown grass. Maize and beans and pease are also raised in great abundance, and any other vegetable, grain, grass, or fruit produced in the United States of America can be cultivated successfully in New Zealand. With the exception of a few harmless lizards, no animals that annoy or hurt are encountered by the invading European. The small species of rat is the only objectionable four-footed inhabitant of New Zealand. Hawks are numerous. Snakes are not to be found at all, nor do insects that worry or hurt abound. The pig, introduced by Cook, runs wild, and the red and fallow deer, the pheasant, partridge, quail, etc., and the common domestic animals introduced by colonists thrive well.



## Picture for New Zealand 1

## Picture for New Zealand 2

*The People, and their Customs and Religious Belief.* The native inhabitants of New Zealand are the *Maoris* (which name signifies *native*, or *indigenous*), and, with the natives of Polynesia generally, they belong to the Malayan race. *SEE MALAYS*. Though calling themselves indigenous, the Maoris have a tradition that their ancestors migrated to the present seat of the nation from the north-east — the island of Hawaiki — about 500 years ago. “They came,” the legend goes, “in seven canoes, which had outriggers, to prevent foundering, and were called Amatiatia, being very different from those subsequently used by them, which were much simpler in construction, and named Wakka. The first of these canoes that touched at New Zealand was named *Arawa*, and this brought over the first settlers from whom the Maori are descended.” If any faith is to be attached to this tradition, Hawaiki was, probably, the same as Hawaii, the principal of the Sandwich Islands, distant about 4000 miles north-east of New Zealand. Some, however, suppose that it may have been Savaii, one of the Samoan or Navigators’ Islands, a group not half that distance away. The tradition says nothing of any indigenous population found in New Zealand before the arrival of these immigrants. Many writers, however, incline to the belief that it was previously inhabited by a darker race, somewhat akin to the Papuas of New Guinea. *SEE NEGRITOS*. Supposing that the two races, in process of time, intermingled, this might account, in some measure, for the differences apparent between the Maori and the Tahitians, Samoans, Sandwich Islanders, and other natives of the Pacific. But whether of pure or mixed race, all testimony combines in representing the Maori as a nation standing very high in the scale of humanity. The skin of the Maori is in general of an olive-brown color, but there are some in whom the shade is much lighter, while in others it is darker. In stature they almost equal Englishmen, and have a powerful muscular development. They have well-shaped, intellectual heads, and their features, when not tattooed might almost be taken for European. Few of them have beards or whiskers, it being an immemorial custom with them to pluck out the hair on the face with pipi shells. On the head, the majority have long black hair, with a slight wave in it; but with some it is of a reddish tinge, and some Maori again have the hair slightly frizzled. Their eyes are large, their lips thick, and their teeth, unlike those of most savage nations, are large and irregular.

The women are of less stature than the men in proportion, and are in other respects inferior to them, perhaps from their marrying too young, and having to perform too much of the drudgery of life. Some of the women, however, are represented as being delicately molded, with long eyelashes, pleasing features, and a plaintive, pathetic voice, which makes them highly interesting. The whole nation is divided into seventeen families or clans; but though they originally kept strictly distinct, they have since the invasion of the whites intermingled freely, especially in the last twenty years. There seem to have existed such great distinctions among the several clans that the differences closely resemble the caste distinctions of India. Wars against each other were frequent, and cannibalism was freely practiced until within the last forty years. The system of *taboo*, or consecration of persons and things by the native priests as sacred and inviolate, so common to the Pacific isles, nowhere prevailed to a greater extent than in New Zealand when first opened to colonization. This was partly a religious and partly a political ordinance, and was so much respected that even in war times hostile tribes left unharmed all persons and things thus protected by the *taboo* of the opposite side. Tattooing was practiced, and was made a much more painful operation than in the other Pacific isles; it was performed with a hammer and saw-like chisel. The punctures were stained with vegetable dyes, and the patterns, which extended over the face, hips, thighs, etc., represented ornamental scrolls and figures, supposed to denote the rank of the individual wearing them. The women were but slightly tattooed, with a few lines on the lips, chin, and occasionally other parts of the body. The priests were the principal operators, and during the process ancient songs were sung, to encourage, divert the attention, and increase the patience of the sufferers. This tattooing was supposed to make the Maori youth both more terrible in the eyes of his enemies and more acceptable in those of his mistress.

The wars of the Maori were formerly carried on with spears and clubs of various kinds, manufactured, as is the custom, according to ethnologists, among lowly civilized people, of stone and wood. Their most remarkable weapon was a spear of nephrite, which descended among the principal chiefs from father to son, and was regarded as a kind of scepter, and even a sacred object. It was called *Merimeri*, "the fire of the gods," and was sometimes used for scalping prisoners. There are other weapons of nephrite in use among the Maori; they are much sought after, and very costly. The use of firearms is now, however, very general among the

Maori, and that they are adroit marksmen has been made but too apparent in their contests with English troops.

The heathen religion of the New Zealanders was largely mythological; temples were wanting; superstition and sleight of hand, however, played an important part in their religious system, and the priest virtually ruled and had his own way in everything. Most pernicious practices were thus introduced and freely encouraged to strengthen and perpetuate priestly power. The New Zealanders worshipped various gods, apparently personifications of natural objects and powers, to whom they addressed prayers and offered sacrifices. Their divinities were spiritual and invisible; they had no idols. Many of the gods were deified men, ancestral chiefs of the tribe or nation by whom they were worshipped. They believed in a future state and in their own immortality. There were two distinct abodes for departed spirits, neither of which was a place of punishment, evil deeds being punished in this world by sickness and other personal misfortunes. Their priests were supposed to be in communication with their gods, and to express their wishes and commands. Sorcerers were thought to possess great power, and were held in peculiar dread. The moral code was adapted to various social conditions and circumstances. Among chiefs courage, liberality, command of temper, endurance of torture without complaint, revenge of injuries, and abstinence from insults to others, were regarded as virtues; among slaves, obedience to their masters and respect for the taboo; among married women, fidelity to their husbands. Their idea of *Wiro*, the evil spirit, was nearly akin to the scriptural idea of the evil one. Sickness, they supposed, was brought on by him, coming in the form of a lizard, and, entering the side, preyed on the vitals. Hence they made incantations over the sick, threatening to kill and eat their deity, or to burn him to a cinder, unless he should come out. With the New Zealander superstition took the place of medical skill. When a person had a pain in the back, he would lie down and get another to jump over him and tread on him to remove the pain. A wound was bruised with a stone, and afterwards held over the smoke. In internal acute diseases the patient sent for a priest, lay down, and died. Dreams and omens were much regarded, and had great influence over their conduct. On important occasions, when several tribes were going to war, all oracle was consulted by setting up sticks to represent the different tribes, and watching the wind to see which way the sticks would fall, in order to determine which party would be victorious. But the person performing the ceremony, by a little juggling, could determine the question

as he pleased. The belief in witchcraft, also, almost universally prevailed, and was productive of all the suspicion, cruelty, and injustice which generally accompany it among a barbarous and superstitious people. A ceremony, called *iriii*, or *rohi*, was performed by the priests upon infants before they were a month old, and consisted of a species of baptism, sometimes by sprinkling and sometimes by immersion. The Rev. W. Butler thus relates the ceremony in Newcomb's *Cyclopaedia of Missions*, s.v.: "When a child was born, it was wrapped in a coarse cloth and laid in a veranda to sleep; and in a few hours the mother pursued her ordinary work in the field. The child suffered much; and if its mother did not furnish it nourishment enough, it must perish. Large holes were slit in the ear, and a stick, half an inch in diameter, thrust through. When five days old the child was carried to a stream of water, and either dipped or sprinkled, and a name given to it; and a priest mumbled a prayer, the purport of which was said to be an address to some unknown spirit, praying that he may so influence the child that he may become cruel, brave, warlike, troublesome, adulterous, murderous, a liar, a thief, disobedient—in a word, guilty of every crime. After this small pebbles, about the size of a pig's head, were thrust down its throat, to make its heart callous, hard, and incapable of pity. The ceremony was concluded with a feast."

Marriage among the New Zealanders, previous to the introduction of Christianity, did not involve any special religious ceremonies. Before marriage, girls not betrothed were permitted to indulge in promiscuous intercourse if they pleased, and the more lovers they had the more highly they were esteemed. Married women, however, were kept under strict restraint, and infidelity was punished severely, often with death. Polygamy was permitted, but was not common, and men could divorce their wives by simply turning them out of doors.

### **Picture for New Zealand 3**

The houses of the better class were snug and warm, ornamented with carved wood. They were built of bulrushes, and lined with the leaves of palm-trees neatly plaited together. They were about sixteen by ten feet, and four or five feet long. The entrance was by a low sliding door, and there was one window, four by six inches, with a sliding shutter. Their houses were without furniture, and their cooking utensils a few stones. Their villages were scattered over a large plot of ground, without any order of arrangement.

The language of the Maori, like the Polynesian languages generally, belongs to the Malay family, but it is by far the most complicated of them all. Its alphabet comprises only fourteen letters, viz. A, E, H, I, K, M, N, O, P, R, T, U, W, and Ng. Seven tolerably distinct dialects are spoken among them. The language is represented as rich and sonorous, well adapted for poetical expression, especially of the lyric kind. The Maori have an abundance of metrical proverbs, legends, and traditions, of which a collection has been made by Sir George Grey. They are also passionately attached to music and song.

*History of the Country and its Civilization.* — New Zealand was discovered by Tasman in 1642, but only one hundred years later it was made generally known to Europeans by the repeated visits of Cook. He surveyed the coasts in 1770. At that time domestic animals, potatoes, and cereals were introduced. In the following decades the visits of Europeans to New Zealand multiplied; whalers especially frequented the country for provisions and shelter. Runaway sailors, escaped convicts from New South Wales, and adventurers of all kinds, formed a sort of colony at Kororarika at the opening of our century. About this time, too, individual Englishmen began to settle on the coasts and intermarry with the natives, and acquire land in right of their wives or of purchase. Missionary enterprise began in 1814 by the zealous Marsden (q.v.), under the auspices of the London Church Missionary Society, soon strengthened by three other laborers, and favored by various chiefs, who made grants of land to the missions. The missionaries not only labored to convert the natives, but introduced improved culture among them, and did what they could to protect them from the injustice, fraud, and oppression of the Europeans who visited the islands or had acquired settlements. More effectually to secure this object, a British resident or consul was appointed in 1833, but without any authority. In the mean time a desultory colonization and the purchase of rights to land from the natives for a few hatchets or muskets were going on; and to put an end to this state of anarchy a lieutenant-governor was appointed, who, in 1840, concluded at Waitangi a treaty with the native chiefs, whereby the sovereignty of the islands was ceded to Britain, while the chiefs were guaranteed the full possession of their lands, forests, etc., so long as they desired to retain them: the right of pre-emption, however, was reserved for the crown, if they wished to alienate any portion. Thus New Zealand became a regular colony, the seat of government of which was fixed on the Bay of Waitemata, and called Auckland. The previous

year an association, called the New Zealand Company, had made a pretended purchase of tracts amounting to a third of the whole islands, and for a dozen years most of the colonization of New Zealand was conducted under its auspices. The conduct of the company is considered to have been on the whole prejudicial to the prosperity of the colony; and after a long conflict with the government, they resigned, in 1852. all their claims — which the government had never confirmed — on condition of receiving £268,000 as compensation for their outlay. The unscrupulous way in which the company and others often took possession of lands which the natives believed themselves to have a right to, brought on, between 1843 and 1847, a series of perilous and bloody conflicts with those warlike tribes. But the result of this conflict was more gratifying than the most sanguine Christians had hoped for. An understanding was reached between native and colonizer, and cannibalism and superstition passed away, and in their stead the teachings of the Bible were made the ruling guide of the natives especially. One of the most desperate encounters was in 1863, when 15,000 soldiers, under English command, contended against 2000 natives, hiding and fighting behind ramparts. Another struggle followed in 1864, and petty rebellions have been frequent, causing great expense and trouble to the colonists, and great demoralization among the converted natives. As they learned to hate the colonists they came to hate their religion, and invented one of their own, called How-howism, those who professed it being called How-hows. It was a most absurd mixture of their old superstitions with some Bible tenets, and a virtual return to heathenism. One Te Kooti made himself famous fighting with a handful of followers against the English from 1866 to 1872, when the pursuit of him was virtually abandoned. Since that time the natives have been more quiet, and the colonists seem more disposed to try the effect of kind treatment and conciliation. By the constitution of 1872 the natives were made voters, and eligible to office. Four of them have been recently elected members of the lower house of the Legislature. A noted European traveler, who has recently been among the Maori tribes near Lake Taupo, in the central district of Northern New Zealand, sends a very interesting account of the How-hows in that quarter. These, though maintaining an independent attitude towards the colonial government ever since the last war left them unsubdued, have not testified any readiness to join their co-religionists to the north on the Waikato in the outrages which have lately raised the fear of fresh hostilities. According to his report How-howism has toned down from its first bloodthirsty extravagances into a quiet and respectable sort of

monotheism. The How-hows have agreed to reject the New Testament in its entirety, but they have accepted the Old, and from their native translations of it erected what is, in fact, a Judaism of their own. They have even dropped the observance of the Sunday to take up that of the Jewish Sabbath; and, in fact, in all things conform to Jewish practice so far as their knowledge enables them to go. At the headquarters of the tribe, the Ureweras, who have a great knowledge of Scripture, morning and evening services are invariably recited daily. The services consist chiefly in chanting in chorus verses of the Psalms, and conclude with short extemporaneous prayers by one of the chiefs.

To show the rapid growth of Christianity in these islands, we give the following table, exhibiting the number of communicants in the eastern district, from the year 1840, when the Church consisted entirely of natives who came from the Bay of Islands, principally as teachers:

1840.....	29
1841 ....	133
1842.....	451
1843 ....	675
1844.....	946
1845.....	1484
1846 .....	1668
1847.....	1960
1848.....	2054
1849....	2893

Here we have illustrated the fact, seen in almost all missionary history, that while during the first years of a mission the results are scarcely perceptible and the prospects discouraging, yet, when the Gospel fairly gets a lodgment in the minds of a people, however desperate their case might seem, its progress will be rapid and powerful. After twenty years' labor in New Zealand the number of communicants reported was but 8, and they were all at one station; but here is an increase in ten years, in one district, from 29 to 2893!

Since the introduction of Christianity a great change has taken place. The natives have abandoned tattooing, and are now generally clothed like civilized men, and possess flocks, herds, furniture, houses, and cultivated lands. Cannibalism was crowded out, too, by Christianity, and, as Scherzer tells us, "any allusion to this revolting practice is very painful to the New

Zealander, as reminding him of his low position in the scale of nations. Every time we endeavored to make any inquiry of the natives respecting this custom they withdrew with an ashamed look." Infanticide also, which prevailed largely among them in their days of heathenism, is now universally abolished, and the same is the case with slavery and polygamy. One half of the Maori adults can read and write, and two thirds of them belong to Christian churches. They generally practice agriculture, but will not work very hard. They are good sailors and fishermen, and indeed more than a hundred coasting vessels of a good size are now the property of natives. But from various causes, especially from the introduction of new diseases, their numbers are rapidly diminishing. In 1872 the number of the aborigines, formerly computed at 100,000, was less than 40,000, nearly all in the North Island.

Education has been liberally provided for, chiefly by the Church organizations, and there are good schools in all the towns. In some provinces state aid is given to both national and denominational schools; in others only to the national. A university has been established at Dunedin, and high schools exist in many of the towns. In 1872 there were in all 397 schools, 602 teachers, and 22,180 pupils. Among the religious denominations the Church of England has always taken the lead, having sent out the first missionary to the natives, the Rev. Samuel Marsden, in 1814. The first bishop, the Rev. G. A. Selwyn, was appointed in 1841. At the fifth general synod of the English Episcopal Church in New Zealand, which met at Dunedin in the early part of 1871, encouraging reports were presented of the progress of religion throughout the colony. In addition to the parochial work carried on among the colonists, it was stated that the number of native clergymen in connection with that Church was 14, while about 1000 persons were reported as communicants. There are now six bishops of that Church in the islands. The support of the churches comes from home grants, lands set apart for Church purposes, and voluntary contributions. The Wesleyans commenced missions in 1819, and now have 77 chapels, and a larger number of adherents among the natives than any other denomination. In the three districts into which the islands are divided the number of principal stations or circuits is 32, in connection with which 43 ordained ministers are employed, with 2587 members under their pastoral care, and 5000 children in the Sabbath and day schools. Several other religious bodies have been organized and are flourishing. The province of Otago was settled by Scotch Presbyterians, and they are



numerous in that part of the islands. In the South Island the North German Missionary Society has sustained missionaries, and accomplished much in Christianizing the natives of those parts. The Roman Catholics, who began their work in 1837 under bishop Pompallier, have bishops at Auckland, Dunedin, and Wellington. They have succeeded in gathering a large number of adherents among the colonists, and some also among the natives.

See Wakefield, *Adventures in New Zealand* (Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 12mo); Polack (J. S.), *Manners and Customs of New Zealanders* (Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 12mo); id. *New Zealand* (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo); Power, *Sketches in New Zealand* (Lond. 1849); Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand* (Lond. 1859); Swainson, *New Zealand and its Colonization* (Lond. 1859); Taylor, *The Past and Present of New Zealand* (1868) Hochstetter, *Neu Seeland* (Stuttgart, 1836; Engl. transl. London, 1868); Trollope, *Australia and New Zealand* (Lond. 1873); Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, pt. iii, No. 3; *The Missionary Worll*, p. 65, 200, 533; Chambers, *Cyclop. s.v.*; *The Amer. Cyclop. s.v.*; *Littell's Living Age*, Nov. 20, 1852, art. iii; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1870, pt. i, p. 228 sq.; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* April, 1873, p. 28 sq.; Jan. 1873, p. 126.

## Neyelah

is the name of a deity worshipped by the ancient Arabians before the days of Mohammed.

## Nezi'ah

(Heb. *Netsi'ach*, **נְצִיחַ** *illustrious*; Sept. **Νασθιέ**. <sup><1024></sup>Ezra 2:54; **Νισειά**, <sup><1026></sup>Nehemiah 7:56; v. r. **Νεθιέ**, **Νισιά**; Vulg. *Nasia*), the father of a family of Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<sup><1024></sup>Ezra 2:54; <sup><1026></sup>Nehemiah 7:56). B.C. 536.

## Ne'zib

(Heb. *Netsib'*, **נְצִיב** *fixed*, or *a garrison* [as in <sup><1015></sup>1 Samuel 10:5; 13:3, 4; 1 Clhron. 11:6]; Sept. **Νασίβ**, v. r. **Νεσειβ**), a city in the Shephelah or maritime plain of Judah; mentioned between Ashnah and Keilah (<sup><1053></sup>Joshua 15:43), in the group in the south-western part of the hilly region (Keil, *Comment. ad loc.*). Eusebius and Jerome give it the same name (**Νασίβ**, *Nazib*), and place it at the ninth (Jerome, seventh) mile from Eleutheropolis towards Hebron (*Onomast. s.v. Neesib*). It is doubtless the present *Beit-*

*Nusib*, situated on a rising ground, at the edge of the plain and mountain tract, two and a half hours from Beit-Jebrin towards Hebron (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2:343 sq., 404; 3:12; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 104). It has ruins of considerable extent, especially a massive tower sixty feet square, with the foundations of another great fabric, and broken columns and large building-stones (Porter, *Hand-book*, p. 280). Tobler, however, describes it as “an insignificant cupola with a few ruins” (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 150).

### Nezikim; Nezinoth

## SEETALMUD.

### Nias

an important East India island to the west of Sumatra, in 18° 54'–1° 35' N. lat., and 97°–98° E. long., with an area of about 1575 square miles, belongs to Holland. and had in 1857, when the Dutch took possession, a population of about 110,000. There are several places where ships can anchor and take in provisions, water, etc. On the east coast is the village Nias, and on the west Silorongang. Little islands and coral reefs lie here and there on the coast, which in some places is steep, while mountain-chains run from the south-east to the north-west. There is a greater breadth of excellent farming-grounds than the population, reduced by internal wars and the exportation of slaves, can properly cultivate. They grow rice, cocoa-nuts, bananas, tobacco, sugar-cane, etc., and annually export about 110,000 pounds of pepper. Cattie and horses have been imported, and they pay great attention to the raising of pigs and fowls. Formerly, about 500 Niassers were carried away annually as slaves to Batavia and other places, and though this traffic has been in a great measure suppressed, it is still to some extent carried on clandestinely.

The Niassers are of the Malay race, but fairer than the Malays usually are. They are gentle, sober, and peaceful, remarkably ingenious in handicraft, ornamenting their houses with wood-carvings, forging arms, etc. The women labor in the fields, the children weave mats, while the men look after the live-stock, and hunt the deer and wild swine. They worship a superior deity, and fear a powerful one, who pursues them if they do evil. Polygamy is permitted, but is rare. The gift to the bride's family is from \$60 to \$500. Divorce is not allowed, and adultery is punished by the death of both parties. Dead bodies are placed in coffins above the ground, and creepers and flowering shrubs planted, which speedily grow up and cover

them. Trade is on the increase. For missionary work in Nias, *SEE MALAY ARCHIPELAGO*. See also *Malayan Miscellanies*, vol. ii; *Het Eiland Nias*, by H. J. Domis; Crawford's *Descriptive Dictionary* (London, 1856); *Tydsch-riiJ voor Ned. Indie* (1854, 1860).

## Nibby, Antonio

an Italian archaeologist of high celebrity, was born at Rome in 1792, and died in that city Dec. 29, 1839. Nibby was one of those who, following in the footsteps of Winckelmann, made an elaborately minute investigation of the remains of antiquity a special study. The first work that made him known was his translation of Pausanius, with antiquarian and critical notes. In 1820 he was appointed professor of archaeology in the University of Rome. In the same year appeared his edition of Nardiui's *Roma Antica*; and in 1837 and 1838 his learned and admirable *Analisi Storicotopografico-antiquaria della carta de Contorni di Roma*, to which was added (1838 and 1840) a description of the city of Rome itself. Among his other writings may be mentioned his *Le Mura cli Roma disegynate da W. Gell*, and a large number of valuable treatises on the form and arrangement of the earliest Christian churches, the circus of Caracalla, the temple of Fortuna at Preneste, the graves of the Horatii and the Curiatii, etc.

## Nib'haz

### Picture for Nib'haz

(Heb. *Nibchaz'*.  $\text{zj } \text{b}^{\text{h}}\text{æ}$  r.  $\text{zj } \text{b}^{\text{h}}$ , and even  $\text{~j } \text{b}^{\text{h}}\text{æ}$  of uncertain meaning; Sept.  $\text{Νιβχάζ}$  or  $\text{Ναιβάζ}$  v.r.  $\text{Αβααζέρ}$  or  $\text{Ναβααζέρ}$  or  $\text{Εβλαζέρ}$ , the last syllable evidently being the Assyrian termination *assar*, or the Babylonian *ezzar*]; Vulg. *Nebchaz*), a deity of the Avites, introduced by them into Samaria in the time of Shalmaneser (<sup><273></sup>2 Kings 17:31). There is no certain information as to the character of the deity, or the form of the idol so named. The rabbins derived the name from a Hebrew root *nabach'* ( $\text{j } \text{b}^{\text{h}}$ ), "to bark," and hence assigned to it the figure of a dog, or a dog-headed man (Jerus. Talm. *Aboda Sara*, 3:423; Bab. Talm. *Sanhedr.* 63, 2). There is no *aprioi* improbability in this; the Egyptians worshipped the dog (Plutarch, *De Isaiah* 44), and according to the opinion current among the Greeks and Romans they represented Anubis as a dog-headed man, though Wilkinson (*Anc. Egypt.* 1:440, second series) asserts that this was a

mistake, the head being in reality that of a jackal. *SEE ANUBIS*. Some indications of the worship of the dog have been found in Syria, a colossal figure of a dog having formerly existed between Berytus and Tripolis (Marmarel, in Bohn's *Eiarly Travels in Palest.* p. 412). A singular trace of this is found in a basaltic gem in the collection of viscount Strangford. It is still more to the point to observe that on one of the slabs found at Khorsabad and represented by Botta (pl. 141), we have the front of a temple depicted with an animal near the entrance, which can be nothing else than a bitch suckling a puppy, the head of the animal having, however, disappeared. The worship of idols representing the human body surmounted by the head of an animal (as in the well-known case of Nisroch) was common among the Assyrians (see also Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarchies*, 1:294; Thevenot, *Itin.* 1:305; La Roque, p. 227; Paul Lucas, *Itin. in Asia Min.* etc., p. 252). In the Sabian books the corresponding name is that of an evil daemon, who sits on a throne upon the earth, while his feet rest on the bottom of Tartarus; but it is doubtful whether this should be identified with the Avite Nibhaz (Ges. *Thesaur.* p. 842; Iken, *Dissert. de Idola Nibchaz*, in his *Dissertations*, 1:156 sq.; Norberg, *Onomast. Cod. Nasar.* p. 99; Beyer, *Add. to Selden's Dii Syr.* p. 321).

### **Niblock, Isaiah, D.D.,**

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Monaghan County, Ireland, in 1794. He studied divinity under the care of John Dick, D.D., professor of theology in the United Secession Church in Glasgow, Scotland, and was licensed to preach in 1817. He came to America in 1818, and commenced immediately to preach in Philadelphia. In December of the same year he was induced to go west of the Alleghany mountains, where he received appointments to supply the vacancies northwest of the Alleghany River for three months. On April 23, 1819, he was called by the united congregations of Butler and White Oak Springs, over which he was ordained and installed, by the Monongahela Associate Reformed Presbytery, in May of the same year. His ministry in Butler County lasted for over forty-five years, during which time many colonies branched off from the field of his labors, whose influence has been felt extensively in building up flourishing congregations in the great West. He died June 29, 1864. Dr. Niblock was a minister of modest disposition and retiring habits. He was an able and faithful expositor of the Scriptures. His life was one of self-denial and arduous labor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 277. (J. L. S.)

## Nib'shan

(Heb. *Nibshan'*, נִבְשָׁן <sup>ⲛⲓⲃⲩⲏⲛ</sup> but with the def. article], *light soil* [Geseni] or *fortress* [Furst]; Sept. **Νεβσάν** v.r. **Ναφλαζών**), a city in the wilderness of Judah, mentioned between Secacah and the "City of Salt" (<sup>(4850)</sup>Joshua 15:62). It is barely mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast. s.v. Nephram*). It is possibly the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Mlap* as *Kasi el-Zeiman* on Wady Hasaseh, which runs up from the Dead Sea not far N. of Ain-Jidy.

## Nicaea

*SEE NICAEAN COUNCILS.*

## Nicaean Councils

(*Concilium Nicoenum*). Important ecclesiastical assemblies were held at Nicaea or Nice, formerly a city of Bithynia, in Asia Minor, situated on the eastern shore of Lake Ascania. It was built, or rather rebuilt (for an older town had existed on its site), by Antigonus, the son of Philip (B.C. 316), and received the name of Antigonea, which Lysimachus changed to Nicoea, in honor of his wife. It was a handsome town, and of great importance in the time of the Roman and Byzantine emperors; all the streets crossed each other at right angles, and from a magnificent monument in the center the four gates of the city were visible. It was the second city of Bithynia, only twenty English miles from the imperial residence of Nicomedeia, and easily accessible by sea and land from all parts of the empire. It became of such importance that it even disputed with Nicomaedea the title of metropolis of Bithynia. Under the Byzantine emperors it was long a bulwark against the Arabs and Seljuks, the latter of whom conquered it about 1080. Before the end of the century it was taken from them by the soldiers of the first crusade, but was restored at the next treaty of peace. In 1204, Constantinople having become the seat of a Latin empire, Theodore Lascaris made Nicaea the capital of a Greek kingdom or empire in Western Asia, comprehending Bithynia, Mysia, Ionia, and a part of Lydia. He was succeeded by John Ducas Vatatzes (1222-55), Theodore II (1255-59), John Lascaris (1259), and Michael Palaeologus, who in 1261 transferred the seat of power to Constantinople. In 1330 the city surrendered to Orkhan, and was incorporated with the recently founded Ottoman capital. Nicaea is now a miserable Turkish village, *Isnik* (corrupted from **Εἰς Νίκαιαν**). of only some 1500 inhabitants, and there

remains nothing but a rude picture in the solitary church of St. Mary to the memory of the event which has given the place a name in the history of the world.

**I.** Two Church councils have been held at Nicaea, but only one of these was properly oecumenical, and it is regarded as the first and most important of such councils. "Next to the apostolic council at Jerusalem," says Schaff, "it is the most important and the most illustrious of all the councils of Christendom" (*Ch. Hist.* 3:630). It was convened by the emperor Constantino in A.D. 325. With the imperial invitation for attendance the different bishops were proffered the service of public conveyances for themselves and two presbyters and three servants; and when the 318 bishops who had complied with the emperor's request gathered at Nicaea, the emperor himself opened the council on June 19 in his own palace, and its use for future sessions was afforded to the ecclesiastical gathering, as it appears from the records that the sessions, continuing for two months, were held sometimes at the palace and sometimes at a church or some public building. The empire, at the time of the call of the council, had in all about 1800 bishops (1000 for the Greek provinces, 800 for the Latin), and of these, if 318 attended, as reported by Athanasius (*Ad Afros*, c. 2, et al.), Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* bk. viii), and Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* 1:7), there were one sixth of the episcopal sees represented at Nicaea — a large number, indeed, if we take into consideration the vastness of the imperial realm and the difficulties of travel in those times. Including the presbyters and deacons and other attendants, the number may have amounted in all to between 1500 and 2000. Most of the Eastern provinces were strongly represented. Besides a great number of obscure mediocrities, there were several distinguished and venerable men, as e.g. Eusebius of Caesarea, who was most eminent for learning; the young archdeacon Athanasius, who accompanied the bishop Alexander of Alexandria, for zeal, intellect, and eloquence. Some, as confessors, still bore in their body the marks of Christ from the times of persecution: Paphnutius of the Upper Thebaid, Potamon of Heraklea, whose right eye had been put out, and Paul of Neo-Caesarea, who had been tortured with red-hot iron under Licinius, and was crippled in both his hands. Others were distinguished for extraordinary ascetic holiness, and even for miraculous works; like Jacob of Nisibis, who had spent years as a hermit in forests and caves, and lived like a wild beast on roots and leaves, and Spyridion (or St. Spiro) of Cyprus, the patron of the Ionian Isles, who even after his ordination remained a simple shepherd. The Latin Church, on the

contrary, had only seven delegates: from Spain, Hosius or Osius of Cordova, the ablest and most influential of the Western representatives; from France, Nicasius of Dijon; from North Africa, Cecilian of Carthage; from Pannonia, Domnus of Stride; from Italy, Eustorgius of Milan and Marcus of Calabria; from Rome, the two presbyters Victor or Vitus and Vincentius, as delegates of the aged pope Sylvester I, who found it impossible to attend in person. A Persian bishop, John, also, and a Gothic bishop, Theophilus, the forerunner and teacher of the Gothic Bible translator Ulfilas, were present.

Various theories have been propounded to explain Constantine's aim in calling this council. By some it is represented as having served a political purpose (based on Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* 3:4); by others it is regarded as intended to restore quiet to the Church, and unite all its parties in the great Trinitarian question on which the Church was at that time greatly divided there existing three parties: one, which may be called the *orthodox* party, held firmly to the doctrine of the deity of Christ; the second was the *Arian* party, **SEE ARIANISM**; and the third, which was in the majority, taking conciliatory or middle ground, and consenting to the use of such christological expressions as all parties could consistently agree upon; they acknowledged the divine nature of Christ in general Biblical terms, but avoided the use of the term **ἁμοούσιος**, **SEE HOMOOUSIAN**, which the Arians decried as unscriptural, Sabellian, and materialistic. According to Pusey, "He (i.e. Constantine) did not understand the doctrine, and attached as much or more importance to uniformity in keeping Easter as to unity of faith. Indeed, he himself at this time believed in no doctrine but that of Providence, and spared no terms of contempt as to the pettiness of the dispute between Alexander and Arius" (*Councils of the Church*, p. 102); yet it would seem that Constantine only called a council when he believed it impossible to restore peace between the contending parties, led respectively by Arius and Alexander, and now turned over the case for settlement to the bishops, who appeared to him to be the representatives of God and Christ, the organs of the divine Spirit "that enlightened and guided the Church," and he appears to have hoped that when in council assembled, analogous to the established custom of deciding controversies in the single provinces by assemblies composed of all the provincial bishops, they would be able to dispose of the present controversy. No complete collection of the transactions of this Nicaean oecumenical council have come down to us. Some account of the bishops who

composed this assembly is given by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. It is uncertain who presided, but it is generally supposed that ‘the president was Hosius, bishop of Corduba (Cordova), in Spain. From the reports of two of its attendants, Athanasius and Eusebius of Caesarea, we learn that it was busy mainly with the settlement of the different christological views. The opening seasons were principally devoted, according to these writers, to a consideration of Arian views, and resulted finally in the personal examination of Arius himself. He did not hesitate to maintain that the Son of God was a creature, made from nothing; that there was a time when he had no existence; that he was capable of his own free will of right and wrong. Athanasius, although at the time but a deacon, drew the attention of the whole council by his marvelous penetration in unraveling and laying open the artifices of the heretical views of Arius and his followers; he resisted Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris, the chief supporters of Arius, and evinced such zeal in defense of the true faith that he attracted both the admiration of all Catholics and the bitter hatred of the Arian party. We are told that so great and far-reaching was the influence of Athanasius’s criticism that many of the Arians became doubtful of their own stand-point, and eighteen of them abandoned the cause of Arius. The orthodox themselves became enthusiastic in behalf of their cause, and when Eusebius of Caesarea proposed a confession of faith — an ancient Palestinian confession, which was very similar to the Nicene, and acknowledged the divine nature of Christ in general Biblical terms. but avoided the term in question, *ὁμόουσιος*, *consubstantialis*, *of the same essence* — they rejected it, though the emperor had seen and approved this confession, and even the Arian minority were ready to accept it. They wished a. creed which no Arian could honestly subscribe, and especially insisted on inserting the expression *homousios*, which the Arians so much objected to. The fathers finally presented through Hosius of Cordova another confession, which became the *substance* of what is now known and owned by the orthodox churches of Christianity as the well-known *Nicene Creed* (q.v.). The following is the Latin text of this creed:

“Credimus in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, omninim visibilium et invisibilium Creatorem. Et in Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei, natum ex Patre, et Unigenitum, hoc est, ex substantia Patris, Deum ex Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum ex Deo vero, genitum non factum, et consubstantialem Patri per quem omnia facta sunt, tam in coelis quam in terra. Qui propter nos homines et propter



nostram salutem descendit, et iucarmartns est et homo factus est; passus est, et resurrexit tertia die et ascendit in celos, venturns inde ad iudicanidum vivos et morttLos. Et in Spirituin Sanctum.”

Eleven copies of this creed in Greek are extant. The decision of the council having been laid before Constantine, he saw clearly that the Eusebian formula would not pass; and, as he had at heart, for the sake of peace, the most nearly unanimous decision which was possible, he gave his voice for the disputed word, and declared that he recognized in the unanimous consent of the bishops the work of God, and received it with reverence, declaring that all those persons should be banished who refused to submit to it. Upon this the Arians, through fear, also anathematized the dogmas condemned, and subscribed the faith laid down by the council; that they did so only outwardly was shown by their subsequent conduct. It was declared by its advocates that it was presented after mature deliberation, and after diligent consultation of all that the holy evangelists and apostles have taught upon the subject; and it proceeded to set forth the true doctrine of the Church in a creed, in which, in order to defy all the subtleties of the Arians, the council thought good to express by the term “consubstantial,” **ὁμοούσιος**, the divine essence or substance which is common to the Father and the Son. According to Athanasius, this creed was in a great measure composed by Hosius of Cordova. It was written out by Hermogenes, bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, and subscribed, together with the condemnation of the dogmas and expressions of Arius, by all the bishops present with the exception of a few of the Arians. Socrates (lib. I, ch. 5) says that all the bishops except five; Baronius, that all except Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea assented to the use of the word **ὁμοούσιος**. According to Cave, Secundus of Ptolemais and Theognis of Marmorica alone refused, and Eusebius signed. Arius himself was banished by Constantine’s order to Illyria, where he remained until his recall, which took place five years after. See for further details the article **SEE ARIANISM**.

The main object of the council being thus achieved, the fathers proceeded to determine other matters which were brought before them: First. They considered the subject of the Meletian schism, which for some time past had divided Egypt, and they decreed that Meletius should keep the title and rank of bishop in his see of Lycopolis, in Egypt, forbidding him however to perform any episcopal functions; also that they whom he had elevated to any ecclesiastical dignities should be admitted to communion, upon

condition that they should take rank after those who were enrolled in any parish (*παροικία*; the district under a bishop's jurisdiction, which we now call a "diocese," was so styled in the primitive Church) or church, and who had been ordained by Alexander. Second. They decreed that throughout the Church the festival of Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday after the full moon which happens next after March 21. Third. They published twenty canons:

- 1.** Excludes from the exercise of their functions those persons in holy orders who have made themselves eunuchs.
- 2.** Forbids to raise neophytes to the priesthood or episcopate.
- 3.** Forbids any bishop, priest, or deacon to have women in their houses, except their mothers, sisters, aunts, or such women as shall be beyond the reach of slander.
- 4.** Declares that a bishop ought if possible to be constituted by all the bishops of the province, but allows of his consecration by three at least with the consent of the absent bishops, signified in writing; the consecration to be finally confirmed by the metropolitan.
- 5.** Orders that they who have been separated from the communion of the Church by their own bishop shall not be received into communion elsewhere. Also that a provincial synod shall be held twice a year in every province to examine into sentences of excommunication. One synod to be held before Lent, and the second in autumn.
- 6.** Insists upon the preservation of the rights and privileges of the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and other provinces. (The sixth canon of Nicaea, according to the version of Dionysius Exiguus, "Antiqua consuetudo servatur per Aegyptum, Lilyam, et Pentapolim, ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et urbis Romae episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem et nunc Antiochiam ceterasque provincias suis privilegia servantur Ecclesiis. Illud autem generaliter clarum est quod si quis praeter metropolitani sententiam fuerit factus episcopus, hunc magna synodus defilivit episcopum esse non oportere," etc.).
- 7.** Grants to the bishop of Aelia Capitolina, the new city built by Aelius Hadrianus upon the site of Jerusalem, or near to it), according to ancient tradition, the second place of honor.

**8.** Permits those who had been ministers among the Cathari (q.v.), and who returned into the bosom of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, having received imposition of hands, to remain in the rank of the clergy. Directs, however, that they shall, in writing, make profession to follow the decrees of the Church; and that they shall communicate with those who have married twice, and with those who have performed penance for relapsing in time of persecution. Directs, further, that in places where there is a Catholic bishop and a converted bishop of the Cathari, the former shall retain his rank and office, and the latter be considered only as a priest; or the bishop may assign him the place of a chorepiscopus.

**9.** Declares to be null and void the ordination of priests made without due inquiry, and of those who have, before ordination, confessed sins committed.

**10.** Declares the same of persons ordained priests in ignorance, or whose sin has appeared after ordination.

**11.** Enacts that those who have fallen away in time of persecution without strong temptation shall be three years among the hearers, seven among the prostrators, and for two years shall communicate with the people without offering (“communicate with the people in prayer, without being admitted to the oblation;” i.e. to the holy eucharist, according to Johnson’s way of understanding it).

**12.** Imposes ten years’ penance upon any one of the military, who, having been deprived of a post on account of the faith, shall, after all, give a bribe, and deny the faith, in order to receive it back again.

**13.** Forbids to deny the holy communion to any one likely to die.

**14.** Orders that catechumens who have relapsed shall be three years among the hearers.

**15.** Forbids bishops, priests, or deacons to remove from one city to another: any one offending against this canon to be compelled to return to his own church, and his translation to be void.

**16.** Priests or deacons removing from their own church, not to be received into any other; those who persist, to be separated from communion. If any bishop dare to ordain a man belonging to another church, the ordination to be void.

- 17.** Directs that clerks guilty of usury shall be deposed.
- 18.** Forbids deacons to give the encharist to priests, and to receive it themselves before the priests, and to sit among the priests; offenders to be deposed.
- 19.** Directs that Paulianists (q.v.) coming over to the Church shall be baptized again. Permits those among their clergy who are without reproach, after baptism, to be ordained by the Catholic bishops: orders the same thing of deaconesses.
- 20.** Orders that all persons shall offer up their prayers on Sundays and Pentecost *standing*.

It was also proposed to add another canon, enjoining continence upon the married clergy: but Paphnutius warmly opposed the imposition of such a yoke, and prevailed, so that the proposal fell to the ground. The creed and the canons were written in a book, and signed by the bishops. The council issued a letter to the Egyptian and Libyan bishops as to the decision of the three main points; the emperor also sent several edicts to the churches, in which he ascribed the decrees to divine inspiration, and set them forth as laws of the realm. On July 29, the twentieth anniversary of his accession, the emperor gave the members of the council a splendid banquet in his palace, which Eusebius (quite too susceptible to worldly splendor) describes as a figure of the reign of Christ on earth; Constantine remunerated the bishops lavishly, and dismissed them with a suitable valedictory, and with letters of commendation to the authorities of all the provinces on their homeward way. Thus ended the Council of Nicaea. It is styled emphatically “the great and holy council,” holds the highest place among all the councils, especially with the Greeks, and still lives in the *Nicene Creed*, which is second in authority only to the ever venerable Apostles’ Creed. Athanasius calls it “a true monument and token of victory against every heresy;” Leo the Great, like Constantine, attributes its decrees to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and ascribes even to its canons perpetual validity; *the Greek Church annually observes* (on the Sunday before Pentecost) *a special feast in memory of it*. There afterwards arose a multitude of apocryphal orations and legends in glorification of it, of which Gelasius of Cyzicus in the 5th century collected a whole volume. The decision of this council had not the effect of restoring tranquillity to the Eastern Church, for the Arian controversy was still warmly carried on, but it has supplied that mode of stating the doctrine of the Trinity (as far as

relates to the Father and the Son) in which it has ever since been received by the orthodox. Says Dr. Schaff, "The Council of Nicaea is the most important event of the 4th century, and its bloodless intellectual victory over a dangerous error is of far greater consequence to the progress of true civilization than all the bloody victories of Constantine and his successors. It forms an epoch in the history of doctrine, summing up the results of all previous discussions on the deity of Christ and the incarnation, and at the same time regulating the further development of catholic orthodoxy for centuries." Dr. Shedd is incorrect in saying (*Hist. of Ch. Doctrine*, 1:308), "The problem to be solved by the Nicene council was to exhibit the doctrine of the 'Trinity in its *completeness*; to bring into the creed statement the *total* data of Scripture upon both the side of unity and trinity." This was not done till the Council of Constantinople in 381, and strictly not till the still later Symbolum Athanasianum (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:629). For a minute and picturesque description of this council, see dean Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Ch.* p. 105; Schaff objects to it as too graphically minute at the expense of the dignity of historical statement. For more trustworthy information, see Ittigus, *Hist. Concilii Niceeni* (Lips. 1712); Richerus, *Hist. Concil. General.* 1:10; Walch, *E'ntwuuf einer Conciliengesch.* p. 157; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1:249 sq. Boyle, *Hist. View of the Council of Nice* (N.Y. 1856); Kaye. *Council of Niccea* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Tillemont, *Hist. Eccles.*; Schaff *Ch. Hist.* 3:22 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:372 sq.; Landon, *Man. of Councils*, s.v. For the sources, see (1) the twenty Canones, the doctrinal' Symbol, and a Decree of the Council of Nicaea, and several Letters of bishop Alexander of Alexandria and the emperor Constantine (all collected in Greek and Latin in Mansi, *Collect. sacrorum Conciliorum*, 2:635-704). Official minutes of the transactions themselves were not at that time made; only the *decrees as adopted* were set down in writing and subscribed by all (comp. Euseb. *Vita Const.* 3:14). All later accounts of voluminous acts of the council are sheer fabrications (comp. Hefele, 1:249 sq.). (2) Accounts of eye-witnesses, especially Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3:4-24 (superficial, rather Arianizing, and a panegyric of the emperor Constantine). The *Church History* of Eusebius, which should have closed with the Council of Nice, comes down only to the year 324. Athanasius, *De decretis Synodi Ivic.*; *Orationes iv contra Arianos*; *Epist. ad Afros*, and other historical and and Arian tracts in tom. i and ii of his *Opera* (ed. Bened.), and the more important of them also in the first vol. of Thilo's *Bibliotheca Patrum Græc. dogmait.* (Lips. 1853; Engl. transl. in the Oxford Library of the

Fathers.) (3) The later accounts of Epiphanius, *Hacr.* 69; Socrates, *H. E.* 1:8 sq.; Sozomen, *H. E.* 1:17 'sq.; Theodoret, *H. E.* 1:1-13; Rufinus, *H. E.* 1:1-6 (or lib. x, if his transl. of Eusebius be counted in). Gelasius Cyzicenus (about 476), *Commentarius actorum Concilii Nicceni* (Greek and Latin in Mansi, 2:759 sq.; it professes to be founded on an old MS., but is filled with imaginary speeches). Comp. also the four Coptic fragments in Pitra, *Spicilegiuqn Solesmense* (Par. 1852), 1:509 sq., and the Syriac fragments in *Analecta Nicoena* Fragments relating to the Council of Nicaea. The Syriac text from an ancient MS. by H. Cowper (London 1857).

**II.** The second Council of Nicaea, called also the seventh OEcumical Council, though falsely so, was assembled Aug. 17, 786, by order of the empress Irene and her son Constantine. Owing to the tumults raised by the Iconoclastic party, it was dissolved and reconvened on Sept. 24, 787. (Theophanes, who was present, says that the opening of the council was made on Oct. 11.) Three hundred and seventy-five bishops were present from Greece, Thrace, Natolia, the Isles of the Archipelago, Sicily, and Italy. Pope Hadrian and all the Oriental patriarchs sent legates to represent them in the synod, those of Rome taking the first place; two commissioners from the emperor and empress also assisted at it. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were briefly as follows: The emperor Leo (and afterwards his son Constantine Copronymus), offended at the excess of veneration often offered to the images of Christ and the saints, made a decree against the use of images in any way, and caused them everywhere to be removed and destroyed. These severe and ill-advised proceedings raised an opposition almost as violent, and both the patriarch of Constantinople (Germanus) and the pope (Hadrian) defended the use of images, declaring them to have been always in use in the churches, and showing the difference between *absolute* and *relative* worship. However, in a council assembled at Constantinople in 754, composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, a decree was published against the use of images. But at this time Constantine Copronymus died, and Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, induced the empress Irene and her son Constantine to convoke this council, in which the decrees of the council of 754 at Constantinople were set aside.

The first session was held in the church of St. Sophia. Tarasius, the patriarch, spoke first, and exhorted the bishops to reject all novelties, and to cling to the traditions of the Church. After this, ten bishops were brought before the council, accused of following the party of the

Iconoclasts. Three of whom, Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodosius of Amorium, recanted, and declared that they received with all honor the relics and sacred images of Jesus Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the saints; upon which they were permitted to take their seats; the others were remanded to the next session. The forty-second of the apostolical canons, and the eighth of Nicaea, and other canons relating to the reception of converted heretics, were read.

In the second session the letters of pope Hadrian to the empress and to the patriarch Tarasius were read. The latter then declared his entire concurrence in the view taken of the question by the bishop of Rome, viz. that images are to be adored with a relative worship, reserving to God alone faith and the worship of Latria. This opinion was warmly applauded by the whole council.

In the third session the confession of Gregory of Neo-Cesarea, the leader of the Iconoclast party, was received, and declared by the council to be satisfactory; whereupon he was, after some discussion, admitted to take his seat, and with him the bishops mentioned above. Then the letters of Tarasius to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and their replies, as well as the confession of Theodore of Jerusalem, were read and approved. The passages of Holy Scripture relating to the cherubim which overshadowed the ark of the covenant, and which ornamented the interior of the Temple, were read, together with other passages taken from the fathers, showing that God had, in other days, worked miracles by means of images.

In the fifth session the patriarch Tarasius endeavored to show that the innovators, in their attempts to destroy all images, were following in the steps of the Jews, pagans, Manichaeans, and other heretics. The council then came to the conclusion that the images should be re stored to their usual places, and be carried in processions as before. In the sixth session the refutation of the definition of faith made in the council of Iconoclasts at Constantie nople was read. They had there declared that the eucharist was the only image allowed of our Lord Jesus Christ; but the fathers of the present synod, in their refutation, maintained that the eucharist is nowhere spoken of as the *image* of our Lord's body, but as the very body itself. After this, the fathers replied to the passages from Holy Scripture and from the fathers which the Iconoclasts had adduced in support of their views, and in doing so insisted chiefly upon perpetual tradition and the infallibility

of the Church. In the seventh session a definition of faith was read, which was to this effect: “We decide that the holy images, whether painted or graven, or of whatever kind they may be. ought to be exposed to view; whether in churches, upon the sacred vessels and vestments, upon walls, or in private houses, or by the wayside; since the oftener Jesus Christ, his blessed mother, and the saints are seen in their images, the more will men be led to think of the originals, and to love them. Salutation and the adoration of honor ought to be paid to images, but not the worship of *Latria*, which belongs to God alone: nevertheless it is lawful to burn lights before them, and to incense them, as is usually done with the cross, the books of the Gospels, and other sacred things, according to the pious use of the ancients; for honor so paid to the image is transmitted to the original, which it represents. Such is the doctrine of the holy fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church; and we order that they who dare to think or teach otherwise, if bishops or other clerks, shall be deposed; if monks or laymen, shall be excommunicated.” This decree was signed by the legates and all the bishops.

Another session (not recognized either by Greeks or Latins) was, held at Constantinople, to which place the bishops had been cited by the empress Irene, who was present, with her son Constantine, and addressed the assembly., The decree of the council and the passages from the fathers read at Nicaea were repeated, and the former was again subscribed. The Council of Constantinople against image-worship was anathematized, and the memory of Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus, and George of Cyprus held up to veneration. Twenty-two canons of discipline were published.

- 1.** Insists upon the proper observation of the canons of the Church.
- 2.** Forbids to consecrate those who do not know the Psalter, and will not promise to observe the canons.
- 3.** Forbids princes to elect bishops.
- 7.** Forbids to consecrate any church or altar in which relics are not contained.
- 14.** Forbids those who are not ordained to read in the synaxis from the Ambon.



**15** and **16**. Forbid plurality of benefices, and luxury in dress among the clergy.

**20**. Forbids *double* monasteries, for men and for women. This council was not for a long period recognized in France. The grounds upon which the French bishops opposed it are contained in the celebrated Caroline Books, written by order of Charlemagne. Their chief objections were these:

1. That no Western bishops, except the pope, by his legates, were present.
2. That the decision was contrary to their custom, which was to use images, but not in any way to worship them.
3. That the council was not assembled from all parts of the Church, nor was its decision in accordance with that of the Catholic Church.

The Caroline Books were answered by pope Adrian, but with little effect so far as the Gallican Church was concerned, which continued long after this to reject this council altogether. See Labbe. *Cone.* 7:1-963; Mansi, *Concil.* 12:951; 13:820; Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, 10:419 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:318 sq.

### Nicaise, St.

(Latin, *Nicasius*) (1), a Christian martyr who lived in the 3d century, was one of the companions of St. Denis, and received from him the mission of converting to the Christian faith the people who inhabited the territory of the Velocasses (ancient Vexin). Before separating, it is said the apostle of the Parisians conferred upon him the episcopal dignity; but this fact is questioned by some hagiographers. Usnard especially gives to St. Nicaise only the title of priest. Some localities situated between the Oise and the Epte had been evangelized by him, when, the third day after the martyrdom of St. Denis, the prefect, Sisinnius Fescenninus, passed through the village of Ecos, where was found Nicaise, with Quiril and Scubicule, companions of his apostolic labors. The prefect stopped the three evangelists, and, upon their obstinate refusal to sacrifice to idols, had them beheaded, October 11, 285 or 286. A Christian woman, called Pientia, soon after herself a subject for martyrdom, buried the bodies of the martyrs on a small island formed by the Epte, which has since become the borough of Gasny-sur-Epte (vadum Nicasii). It follows then from the acts of these apostles of the Vexin that Nicaise never came as far as Rouen. This city, however,

considers him as her first bishop. Since the redaction of the new Breviary of Rouen, his day is celebrated with that of the bishop St. Mellon, the first Sunday of October. The remains of St. Nicaise and of St. Scubicule were, in the 9th century, brought to Meulan, where a church was erected under the invocation of the first of these martyrs, and the body of St. Quirin was transferred to Malmedy, in the diocese of Liege, in Belgium. See *Acta Sanctorum*, month of October; Godescard, *Vies es Saints*; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*.

### Nicaise, St. (2),

of Rheims, a Roman Catholic bishop and a Christian martyr, famed especially for his eloquence, was of Gallic origin, and is presumed to have been a native of Rheims. The time of his birth is not known. He flourished in the 5th century. Even the date of his accession to the episcopal seat of his native place is unknown. It is only certain that he was the immediate successor of Severus. Flodoard reports that he founded at Rheims the first church in honor of the Holy Virgin, and that he transferred to it at the same time the seat of the bishopric, which was in the church of the Holy Apostles. The year 401 is fixed for the construction of this new cathedral, which Nicaise consecrated by the shedding of his blood when, several years after, the Vandals took and sacked the city of Rheims. When the barbarians appeared before the city to besiege it, Nicaise boldly exhorted his flock to the defense, preaching at the same time repentance and submission to the will of God. When the Vandals had refused all terms of agreement, and by force had made themselves masters of Rheims, Nicaise boldly went to meet them upon the threshold of his cathedral, attended by his clergy and singing hymns. They had no regard either for his character or his supplications in favor of the people who surrounded him, and after making him suffer many outrages they beheaded him. The beauty of Eutropia, his sister, who was near him, appeared to disarm the barbarians; but the Christian virgin, fearing more their love than their hatred, excited herself the fury of her brother's executioner, and also received the martyr's crown. Several persons of the clergy and of the people were also put to death, and among this number several distinguished ecclesiastical students. St. Nicaise and his companions were buried in the cemetery of the church of St. Agriculus, which then took the name of the martyr bishop. It is an error of Flodoard. Followed by several other authors, who has made St. Nicaise contemporaneous with St. Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and with St. Aignan, bishop of Orleans. The latter prelates lived at the time of the invasion of

the Huns, under the conduct of Attila, in 451, and not the irruption of the Vandals in 407. Besides, Flodoard seems to hesitate upon the time of the martyrdom of St. Nicaise; for his text bears, *Sub eadem Vandalorum vel Hunnorum persecutione*. The death of St. Nicaise and his companions is commemorated by the Roman Catholic Church on December 14. See *Gallia Christiana nova*, tom. ix; Flodoard, *Historia-Ecclesiae Remensis*; Dom Marlot, *Metropolis Remensis historica*; Fisquet, *France pontificale Breviaires de Paris et de Rheims*; Hoefler, *Noun. Biog. Generale*, 27:914; Clemenl, *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythol. Art*, p. 233.

## Nicander And Marcian

two Christian martyrs of the 4th century. Both were Roman military officers of great ability, and great efforts were made to induce them to renounce Christianity, but in vain. Crowds of people attended their execution. The wife of Nicander, being herself a Christian, encouraged her husband to suffer patiently for Christ; but the wife of Marcian, being a pagan, entreated her husband to save his life for the sake of her and of his child. Marcian embraced her and her babe, gently reproving her idolatry and unbelief; and then, together with Nicander, who also in the most affectionate manner had taken leave of his Christian wife, submitted joyfully to the fatal stroke, which conferred on them the crown of martyrdom, A.D. 306.

## Nica'nor

(**Νικάνωρ**, *victor*), the name of two or three men in Scripture history.

**1.** The “son of Patroclus” (1 Maccabees 8:9), a general under Antiochus, Epiphanes, and Demetrius I, who took a prominent part in the wars waged by the Syrians against the Jews, to whom he “bore a deadly hate.” Under Antiochus he had been master of the royal elephants (**ἑλεφαντάρχης**), but he was appointed governor of Judea by Demetrius (2 Maccabees 14:12), whose trusted friend he was, and who had accompanied him when he escaped from Rome (Polyb. 3:21; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 4). Nicanor, being one of the generals chosen by Lysias when he invaded Judaea, B.C. 166’ (1 Maccabees 3:38), by the sale of Jewish captives at ninety for a talent, brought multitudes of slave-merchants to his camp (1 Maccabees 3:41; 2 Maccabees 8:10, 11; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 3 and 4). He was, however, most signally disappointed in his expectations, for, in common with his companions in arms, he suffered a disgraceful defeat from Judas

Maccabaeus, and was compelled to escape in the disguise of a slave to Antioch, where he declared that the Jews had God for their “defender,” and that they were “invulnerable” (ἄτρωτοι), “because they followed the laws appointed by him.” Four years later, entrusted with a large army by Demetrius, he had orders “not to spare” the nation of the Jews. According to 2 Maccabees 14, he at first made peace with Judas Maccabaeus, “whom he loved from his heart;” but, accused by Alcimus to Demetrius, he was compelled to break all his engagements with the Maccabean chief, and ordered to send him prisoner to Antioch. According to 1 Maccabees 7:26-32, and Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 4, Nicanor attempted, at first, by pretense of friendship, to get Judas into his hands. Raphall unites both accounts, regarding the treachery of Nicanor as subsequent to the angry orders he received from Demetrius. Judas, however, discovered the treachery in time, and escaped. Open hostilities immediately commenced, when Nicanor was defeated with the loss of 5000 men, and took refuge in the fortress “which was in the city of David” (1 Maccabees 7:31, 32; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 4). Josephus, indeed, as the text now stands, represents Judas as sustaining a defeat, and fleeing to the “citadel which was in Jerusalem.” But there is evidently an error in the text here, as it contradicts the context, which shows that the citadel at Jerusalem was then in the hands of the Syrians. Nicanor, on coming down from the citadel, and meeting the priests, blasphemed God, and threatened to destroy their temple unless they delivered up Judas, a thing they could not do, even if they were disposed. Departing from Jerusalem, and joined by a fresh army out of Syria, he encamped at Beth-horon. Judas also pitched his camp at the village of Adasa, thirty furlongs off. At length they joined battle, when, Nicanor having fallen among the first, the Syrians were beaten, routed, and slaughtered in their flight. Finding Nicanor on the battle-field, the Jews cut off his head and his right arm, which he “had stretched out so proudly,” and hung them up at Jerusalem. His tongue also they cut out and minced, and threw to the birds. The day of the victory, Adar 13, being that before “Mardocheus’ day,” they set apart as a season of annual solemnity (B.C. 161) (1 Maccabees 7:43-49; 2 Maccabees 15:26-36; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 5; see also Raphall’s *Post. Bib. Hist. of the Jews*, ch. 4 and 6; Jahn’s *Heb. Commonwealth*, § 96, 97, 98). **SEE MACCABEE.**

**2.** A Nicanor is mentioned in 2 Maccabees 12:2, as “governor of Cyprus” (κυπριάρχης) in the time of Antiochus V Eupator, and yet as interfering with the Jews in Palestine. But as the above Nicanor mentioned by Polybius cannot be meant, this must either be another person, or some

confusion has befallen the author here (see Grimm, ad loc.). In 4 Maccabees 3:20, Nicanor is given as a surname of Seleucus, meaning apparently Seleucus I *Nicator*.

**3.** One of the first seven deacons appointed by the Church at Jerusalem along with Stephen (<sup>416B</sup>Acts 6:5), A.D. 29. Dorotheus makes him to have been one of the seventy disciples of our Lord, and according to the Pseudo-Hippolytus he “died at the time of the martyrdom of Stephen” (p. 953, ed. Migne).

## Nicaragua

a republic of Central America, bounded on the N. by the republic of Honduras, on the W. by the Pacific Ocean, on the S. by the republic of Costa Rica, and on the E. by the Caribbean Sea, is situated in lat. 10° 45' - 15° N., long. 83° 20' - 87° 31', and has an area of about 58,000 square miles.

*General Features.* — Nicaragua is traversed by two ranges of mountains — the western, which follows the direction of the coast-line, at a distance of from ten to twenty miles from the Pacific; and the eastern (a part of the great, range of the Cordilleras), which runs nearly parallel to it, and sends off several spurs towards the Caribbean Sea. The former is generally high and volcanic, but sinks at times almost to the level of the plains. Between the two ranges lies a great interior basin, containing the lakes of Nicaragua and Managua. The principal rivers are the Rio Coco, or Segovia, forming part of the boundary between Honduras and Nicaragua, the Escondido, or Blewfields, and the San Juan, all of which flow into the Caribbean Sea. The eastern coast of Nicaragua is called the Mosquito Coast; it formerly constituted an independent territory known as the Mosquito kingdom, and enjoyed the protectorate of Great Britain. It became a part of Nicaragua in 1860. Nicaragua is in many places densely wooded, the most valuable trees being mahogany, logwood, Nicaragua-wood, cedar, and Brazil-wood. The pastures are splendid, and support vast herds of cattle. The chief products are sugar-cane (softer and juicier than the Asiatic variety), cocoa, cotton, indigo, tobacco, maize, and rice, with nearly all the fruits and edibles of the tropics — plantains, bananas, tomatoes, bread-fruit, arrowroot, citrons, oranges, limes, lemons, pineapples, guavas, etc. The chief vegetable exports are sarsaparilla, aloes, ipecacuanha, ginger, copal, gum-arabic, caoutchouc, etc. The northern part of Nicaragua is rich in

minerals — gold, silver, copper, iron, and lead but the mines are not so carefully worked now as they were under the Spaniards.

*Population.* — Of the 275,815 inhabitants of Nicaragua, 220,000 belong to the uncivilized, and 30,000 (being whites) to the civilized races. The former may be divided proportionately as follows: Indians of unmixed blood, 550 in 1000; mestizos (*ladinos*, from whites and Indians; *zambos*, from negroes and Indians; and *mulattoes*, from whites and blacks), 400; whites, 45; negroes, 6. The ladino element predominates in Jalapa, Ocotal, Matagalpa, Corinto, Leon, Libertad, Managua, Blewfields, Acoyapa, Rivas, and San Juan del Sur; the mulatto in Granada Nandaime, San Carlos, and San Juan del Norte. Masaya is almost entirely Indian, and Indians occupy a large part of the basin of the two lakes. The coast basins of the Pacific are peopled by Indians of Aztec descent. The uncivilized Indian tribes occupy the river basins of the Atlantic slope; the Pantasmas, Poyas, and Carcas in the several upper basins of the Coco, Rio Grande, and Mico, the lower basins of which are peopled by Mosquitos, Zambos, and black Caribs; and the Wawas, Toonglas, and Ramas in the upper basins of the rivers of the same names. Most of the Nicaraguans live in towns, many going daily long distances to their plantations, which are often reached by paths so obscure as to escape the notice of the traveler. The chief occupation is the raising of cattle, and large quantities of cheese are made on some of the estates. The Indians, who are generally a sober race, are the principal producers. The half-breeds, as a class, are indolent, thriftless, and ignorant. Baptism is considered indispensable, but the marriage ceremony is often omitted, Petty thefts are common, but robberies and murders are unusual. Every few years a revolution breaks out, the population divides into two parties, and all business is suspended until the insurgents are put down or a change of rulers effected. Indeed, the incessant political distractions of the country have notoriously all but destroyed its material prosperity.

*Religious and Educational Status.* — Education is in a low condition. In 1868 radical changes were effected in public instruction, but the reform was only on paper. There are two universities, so called, one at Leon, with faculties of law, medicine, and theology, and in 1872 with 56 students, and an intermediate course with 102 students; and one at Granada, which has a faculty of law and an intermediate course, with 162 students. At that time there were in the republic 92 male primary schools, with 3871 pupils, and 9 female primary schools, with 532 pupils. Education is wholly secular, the

supreme direction being in the hands of the executive. Instruction is gratuitous, and teachers are paid from the public funds. There is no public library in the country, no museum, and no newspaper. According to the constitution of the state the religion is Roman Catholic, and the republic is, ecclesiastically, a suffragan bishopric subordinate to the archbishop of Guatemala. There are 117 parishes, of which about 100 have incumbents. There are no religious orders, all convents having been suppressed in 1829. Freedom of worship is nominally granted, but is not really practiced to any extent. The Moravians have a mission school at Blewfields, and several schools at other places on the Mosquito Coast; in all 8 schools, with about 500 pupils of both sexes. The Moravians also have a church, and it is the only Protestant church in Nicaragua.

*History.* — Nicaragua was discovered in 1521 by Gil Gonzales de Avila, and conquered by Pedro Arias de Avila, the governor of Panama, in 1522. In 1821 — the great year of revolution in Central America — it threw off allegiance to Spain, and, after a desperate and bloody struggle, secured its independence by the help of the “Liberals” of San Salvador. Nicaragua now formed the second state in the federal republic of Central America, but on the dissolution of the union in 1839 it became an independent republic. In 1847-8 a dispute arose between Nicaragua and Great Britain about the Mosquito Coast, which led to some hostilities, and was only settled in 1860. Meanwhile, in 1855, a civil war had broken out between the so-called “Conservatives” and “Liberals,” which resulted in the victory of the latter, who were, however, obliged to call in the help of the since notorious colonel William Walker, of California, who, at first successful, was finally overthrown by a coalition of the other Central American states. After Walker’s expulsion the government was re-established, and in 1858 a new constitution was adopted. By this constitution the republic of Nicaragua is governed by a president, who is elected by universal suffrage, and holds office for four years. There are two legislative chambers — the Senate and the House of Representatives. Liberty of speech and of the press exists, but is not absolutely guaranteed. Nicaragua took an active part in the struggle between Guatemala and San Salvador, which resulted in the shooting of president Barrios and the death of Carrera in 1865. Since then the country has been comparatively quiet. P. Chamorra was elected president in 1875.

See Billow, *Der Freistaat Nicaragua* (Berlin, 1849); Squier, *Travels in Nicaragua* (N. Y. 1850); id. *Nicaragua, its People, etc.* (Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); id. in *Harper’s Monthly*, vol. 11; *Edinburgh Rev.*, 95. 287 sq.

## Nicarete

(Νικαρέτη), ST., a lady of good fortune and family, born at Nicomedeia, in Bithynia, was renowned for her piety and benevolence, and also for the numerous cures which her medical skill enabled her to perform gratuitously. She suffered great hardships during a sort of persecution that was carried on against the followers of St. Chrysostom after his expulsion from Constantinople, A.D. 404 (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 8:23; Nicephorus Callistus, *Hist. Eccles.* 13:25). She has been canonized by the Roman Catholic Church, and her memory is celebrated on December 27 (*Martyr. Rom.*). Bzovius (*Nomencl. Sanctor. Profess. Med.*), and after him C. B. Carpzovius (*De Medecis ab Eccles. pro Sanctis habit.*), think it possible that Nicaret, may be the lady referred to by St. Chrysostom as having restored him to health by her medicines (*Epist. ad Olymp.* [4 vols.] 2:511, ed. Bened.), but this conjecture is founded on a faulty reading that is now amended. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Ludlow, *Woman's Work in the Church*, p. 30.

## Nicasius

SEE NICAISE.

## Niccola, Di Pisa

an eminent Italian sculptor and architect, is noted not only for his inventive genius and devotion to sacred art, but also as the principal restorer of sculpture in connection with Gothic architecture. The precise dates of his birth and death have not been ascertained. It is probable, however, that he was born near the beginning of the 13th century, as he was greatly advanced in years in 1273, and is reported to have died at Pisa in 1276 or 1277. Niccola is distinguished among the earliest restorers of sculpture, which he elevated to a much higher state of perfection than he found it. He quitted the hard, dry, and mechanical style of his predecessors, and introduced a style which, though falling far short of the antique, was based upon similar principles, and evinced a vigorous mind and much feeling, if not always the most refined taste. It is said that his adaptation of the antique was brought about by the sight of an ancient sarcophagus brought from Greece. in the ships of Pisa, but he must have had other opportunities of studying the antique sculpture, if we are to judge from his works. Though most of the finest specimens of Greek sculpture were not discovered till long after Niccola's time, he doubtless examined the various



classic ruins with which Italy then abounded as much as to-day. Niccola's earliest work is supposed to be the *Deposition* over one of the doors of the facade of the cathedral of Lucca, dated 1233. In 1235 Niccola was employed to execute the arca, or tomb of St. Domenico at Bologna, which he embellished with a series of bass-reliefs and figures, truly admirable for the time. Several of these subjects are given by Cicognara in his *Storia della Scultura*, and many of the heads and countenances are finely expressed. It is composed of six large bass-reliefs, delineating the six principal events in the legend of St. Dominic, and is ornamented with statues of our Savior, the Virgin, and the four doctors of the Church. The operculum, or lid, was added about two hundred years afterwards. Among his other and most excellent works in sculpture are the pulpit in the Baptistery at Pisa, executed in 1260, reckoned the most elegant pulpit in Italy. It is of white marble, six-sided, supported by seven Corinthian columns, and adorned with five bass-reliefs of subjects from the New Testament. His next work is the pulpit in the cathedral at Siena. The subjects on this pulpit are the same as those on that at Pisa, with the substitution of the *Flight into Egypt* and the *Massacre of the Innocents* for the *Presentation*, and the enlargement of the concluding composition, the *Last Judgment*. "In these compositions there is great felicity of invention and grouping, truth of expression, and grace in the attitudes and draperies; and in that of the *Last Judgment* the boldness displayed in the naked figures, twisted and contorted into every imaginable attitude, is wonderful, and evinces the skill with which Niccola drew on the antique and on nature. But it must be admitted that there is a degree of confusion or overfullness in the grouping, and that the heads of his figures are often large in proportion to the bodies-faults incidental to all early efforts. In this last work it appears by the contract for its execution that Niccola was assisted by his scholars, Lapo and Arnolfo, and his son Giovanni; and this accounts for a certain feebleness that may be observed in portions of it." Both these works are highly praised by Cicognara, and are sufficient of themselves to prove the great excellence of Niccola in this department of art. As an architect Niccola seems to have acquired no less distinction. In 1231 he erected the celebrated church of St. Antonio at Padua. He was subsequently commissioned to build the church Dei Frari at Venice; and his reputation extended so widely that he was successively employed at Florence, Pistoia, Volterra, Naples, and Pisa. Among his most important works at Florence is the church and monastery at Santa Trinita, highly extolled by Michael Angelo as an edifice of surpassing excellence for its

simple grandeur and the nobleness of its proportions. In 1240 he commenced the cathedral of Pistoia, and likewise improved and embellished that of Volterra. Among his other works in architecture were the convent of St. Domenico at Arezzo, the church of St. Lorenzo at Naples, the campanile of St. Niccola at Pisa, and the magnificent abbey on the plain of Tagliacozzo, erected by Charles I of Anjou, in 1268, in commemoration of his decisive victory over Conradino, and thence called Santa Maria della Vittoria. Another work, which is regarded as one of the masterpieces of Italian sculpture, is the representation of the *Last Judgment* and *Inferno*, in the facade of the Duomo of Orvieto, which has generally been attributed to Niccola, but is now determined by the best critics of Italian art to have been the production of the following, whom; for completeness' sake, we notice here.

GIOVANNI DI PISA was the son and pupil of Niccola. He may have been born somewhere about 1235, as at the time of his death, in 1320, he is said to have been "vecchissimo," exceedingly old. We may at least suppose him to have been nearly twenty-five when he was invited to Perugia to erect a splendid monument to Urban IV, who died in that city in 1264. That work gave such satisfaction that he was employed also upon the embellishments of the fountain in front of the Duomo, wherein he displayed extraordinary ability in the architecture, the sculpture, and the bronzes. Scarcely had he completed this work. when his father died, and he returned to Pisa to take possession of his patrimony. One of the first tasks committed to him by his fellow-citizens was that of adorning the small but celebrated church of Santa Maria della Spina, one of the richest and most remarkable specimens of the peculiar Gothic style in Italy. For the facade and other parts of the exterior he executed a number of statues, bass-reliefs, and other ornaments of sculpture, and is said in one of the figures to have portrayed his father, Niccola. What he there did, however. was merely the embellishment of a building, in which others shared with him; but it was not long before opportunity was afforded him of displaying his architectural ability on an ample scale, for in 1278 he began, and in 1283 completed, the renowned Campo Santo, or cemetery, one of the most remarkable monuments of its period, and that which, together with the adjacent cathedral, campanile, and baptistery, offers a most interesting group of architectural studies. The edifice is of marble, and forms a cloister of sixty-two arches (five at each end, and twenty-six on each side), enclosing the inner area or burial-ground; but neither this latter nor the exterior is a perfect parallelogram,

the cloister being fifteen feet longer on one side than on the other, viz. 430 and 415 feet, and consequently the ends not at right angles to the sides. This defect would almost seem to have been occasioned by oversight, as it could not have been worth while to sacrifice regularity for the sake of a few feet. After this, according to Vasari, he went to Siena, where he made a model or design for the facade of the Duomo; this, however, is questionable. One of the first commissions he received after finishing the Campo Santo was from Charles I of Anjou, who invited him to Naples, where he erected the Castel Nuovo, and built Santa Maria Novella. In 1286 he was employed to erect the high altar in the Duomo at Arezzo, an exceedingly sumptuous work, in the Tedesco style, with a profusion of figures and sculptures, all in marble. This work, and his *Virgin and Child*, on one side of the cathedral of Florence, are reckoned by Cicognara as his best productions; but another of great celebrity is the marble pulpit by him in the church of San Andrea at Pistoia, which, like that by Niccola in the Duomo at Pisa, is a hexagon supported by seven columns. He also executed many of the sculptures of the Duomo of Orvieto, where he employed various assistants and pupils, some of the latter of whom afterwards became celebrated, particularly Agostino and Agnolo di Siena. At the instance of the Perugians, he returned to their city and executed the mausoleum of Benedict XI. He was also invited by the citizens of Prato, in 1309, to build the (Capella della Cintola, and to enlarge their Duomo. TJoaded with honors and distinctions as well as years, he in 1320 closed his life in his native city, and was p there buried within that monument which he had himself constructed about forty years before, the Campo Santo, which for others was a burying-place, for himself a mausoleum. See Vasari, *Lives.*; Lord Lindsay, *Christian Art*; Agincourt, *Davia Memorie Istoriche*; .Rosini, *Storia*, etc.; Cicognara, *Monumenti Sepolcrati della Toscana*, vol. i; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.'; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

## Nice

*SEE NICEAN COUNCILS.*

## Nicene Creed

is the name applied to a detailed statement of Christian doctrine which forms part of the liturgy of the Roman, Oriental, and Anglican churches, and is also received as a formulary by many of the other Protestant communions. The creed is given in the article on that subject. It remains

simply to add that though it is called by the name of the Council of Nicaea (q.v.), nearly one half of the present clauses formed no part of the original Nicene formulary, that document containing a series of anathemas condemnatory of specific statements of Arius which find no place in the present so-called Nicene Creed. It was not even framed by the fathers of the first general council. They rather adopted the existing Oriental Creed, as the Roman or Apostles' Creed was followed by the churches of the West. Eusebius, the historian, exhibited it to the council as the ancient creed of the Church of Caesarea, of which he was the bishop. Doubtless it had descended in that Church from primitive times. A general likeness may be observed between it and the Creed of Antioch, as given by Lucian the Martyr (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:5; 6:12). The principal addition made to it by the council was the insertion of the phrase **ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ**, “of one substance with the Father,” in order to render the creed all that could be wished for as a standard of orthodoxy. *SEE ARIANISM*. Eusebius says, however, that this was no new term: “We are aware that certain illustrious bishops and writers among the ancients have made use of this expression, **ὁμοούσιους**, in defining the Godhead of the Father and Son” (*ibid.*). Athanasius declares the same thing in his epistle to the African bishops, and states that the term was incorporated in the Nicene Creed on the authority of ancient bishops: **τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐπισκόπων**. In the preceding century Dionysius of Alexandria still appeals to older writers who used the expression **τὸ ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ εἰρήμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων** (Athanasius, *De Sent. Dionys.*). Origen, the preceptor of Dionysius, used the word in the same sense as the Nicene Council, as shown by Ruffinus and Pamphilus in his apology. Tertullian, writing in Latin, while he thought in Greek, as was often the case with him, says that the three persons of the Godhead were “*tius substantiae*” (*Adv. Pra.* 11), which was the equivalent for **ὁμοούσιος**, as bishop Bull affirms; so also Ruffinus, “*Unius substantiae quod Graece ὁμοούσιον dicitur*” (*De Deprav. libr. Orig.*). The term itself was coined in the philosophical schools of ancient Greece. Thus Aristotle affirmed the consubstantial character of the stars, **ὁμοούσια δὲ πάντα ἄστρα**; and Porphyry uses it with regard to the soul of life or vital principle that man shares with the lower animals, **εἶγε ὁμοούσιοι αἱ τῶν ζῶων ψυχὰὶ ἡμετέραις** (*De Abst. ab esu Anim.* 1:19). Hence it was adopted by the Gnostic heretics to express the oneness of nature that existed between the psychic seed of the human race and the Demiurge (Irenaeus, *Conti Haer.* 1:9, 10, Cambridge ed.). The term fell into a certain degree of discredit when Paul

of Samosata made use of it in his heretical Christology. He maintained that Christ had no pre-existence before his birth of the Virgin Mary, and that he could only be consubstantial with the Father through the deification of his mortal body. The very gainsaying of heresy thus helped to establish the high antiquity of the term as used by the Church. The Council of Antioch denied the consubstantiality of the Son in this gross sense, but left no doubt as to their belief in the eternally divine substance of the Word, though they suppressed for a time the term **ὁμοούσιος** as having been rendered suspicious by Paul. Altogether there can be no doubt that the term was well known and of familiar use for more than a century before the Church stereotyped it in her creed at Nice. The Caesarean Creed contained the clause "God of God," which was omitted by the fathers at Constantinople, but was afterwards restored to its position. The insertion of "Filioque" (q.v.) by the Spanish Church was unauthorized. The final clauses were added at Constantinople, the Nicene formula having ended with **καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον**. But midway between the two councils Epiphanius indicates three clauses in his longer, creed as used by the Church of Cyprus. It is probable therefore that the Creed of Caesarea also contained them; but Eusebius, having quoted so much of the formula as was germane to his purpose, stopped when he came to the expression of faith in the Holy Spirit in order that he might assert the hypostatic unity of each person, and so never completed the words of the creed. The creed so foreclosed by Eusebius remained on record as the faith of the Nicene fathers, an anathema against all who held Arian notions having been substituted for the closing words of Eusebius. The creed thus formed was used for catechetical instruction, and was the- baptismal confession of faith. as in fact it had been from the earliest days (comp. Eusebius, *Ad Caesar.*), but it had no place in the liturgy until the time of Peter Fullo. bishop of Antioch, who embodied it in the service (A.D. 471). Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople, adopted the same course (A.D. 511). In the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589) the Spanish Church made it a part of the liturgy as an antidote to the Arianism of the Goths. The Gallican Church admitted it soon afterwards. The question was raised in the Council of Aix (809) whether the Spanish and French churches were right in adding the Filioque clause in this creed, and it was referred by Charlemagne to pope Leo, who allowed the creed to be sung, but without the addition; and Walafrid Strabo says that the creed was chanted in France and Germany after the condemnation of the Felician heresy in Gaul. Leo the Great, however, in consequence of the opposition of the patriarch of Aquilea and Photius, at

length authorized the use of the clause, and used it in letters to the bishop of Astorga and the monks of Mount Olivet. Charlemagne decreed that the interpolation was to be used; the Council of Toledo (447 and 580) adopted it; and it was inserted by the Catholic Visigoths and Franks. In 680 archbishop Theodore and an English council accepted the clause. Pope Benedict in 1024; at the request of the emperor, required the creed to be chanted in Italy. It is the custom for the priest alone to intone the words, "I believe in one God." The Nicene Creed was only received into the "Ordo Romanus" by pope Benedict VIII in A.D. 1014. The reason assigned for this long delay is the strict orthodoxy of the Western Church; this making unnecessary a decided expression against Arianism. Its position in the liturgy varies in the different rituals. In the Roman liturgy it is read on all Sundays, feasts of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, apostles' days, and all the principal festivals, but not on week-days or the minor saints' days, when the Apostles' Creed is used. In the English Prayer-book, the Nicene Creed occurs only in the Communion office; but in the American revision it has been placed with the Apostles' Creed, in the order of Morning and Evening Prayer, the minister having liberty to use either of them in the ordinary services, and also in the administration of the Communion, when necessary. See, besides the literature in the article CREED *SEE CREED*, Harvey, *Hist. and Theology of the Three Creeds*; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:129 sq.; Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*, p. 18, 200, 256, 359, 410, 432, 434 sq., 473; Burnet, *Examination of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 135 sq.; Blunt, *Dict. of Theology. s.v.*; *Biblical Repository*, v. 280; *Church Ren* Oct. 1870, p. 383; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1875, p. 136.

### Nicephorus, Blemmidas Or Blemmydas,

a noted Greek ascetical writer, flourished in the 13th century. According to a recent Russian bibliographer, Nicephorus was born at Constantinople in 1198. He was of a noble and wealthy family; but, converted to Christianity, he decided for a life of devotion, and after taking holy orders fell into extreme asceticism. The wealth which came to him from his friends he spent for the good of the Christian cause. At Nicaea he built a church at his own expense, and served it as presbyter. Universally esteemed for his Christian life, he yet suffered many trials and disappointments. From imperial friends he encountered opposition for his censures on concubinage. Under the emperor Theodore Lascaris, the successor of the licentious Ducas, Nicephorus was more favored, and on the death of patriarch Germanus, in 1255, was offered his place. Nicephorus, however,

declined the honor. In the religious disputes between the Greeks and the Latins, Blemmidas showed himself well-disposed towards the latter. He died as abbot of a convent near Ephesus in 1272. He wrote various works, but all of them were devoted especially to secure the peace of the Church, and this, says Neander, "he was induced to do by a purely Christian interest, separate from all other considerations." Nicephorus's writings are not all accessible as yet, but twelve works have thus far been determined as his, and have recently been brought out in the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica continens Graecorum Theologorum Opera*, vol. i (Leips. 1866, 8vo).

Nicephorus's principal writings thus far determined are:

(1.) *Opusculum de Processione Spiritus Sancti*, etc. In this work he adopts entirely the views of the Roman Catholics on the procession of the Holy Ghost and other matters; which is the more surprising as he wrote a second work on the same subject, wherein he defends the opinion of the Greek Church. Leo Allatius (*De Consensu*, 2:14) endeavors to justify him for his want of consistency, showing that he either wrote that work when very young, before he had formed a thorough conviction on the point, or that some schismatics published their opinions under the name of Blemmidas:

—

(2.) *De Processione Spiritus Sancti libri 2*: This is the second work just mentioned, the first book of which is dedicated to the emperor Theodore Lascaris, and the second to Jacob, archbishop of Bulgaria (ed. Greece et Latine, by Oderius Raynaldus, in the appendix, to the first volume of his *Annalis Ecclesiast.* by Leo Allatius in the first volume of *Orthodoxce Graecice Script.*): —

(3.) *Epistola ad plurimos data postquam Marchesinam templo ejecerat, Greece et Latine*, in the second book of Leo Allatius, *De Consensu*: —

(4.) *Ἐπιτομή λογικῆς* (Augsburg, 1605, 8vo). There are also many other writings by Blemmidas extant in manuscript in the libraries of Munich, Rome, Paris, and other places. See Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ad ann. 1255; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:394; Neander, *Church Hist.* 4:541. sq.; Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresbericht*, 1867, 2:253, 254.

### Nicephorus, Callistus Xanthopulus

son of Callistus Xanthopulus, is the last of the Greek Church historians, and the only one their Church produced in the Middle Ages. He is frequently denominated the ecclesiastical Thucydides, because of the

elegance of his style, and the “theological Pliny,” because of the superstition and credulity which are betrayed in his writings. The precise date of his birth is not ascertained. He flourished at Constantinople near the opening of the 14th century, and was probably a monk of St. Sophia, of which he was librarian. According to his own statement (*Hist. Eccles.* vol. i, c. 1) he commenced his *Ch. Hist.* at an early age, and labored at it till he was thirty-six years old. It is dedicated to the elder Andronicus Paleologus. As the latter was already well advanced in years, and died in 1327, it is supposed that Nicephorus was still alive in 1356, and therefore during the reign of John Cantacuzenus. We possess no information of his personal history. His work is of great interest, as it is the only contribution to Church history which appeared in the East from the 6th century to the 14th. It is, however, generally condemned in modern times as a compilation of fables and absurdities, and Casaubon says of it, “*Historia eius non pluris quam folia farfari facienda est*” (*Exercitt. in Baron.* i, sect. 17; comp. Joh. Gerhard, *Method. Stud. Theol.* p. 238). If we set aside the too great credulity of the author, the work will be judged as not without merits. Says Dowling: “Though he amply partook of the superstition of the age in which he lived, and paraphrased the writers from whom he derived his information in the extravagant style characteristic of the later Greeks, he has transmitted some important facts, of which we should without him have remained in ignorance” (*Study of Eccles. History*, p. 91-93). In his first chapter Nicephorus speaks of the utility of ecclesiastical history, and gives a list of his predecessors in that line -from Eusebius to Procopius and Agathias, with a notice concerning each of them in which indeed he accuses Eusebius of heresy and Socrates of impurity. He states that each of them wrote only the history of a period, and some often wandered away from the pure doctrine, while he intends to give a full and impartial history. The work is divided into eighteen parts, treating of the internal and external history of the Church with reference to the dogmas, doctrines, and usages. Monasticism and the episcopacy are specially considered. The plan was good. It begins with the incarnation (ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπιφανείας), and continues to the death of Phocas (611). He, besides, refers to five other parts which were to extend down to the death of Leo Philosophus (911); but of these we find only the headings, which seem to have been written subsequently by some one else. Whether he did not continue his history any further, or whether the other parts of his work are lost, is unknown. This, however, is certain, that while he was to have given the whole history of the Church in these eighteen parts, as stated in



his preface, they embrace only a period of 600 years. As to the nature of the work, it is evident that Nicephorus made extensive use of the early MSS. of ecclesiastical history, merely completing them by means of all kinds of materials. He made use for his purpose of the ancient Greek writers, political sources, legends, and traditions. He greatly neglected the history of the Latin Church. Thus, while he gives full details concerning Anastasius Sinaita, John Philoponus, and the leaders of the Monophysites, he says nothing of the Pelagians and their controversy. His information on the invasions of the Huns, Goths, Burgundians, Vandals, and Alans is valuable. There is only one Greek MS. known of this history. It was stolen under Mathias Corvinus by a Turkish soldier out of the library of Buda (Ofen) and brought to Constantinople; here it was bought by a Christian, and after many adventures now lies in the imperial library at Vienna. It was published in Latin by John Lange in Erfurt, *Nicephori Hist. Ecclesiastica* (Basle, 1553, fol.; often reprinted, Basle, 1560; Antw. 1560; Paris, 1562-73; Frankf. 1588, 1618). The Greek text was subsequently published also: *Greece et Lat. cura Frontonis Ducei* (Par. 1630, 2 vols.). Nicephorus is also considered as the author of the *Catalogus imperatorum C.*

*Politanoaum versibus iambicis Gr.* in Labbei *Protreptica histor. Byzant.* p. 34: — *Catalogus patriarcharum Constantinopolit.* *ibid.* p. 35, extends down to Callistus, under John Cantacuzenus: — *Excidium Hierosol. versibus iambicis*, in Morelli *Exposit. memorabiliuma quae Hieros. sunt* (Paris, 1620): *Synopsis totius script. sacrae ad calcem Epigrammatum Theodori Prodromi* (Paris, 1536): — — **Σύνταγμα** *de templo et miraculis S. Marice adfontem*, in MSS. See Lambec. *Comment*, 8:119; Oudini *Coemm. de Script.* 3:710; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, ed. Harl. 7:437 sq.; Stiaudlin. *Gesch. u. Literatur d. Kirchengeschichte*, p. 111 sq.; Darling. *Cycl. Bibliographica*, 2:2192; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 1333; Dupin, *Bibliothèque des eciovains ecclsiastiques du quatorzieme siecle.* —

### Nicephorus, Chartophylax

an Eastern monastic, is supposed to have flourished some time about the close of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century. Fabricius thinks he is the same as Nicephorus Diaconus et Chartophylax, who was present at the second Council of Nicaea, and was afterwards raised to the patriarchate; if so, however, he would be identical with Nicephorus, the famous author of the *Breviarium*, who was made patriarch in 806. He wrote, *Solutionurn Epistolae I. ad Theodosium nmonachum, Greece et Latine*, in Leunclavis, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, also in the twelfth vol. of *Biblioth. Patr. Maxim.*,

and in the *Orthodoxographi*. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 801; Fabricius, *Bibl. Garc.* 7:608, 674.

### Nicephorus, Constantinopolitanus, St.,

an eminent Byzantine Church historian, and patriarch of Constantinople, was born in that city about 750 or 758. He first attached himself to the court, and held high offices. In 787 he was present at the Council of Nicea, and there defended image-worship. Shortly after his return to the capital he withdrew to a convent, from whence he was called in 806 to become patriarch of Constantinople. Leo Arminius having become emperor in 813, the worship of images was forbidden, and Nicephorus, on account of his exertions in their defense, became unpopular at court, and was finally obliged to resign the patriarchate in 815. He then retired to the convent of St. Theodore, of which he was the founder, and remained there until his death in 828. Nicephorus is sometimes called *Homologeta*, or *Confessor*, on account of his firm opposition to the Iconoclasts and his ensuing deposition. He is highly esteemed as the author of several important ecclesiastical productions of intrinsic value and beautiful style. His historical writings, which are his best, are remarkable for accuracy, erudition, and discernment; yet the doctrine of the worship of images is defended in his writings to a tiresome extent, and this course of Nicephorus astonishes the more as it is in contrast with his liberal views on other points. His most important works are: *Breviarium historicum*, or **Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἱστορία σύντομος**, one of the best works of the Byzantine period, from the death of Mauritius to the marriage of Leo IV and Irene, 602-770 (ed. Petav. Par. 1616; Venet. 1729): — *Chronologia compendiaria tripartita*, from Adam down to the time of the author (translated by Anastas. Bibliothec., and often published: Par. 1648; *ibid.* 1652, cum notis Goari): — *Antirchetici libri adversus Iconomachos opuscula iv apud Canisium* 1. c. and in *Bibl. Patr.* Lugd. t. xiv: — *Disputatio de Imaginibus cum Leone Armeno ed Combefis* (Par. 1664): — *Stichometria librorum sacrorum* (in *Opp.* Petri Pitheoi, Par. 1609; also in *Critici sacri Angli*, t. viii): — *Confess.fid. ad Leonern III* (in *Baron. Annal.* ad ann. 811; and in *Hardouini* t. 4:978): — *Canones ecclesiastici XVII* (in *Hardouini* t. iv; and *Cotelier. Monum.* t. 3:445): — *Fragmentunm de sex synodis* (in *Combefis, Auctar. Nov. Bibl.* 2:603). Banduri prepared a complete edition of Nicephorus's works, but he died before it was ready for publication. In recent times a number of the works of Nicephorus have been brought out by Neri (1849) and Petra (1852). See an account of his

life in Ignatius, *Polit. in Actis ad. 13 Mart. Auctar. Nov. Bibl.* 2:503; Combefis, *Origen. Constant.* p. 159; Oudini *Comment.* 2:2; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grec.* 7:603 sq.; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* 4:373; Piper, *Einleitung ind. Monumental-Theologie*, § 62; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1853, p. 248.

### Nicephorus, Monachus

an Eastern ascetic noted as an ecclesiastical writer, but little known, however, except as an author, flourished about 1100, according to P. Possinus. One Nicephorus, a monk, is the author of *Περὶ φυλακῆς καρδίας*, *De Custodia Cordis*, a very interesting and valuable essay, which Possinus published in Greek and Latin, in his *Thesaurus Asceticus* (Paris, 1648, 4to). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 1101; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grec.* 7:679.

### Nicephorus, Philosophus

an Eastern writer, flourished about 900 at Constantinople, where he enjoyed great esteem for his learning and genius. He wrote *Oratio Panegyrica s. Vita Antonii Caulei (Caulece) Patriarch C. P.*, who died in 891 (895), which is printed in *Bollandii Acta Sanct.* ad 12 diem Februarii. He is perhaps also the author of *Ὀκτατευχός*, or *Catena in Octateuchum et Libros Regum*, which is ascribed to one Nicephorus Hieromonachus. *The Octateuchus* was published at Venice (1772-1773, 2 vols. fol.), with a Latin version and a commentary; in the title there stands Leipzig, without a date. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 12:610; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 895.

### Nicephorus, Presbyter,

an Eastern ecclesiastic of uncertain age, flourished at Constantinople, and was connected with the church of St. Sophia. He wrote *Vite S. Andrece*, which is printed in *Acta Sanctor.* ad 28 diem Maii. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:675.

### Niceron, Jean Pierre

a distinguished French ecclesiastic, noted especially as a biographer and bibliographer, was born at Paris March 11, 1685. He studied at the Mazarin College at Paris, and afterwards at the College of Du'Plessis. He was received into the Society of the Barnabite Jesuits in 1702, and took the vows in 1704. Ordained in 1708, he became a very useful preacher, and died at Paris July 8, 1738. Niceron wrote *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire*

*des Hommes illustres dans la republique des Lettres*, etc. (Paris, 1729-45, 43 vols. in 44, 12mo), a laborious and excellent work, from which all subsequent accounts of the same authors and their works are derived. (See Darling, *Cycl. Bib. liographica*, 2:2192; Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire*, s.v.) Hallam has made free use of these writings, and not unfrequently quotes Nicéron's estimates of writers in his own *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries*. In our *Cyclopedia* Nicéron's work has frequently proved of great service. Indeed no bibliographical labors can be satisfactorily performed on the periods with which it deals without the aid of Nicéron's labors. See Labbe Gouget, "Eloge de J. P. Nicéron," in *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire des Hommes illustres*, vol. xl.

### Nicetas, St. (1),

a Christian martyr of the 4th century, was of Gothic descent, and born near the Danube. Though he had long been a Christian, he met with no molestation on that account until the persecution under Athanaric in A.D. 370. That monarch of the Eastern Goths ordered an idol to be drawn about on a chariot through all the places where Christians lived. The chariot stopped at the door of every professed Christian, and he was ordered to pay it adoration. Upon a refusal the house was immediately set on fire, and all within were burned. This was the case with Nicetas, who became a martyr to his Christian constancy, being consumed to ashes in his own house, Sept. 15. 372. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 71; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 293.

### Nicet(as) Or Nicetius, St. (2),

a French prelate and martyr to the Christian cause, died in the first part of the 7th century, probably in 612. He is commemorated on Jan. 31; yet Bollandus has published his acts under the date of Feb. 8. But little is known of the life of this St. Nicetas. He was archbishop of Besanon when St. Columbanus, arriving in Sequania, founded there the monastery of Luxeuil. Later St. Columbanus, pursued by the Gauls, passed through Besanon; St. Nicetas gave the most honorable reception to this illustrious outlaw, and assisted him to retreat into Italy. Nicetas was very zealous in maintaining the purity of the faith in his vast diocese, which he traversed frequently, preaching and instructing the people. Gregory the Great had great confidence in Nicetas, and consulted him on all important occasions.

See Dunod de Charnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Besangon*, vol i; *Gallia Christiana*, vol. xv, col. 12; L'abbe Richard, *Hist. des Dioc. de Besangon et de St. Claude*, vol. i.

### Nicet(as) Or Nicetus, ST. (3),

of Treves, one of the most celebrated prelates of ancient Gaul, lived in the 6th century. His life has been written by Gregory of Tours; it is found in ch. 17 of the *Vito Patrum*. At first a monk, then abbot of an unknown monastery, he gained in this position the esteem and friendship of the king, Theodoric, whom, however, according to report, he failed not to reprimand for the looseness of his moral habits. After the death of St. Aprunculus, Theodoric chose Nicetas archbishop of Treves. It is supposed that the ceremony of his ordination took place in 527. Nicetas owes his renown to the firmness of his character. He more than once censured the government and the manners of Theodoric and his successors. He even had the boldness to excommunicate king Clotaire, for which the latter finally drove Nicetas from his seat. But Clotaire's successor, king Sigebert, recalled Nicetas. He attended the councils of Clermont in 535, of Toul in 540, of Orleans in 544, the second Council of Clermont, convened about the same time, and the Council of Paris in 555. He died Dec. 5, 566. Gregory of Tours has not been the only biographer of Nicetas; Florien, abbd of Roman-Moutier, has left us a grand eulogy of his eloquence and his virtue. Fortunatus says of him, "Totius orbis amor, pontificumque caput." Several other contemporaries have equally praised this powerful bishop. He enjoyed great authority, which made him so bold as to admonish the emperor Justinian himself about 563, and to charge him to disavow the principles of the Eutychian heresy. Several writings of Nicetas are preserved. D'Achery has published in vol. iii of his *Spicilegium* the treatises *De Vigiliis servorum Dei* and *De Psalmodia bono*. In addition to these two works are two letters, one to Justinian, the other to (iodosinda, queen of the Lombards, urging her to work for the conversion of her husband, Alboin, who was an Arian. Several times reproduced by the press, these two letters are found in the *Councils of Gaul* of Don Labar, ol. 1145, 1151, and in the collection of Don Bouquet, 4:76-78. See *Hist. litt. de la France*, 3:291; *Gallia Christiana*, 13:380; Gregorius Turonensis, *Vito Patrum*, ch. xvii; Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* p. 300.

## Nicetas, Acominatus

(Ἄκομινάτος), also CHONIATES (so called probably from his native place, Chonle, the ancient Colossas), was a younger brother of Michael Acominatus. Both occupy a distinguished place among the Greek writers of the 12th century. Nicetas Choniates is eminent as a doctrinal and polemical writer, and also as a Byzantine historian. He was educated at Constantinople under his brother's supervision, and, besides studying theology, applied himself especially to history and jurisprudence. Under Isaac Angelus he became imperial under-secretary (ὑπογραμματεὺς βασιλικός), then privy councilor, chief justice, and finally governor of the province of Philippopolis. In this position he had to endure many annoyances during the passage of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 1189; and when the Latins took Constantinople in 1203, he was obliged to flee to Nice, where he died about 1206 or later. His *Histor. Byzant. libri xxi* embraces the period from 1118 to 1205; the fact that the author himself bore a part in many of the events he relates gives his work great historical value. The mode of quoting this historical work is thus: Nicetas, *Isaac Angelus*, 1:3; *Urbs Copta*, c. i; *Andron. Comnen.* 2:5, etc. Editions: Ed. princeps, by H. Wolf, with a Latin version (Basle, 1557, fol.); reprinted, with an index and a chronology by Simon Goulartius (Geneva, 1593, 4to), by Fabrot, with a most valuable glossarium Graeco-barbarum, and a revised translation, notes, etc. (Paris, 1647, fol.), in the Paris collection of the Byzantines; the same, badly reprinted, Venice, 1729, fol. The last edition is in the Bonn collection of the Byzantines, edited by J. Bekker (1835). A Greek MS. in the Bodleian, divided into two books, and giving an account of the conquest of Constantinople, with special regard to the statues destroyed by the Latins, is ascribed to Nicetas, but it seems to have been altered by a later writer, who also made additions. The account of the statues, which is of great interest, is given by Fabricius, quoted below, and critical investigations concerning this MS. are given by Harris in his *Philological Inquiries* (pt. iii, c. 5). The work itself has been published by Wilken, under the title of *Niceta Narratio de Statuis, antiquis, quas Franci, post captam anno 1204 Constantinopolin destruxerunt* (Lips. 1803). The result of his theological studies is embodied in his **θησαυρὸς ὀρθοδοξίας**, written ostentatiously for the information of a friend, but evidently intended for circulation. Ullmann compares this work to the *Panoplia* of Euthymius, as both represent the state of dogmatic criticism, and of the knowledge of the history of dogmas at that time, but he justly

gives the first place to the work of Nicetas, as the latter shows an independence of views, a soundness of criticism, and a philosophical spirit which we do not find in Euthymius. The work of Nicetas commences with an exposition of the Jewish and Greek philosophy and mythology. Then he reviews the principal doctrines of the Church, taking as a basis the dogmatic traditions of the Greek fathers, yet not without expressing some personal views, especially in anthropology and psychology. Thus he divides spiritual activity in man into three functions—the **νόησις**, or the highest degree of contemplation; **δοχή**, or the lowest degree of conception or thought; and **διανοία**, the connection between both, or reasonable thought. Nicetas counts six degrees in virtue: natural, moral, civil, purifying, contemplative (**θεωρητική**), and theurgical (**θεουργική**), i.e. such as brings us into a state of assimilation to God. These divisions resemble somewhat the psychological theory of the Latin mystics. With the fourth part Nicetas commences his polemics against the heretics, opening with Simon Magnus, and mentioning many previously obscure heresies and unknown heretics. The last parts treat of Islamism, the controversy with the Latin Church, and the inner dissensions in the Greek Church. The whole is as yet unpublished. The work in its complete form is in the royal library at Paris, and a fragment of it is preserved in the Bodleian. Only the first five parts have been translated into Latin by Petrus Morellus (Paris, 1561; 1579; Geneva, 1629; *Bibl. Patr.* [Lugd.] 25:54); a fragment in Greek of the twentieth part, against the Agarenes, is to be found in the *Sylburgi Saracenicis* (Heidelb. 1595), p. 74. A description of the contents of the work is given in Montfaucon, *Palaeogr. Gr.* p. 326, and Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 429; but whether the complete work will ever appear is doubtful. Some minor productions of Nicetas, among which a fragment on the ceremonies observed when a Mohammedan adopted the Christian religion, are extant in different libraries in Europe. See Ullmann, *Die Dogmatik d. griech. Kirche im 12 Jahrh.* (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833); Ellissen, *Michael Akominatos von Chonce*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:737 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:530, 533, 537; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biogr.* 2:1183.

### Nicetas [Or Nic(a)eus] Of Dacia

an Eastern ecclesiastic, who was bishop of a city called by ecclesiastical writers *Civitas Romatiana* or *Remesianensis*, situated in Maesia, somewhere between Naissus and Sardia, flourished near the close of the 4th century. He visited Italy about this time, and while at Nola viewing the

tomb of St. Felix made a warm friend of Paulinus (q.v.), who celebrated in a poem still extant the high talents and virtues of Nicetas, and the zeal with which this man of God labored in preaching the Gospel among the barbarians. A.D. 402 Nicetas paid a second visit to Nola, and it appears from an epistle of pope Innocent I (note xvii, ed. Constant.) that he was still living in A.D. 414. The time of his death is as uncertain as that of his birth. Considerable confusion has been occasioned by the mistake of Baronius, who supposed that Nicetas the Dorian, mentioned in the Roman martyrology under January 7th, was a different person from the *Niceas Romatiana civitatis episcopus* of Gennadius, and that the latter was the same with the Niceas of Aquilea, to whom a letter was addressed by pope Leo the Great in A.D. 458 — a hypothesis which forced him to prove that Aquilea bore the name of *Civitas Romatiana*. But the researches of Holstein, Quesnel, and Tillemont have set the question at rest. Gennadius informs us that Nicetas composed in a plain but elegant style instructions for those who were preparing for baptism, in six books, of which he gives the arguments, and also *Ad Lapsam Virginem Libellus*. Of these the former is certainly lost, but we find among the works of St. Jerome (vol. 11:178, ed. Vallarsi; vol. v, ed. Bened.) a tract entitled *Objurgatio ad Susannam Lapsam*; and among the works of St. Ambrose (vol. 2:311, ed. Bened.) the same piece under the name *Tractatus ad Virginem Lapsam*, although it can be proved by the most convincing arguments that neither of these divines could have been the author. Hence it was conjectured by Cotelerius that it might in reality belong to Nicetas, and his opinion has been very generally adopted, although the matter is involved in great doubt. See Gennadius, *De Viris Illustr.* 22; Schonemann, *Biblioth. Patrum Lat.* vol. ii, § 17, s.v.

### Nicetas, David

commonly called *Paphlago*, either on account of his having been born in or having become bishop of Paphlagonia, lived about the year 880. He is best known as the author of a biography of the patriarch Ignatius, who died in 878. This biography is untrustworthy: at the end Ignatius is made to ascend into heaven, and his opponent Photius is accused of all possible wrongs. As in this the author served the Latin party, it is easy to understand why his work has been praised by the Roman Catholic writers. It must be admitted, however, that the work furnishes some valuable materials, for the history of the patriarchs. It has been repeatedly published (Gr. et Lat. ed. Matth. Raderus [Ingolstadt, 1604]), and in the acts of the councils, as in Hardouin, v. 955. Another polemic work, *Liber pro Synodo Chalcedon. adv.*



*epistolam regis Armenic* (Gr. et Lat. apud Allat. *Graec. Orthod.* 1:663), is also attributed, but without sufficient proofs, to Nicetas. He is besides considered as the author of a number of hymns, and panegyrics of saints and martyrs mentioned under his name in the catalogues of MSS., such as *Laudatio s. Barbarae, Encomium in mart. Theodorum, in Nicolaum, in Panteleemonem*, etc.; but on account of the many writers of the same name it is difficult to ascertain their authenticity. Some of the discourses (*Apostolorum encomia, oratio in Marcunz evangel.* etc.) are given by Combefis, Latine in *Bibl. Concionatoria*, Gr. et Lat. in *Auctar. Bibl. patrum noviss.* (Paris, 1672), and in *Illustrium Christi martyrum triumphis* (Paris, 1660). Nicephorus (lib. xiv, cap. 28) calls Nicetas a philosopher, but at present we know of no work of his to justify the appellation. The *Quaestiones in Philosophiam et commentarii in Aristot. categor. et quinque voces Porphyrii*, mentioned by Gesner, are proved by Fabricius to be due to a later writer. See Allat. *De Simeon*, p. 102, 111; id. *De Psellis*, § 13; Oudinuis, 2:215; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ed. Harl. 7:747; Hanckius, *De script. Byzant.* p. 261; Brucker, *Histor. Philos.* 3:543. (J. N. P.)

### Nicetas, Niceanus

an Eastern ecclesiastic of uncertain age, was chartophylax at Nicaea. He wrote *De Schismate inter Eccles. Groecam et Romanan*, extant in MS. in Paris and elsewhere; Leo Allatius gives a fragment of it in *De Synodo Photian.* Also perhaps *De Azymis et Sabbatorum Jejuniis et Nuptiis Sacerdotum*, which others ascribe to Nicetas Pectoratus (q.v.). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* D, p. 14.

### Nicetas (Or Nechites) Of Nicomedeia,

an Eastern prelate, flourished as archbishop of Nicomedeia in the first half of the 12th century. When, in 1136, Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, was sent by pope Innocent II to Constantinople for the purpose of effecting a union between the Eastern and Western churches, Nicetas appeared at this meeting as the defender of the Eastern views on the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. When Anselm, at a subsequent period, was residing at the court of pope Eugenius III, he drew up, at the request of that pope, a full account of the conference (in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* vol. i). We may take it for granted, indeed, that we are not presented here with a set of minutes drawn up with diplomatic accuracy; still we have every reason to presume that the manner in which the Greek prelate managed his

cause in this conference has in all essential respects been truly represented by Anselm. He represents Nicetas as saying many pointed and striking things against the Latin Church, such as he assuredly could not have invented from his own point of view, and would not have put into the mouth of his opponent. In respect to the contested point in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Nicetas appealed, as the Greeks were ever wont to do, to the passage in the Gospel of John, and to the inviolable authority of the Nicene Creed. Anselm replied conformably with the doctrine of the Church, as it had been settled since the time of Vincentius Lirinensis. He presented on the other side the progressive evolution of that doctrine under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, actuating the Church, by virtue of which the doctrine, contained as to its germ in the sacred Scriptures, had been more exactly defined and explained, and what it contained in spirit reduced to the form of more precise conceptions; just as the work of one universal council is completed in the gradual development of Christian doctrine by another and later. All this is the work of the same Spirit, promised by Christ to his disciples and to his Church; of whom he says that he would teach many things which the apostles at that time could not understand. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, as explained by the Council of Nice, the doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, cannot be pointed out as a dogma expressed in so many words in the Bible (lib. ii, c. xxii sq.). Anselm alleged as an argument for the authority of the Roman Church that all heresies had found their birthplace in the Greek Church; while in the former the pure doctrine had ever been preserved free from alloy amid all the disputes proceeding from that other quarter. To this Nicetas replied, "If the heresies had sprung up in the Greek Church, still they were subdued there; and they could only contribute to the clearer evolution and stronger confirmation of the faith" (lib. iii, c. xi). And he endeavors to point out here a substantial advantage of the Greek Church over the Latin, tracing it to the predominating scientific culture which had distinguished the Greek Church from the beginning. "Perhaps the very reason why so many heresies had not sprung up among the Romans was that there had not been among them so many learned and acute investigators of the sacred Scriptures. If that conceit of knowledge by which the Greek heretics had been misled deserved censure, still the ignorance of the Latins, who affirmed neither one thing nor another about the faith, but only followed the lead of others in unlearned simplicity, deserved not to be praised. It must be ascribed either to blamable negligence in examining into the faith, or to singular inactivity of mind and dullness of apprehension, or to hinderances growing

out of the heavy load of secular business.” He applies to the Latins in this regard the words in ~~1~~ Timothy 1:7, and to the Greeks what Aristotle says of the usefulness of doubt as a passage-way to truth. Earnestly does Nicetas protest against the intimation that the Greek Church might be compelled to adopt what the pope, without a council held in concurrence with the Greeks, could on his own self-assumed authority prescribe. He then goes on to say that if such authority belongs to the pope, then all study of the Scriptures and of the sciences, all Greek intellect *and* Greek learning, were superfluous. The pope alone could be bishop, teacher, and pastor; he alone would have to be responsible to God for all whom God had omitted to his charge alone. The Apostolic Creed did not teach men to acknowledge a Roman Church in especial, but one common, catholic, apostolic Church (lib. iii, c. viii). Though Nicetas defended the use of ordinary bread in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, a custom which had always been handed down in the Greek Church, yet he estimates the importance of this disputed point with Christian moderation (lib. c, c. xviii). He says that he himself, in case no other bread was to be had, would have no hesitation in using unleavened bread in the mass. “Since, however,” he adds, “the number of the narrow-minded far exceeds that of persons well-instructed in the faith, and the undistinguishing multitude easily take offense, it was worthy of all pains that both Latins and Greeks should be induced to join heart and hand in bringing about, in some suitable place and at some suitable time, a general council, at which the use of leavened or unleavened bread by all at the same time should be adopted; or if such an agreement could not be arrived at without giving scandal to one of the two parties, yet all should agree in this, that neither party should condemn the other, and this difference should no longer turn to the injury of holy charity.” “Mutual condemnation,” says he, “is a far greater sin than this diversity of custom, which is in itself a matter of indifference.” Both finally agreed that a general council, consisting of Latins and Greeks, for the purpose of bringing about a reunion of the two churches was a thing greatly to be desired. The irritable state of feeling, however, between the two parties, heightened by the Crusades and the consequences following in their train, and the arrogant pretensions of the popes, who would not lower their tone, put the assembling of such a council out of the question; and, even if it could have been held, it would have failed to bring about the result desired by Nicetas and Anselm. Nothing further of the personal history of Nicetas is accessible to us.

## Nicetas, Pectoratus

(ὁ σθηθατός ‘), an Eastern ascetic, noted as a Church writer, was, at the time when patriarch Michael Caerularius (q.v.) separated from the Romish Church, a monk in the convent of Studium, near Constantinople. He is mentioned as a pupil of abbot Simeon of St. Mamas. An enemy of the Latins, he sided at once with the patriarchs, and wrote on the custom of fasting on the Sabbath and on the marriage of priests. In 1054 came the Romish ambassadors, and at their head cardinal Humbert and archdeacon Frederick. The cardinal and Nicetas held a conference in the convent of Studium, which ended the emperor also interfering in the matter by a retraction on the part of Nicetas of all he had said, a condemnation of the enemies of Rome, and submission to the burning of his works. This is mentioned only by Latin writers (comp. Canis. *Lectt. antiquae*, iii, pt. i, p. 325, and Vibertus in *Vita s. Leonis*, 2:5; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 199, note i; and the review of the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, in Hauck, *Theology. Jahresbericht*, 1867 2:252), but such things occurred so often in the Greek Church that there is no reason to doubt its truth; besides, it did not oblige Nicetas to foreswear forever his attachment to the Greek Church. Among his works at present extant, the principal is *Liber adv. Latinos de Azymis, de Sabbatorum jejuniis et nuptiis Sacerdotum*, Latine apud Canis. I. c. p. 308, ed. Basnage (*cum refutatione Humberti*, comp. Allat. *De Missa praesantific.* § 2, 16; *De purgator*, p. 870). This book has been recently brought out in the *Bibl. Eccles.* vol. i (Leips. 1866, 8vo), and is entitled Περὶ τῶν ἄζύμων. A copy of this work in Greek is preserved in the imperial library at Vienna. As will be noticed from a preceding article, some critics ascribe its authorship to Nicetas Nicaeanus (q.v.). Among the other writings of Nicetas, we notice *Carmena lambicum in Simeonemjunioem Greece*, in Allat. *De Simeon*, p. 168: — *Tractatus de anima*, in fragments in Allat. *De synodo Photian.* cap. 14: — *Capita ascetica, capita de sanctis patribus, contra blasphemam Armeniorum haeresim, de processione Sp. S., de caelesti hierarchia, de paradiso terrestri, epistolae*, etc., mentioned in Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* ed. Harl. 7:753, 754. See Allat. *De perp. consens.* 2:9, § 6; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2:136; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 24:219; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:583; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 10:323; and Hauck as above noticed.

## Nicetas, Rhetor

an Eastern ecclesiastic, by some thought to be identical with Nicetas Paphlago (q.v.), has, among other productions, the following ascribed to him: several *Orations* known to *Allatius*: — *Diatriba in gloriosum Martyrern Panteleemnonem*: — *De Certamine et de Inventione, etc., reliquiarum S. Stephani Protomartyris*: — *Encomiuns in Magnum Nicholaum Myrobleptem et Thaumaturgum*. None of these have been published. See Cave, *Hist. Lit. D*, p. 14.

## Nicetas, Scutariota

an Eastern writer of uncertain date, who was born at Scutari, opposite Constantinople. He wrote, *Homilice*: — *Scholia sive Annotationes in Nicetae Acominati Thesaurum, Orthodox. Epistolae de Arte Rhetorica*: — *poems* and other minor productions extant in MSS. in Paris and elsewhere. See Cave, *Hist. Lit. D*, p. 15; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:755.

## Nicetas, Setius

an Eastern writer who violently opposed the Latins, and wrote a small work against them, a Latin translation of which begins, “Non simpliciter antiqua novis venerabiliora,” etc., and of which *Allatius* gives some fragments in *De Consensu*, 1:14. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 1110.

## Nicetas, Serron

an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as a contemporary of Theophylact in the 11th century. He was first deacon of the Church of Constantinople, and afterwards bishop of Heraclea. He composed several funeral orations upon the death of Gregory Nazianzen; also a commentary, which is inserted in Latin among the works of that father. There is besides ascribed to him a catena upon the Book of Job, compiled of passages from several of the fathers, as Apollinarius, Athanasius, Basil, Ephrem Syrus, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Isidore, Julius Halicarnassensis, Methodius, Nylus, Olympidorus, Origen, Polychronius Severus, Theophilus of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Didymus of Alexandria. This work was printed at London in 1637 in folio. We have also by the same author several catenae upon the Psalms and Canticles, printed at Basl. in 1552. There is likewise a commentary upon the poems of Gregory Nazianzen, printed at Venice under the name of Nicetas of

Paphlagonia, which is apparently by the same author. See Cave, *Hist. Lit. ad ann.* 1077; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 8:431.

### Nicetas, Thessalonicensis,

an Eastern ecclesiastic, was born at Thessalonica about 1200. He was archbishop of Thessalonica, and author of *Dialogi Sex de Processione Spiritus Sancti*, of which Allatius gives a fragment in *Contra Hottinger*. He has often been confounded with Nicetas Acominatus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:756.

### Niche

#### Picture for Niche 1

#### Picture for Niche 2

is an architectural term derived from the French, and designates a cavity, hollow, or recess in a wall or buttress for an image, vase, or other erect ornament. Among the ancients niches were sometimes square, but oftener semicircular at the back, and terminated in a half-dome at the top; occasionally small pediments were formed over them, which were supported on consoles, or small columns or pilasters placed at the sides of the niches, but they were frequently left plain, or ornamented only with a few moldings. In the Middle Age architecture niches (often called *tabernacles*) were extensively used, especially in ecclesiastical buildings, for statues.

The figures in the *Early English* style were sometimes set on small pedestals, and canopies were not unfrequently used over the heads; they were often placed in suites or arranged in pairs, under a larger arch; when in suites, they were very commonly separated by single shafts: in other cases the sides were usually molded in a similar way to windows; the arches of the heads were either cinque-foiled, trefoiled, or plain, and when canopies were used they were generally made to project: good examples of the 13th century are to be seen on the west front of the cathedral at Wells.

#### Picture for Niche 3

In the *Decorated* style they very frequently had ogee canopies over them, which were sometimes placed flat against the wall and sometimes bowed out in the form of an ogee; triangular canopies were also common: several

kinds of projecting canopies were likewise used, especially when the niches were placed separately. In the tops of buttresses niches were sometimes made to occupy the whole breadth of the buttress, so as to be entirely open on three sides, with small piers at the front angles; pedestals were very common, particularly in niches with projecting canopies, and in such cases were either carried on corbels or rose from other projecting supports below; sometimes corbels were used instead of pedestals.

### Picture for Niche 4

In the *Perpendicular* style the paneling, which was so profusely introduced, was sufficiently recessed to receive figures, and these varied considerably in form; but of the more legitimate niches the general character did not differ very materially from those of the preceding style. In plan the canopies were usually half an octagon or hexagon, with small pendants and pinnacles at the angles; and crockets, finials, and other enrichments were often introduced in great profusion; buttresses, surmounted with pinnacles, were also very frequently placed at the side of niches in this style.

### Nichol, John Pringle

a British astronomer and philosopher, eminent for his services to the Church by seeking to harmonize science and revelation, was born at Brechin, Scotland, in 1804. He was originally educated for the ministry, but turned aside to the study of the natural sciences, especially astronomy, and gained distinction as a lecturer and writer on science. About 1836 he was appointed professor of astronomy in the University of Glasgow. He died in 1859. He published popular works, entitled *The Architecture of the Heavens* (1836); *The Stellar Heavens*; *The Solar System*; and a *Dictionary of the Physical Sciences*. He wrote also numerous articles for the *Imperial Dictionary of Biography*. His style is vigorous and attractive. "In the combined character of lecturer and popular writer," says a writer in *Tait's Magazine* (1848), "Dr. Nichol has done more than any modern scientist to uncase science from its mummy confinements, and to make it walk abroad as a free and living thing. . . Nichol is the prose laureate of the stars. From his writings ascends hitherto the richest tribute of mingled intelligence of their laws — love for their beauty — admiration for their still, strong order — hope in the prospects of mankind, as reflected in their mirror — and sense, ever profound and near, of that unseen Power who

counts their numbers, sustains their motions, and makes their thousand eyes the organs and the symbols of his omniscience.” Professor Nichol’s spirit of reverence is in all his writings, and has made him famous throughout Britain. In this country his writings have not circulated as largely as they deserve. See Littells *Living Age*, May 6, 1848, art. i; and the references in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v. (J. H.W.)

### Nicholas I Of Alexandria,

an eminent prelate of the Eastern Church, flourished near the opening of the 13th century. He was patriarch of Alexandria at a time when the Greek Church was as low as it ever fell, and when Alexandria alone stood forth the worthy representative of orthodox Christianity in the East. Constantinople was in the hands of the Crusaders, Jerusalem under Mohammedan rule, and therefore Alexandria alone was the prop of the Greek Church at this time. Yet even Alexandria’s independence from Rome waned under Nicholas I, who was inclined to acknowledge the authority of the all-powerful pope Innocent III, “that mighty pontiff who raised the authority of St. Peter’s chair to its highest pitch.” Nicholas, indeed, was once thanked by Innocent for “seeking to console both himself (i.e. Nicholas) and those who were suffering captivity (Crusaders) for the name of Christ, by the comforts of the Holy Roman Church.” A.D. 1212, when Innocent called the fourth Lateran Council, and Nicholas found it impossible to attend, he sent a deacon named Germanus as his legate to that Western assembly (Innocent, *Epp.* 15, 34). After the death of Innocent III, Nicholas continued his close relation with Rome under Honorius, notwithstanding the erection of a Latin archbishopric within the Alexandrian patriarchate. Nicholas died about 1228. See — Neale, *History of the Eastern Church, Patriarchate of Alexandria*, 2:278 sq., 294 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Nicholas Of Argentine.

*SEE NICHOLAS OF STRASBURG.*

### Nicholas Of Basle

the great lay-preacher of the Middle Ages, and a leader of the Mystics in the 14th century, the man who taught Tauler (q.v.) that God’s illuminating grace was not confined to the Church of Rome or her clergy, but comes to every one of God’s people directly from Jesus Christ himself, was the son



of a wealthy merchant in Basle, and was born in the year 1308. He was a lad of good abilities and irreproachable conduct, and was from his early years of a decidedly religious disposition. When about fifteen years of age he became oppressed by a great consciousness of sin, and, in order to free himself from the burden under which he labored, he resolved to renounce the world and devote himself to a religious life. Even at this early stage of his career the independence of his character revealed itself, for he does not appear to have remotely contemplated entering a convent or becoming a priest; he renounced the world, but made the renunciation in his own way. For five years he labored to obtain a nearer approach to God, reading the lives of saints and practicing austerities. At length God revealed himself to him, and he found peace. Now he began to feel himself specially inspired by God, and specially taught by the Holy Spirit. Immediately after his conversion he began to study the Scriptures, and found that, although he had never received a university education, nor any instruction in theology, he was able, in the space of thirty weeks, to master and understand the Word of God as thoroughly as many learned doctors of the Church. While separating himself from the Church, and denying her claim to be the mediator between God and man in the revelation of doctrine, Nicholas did not associate himself with any heretical sects. He had no connection whatever with the Waldenses, although some of his doctrines were the same as theirs, and he was the determined opponent of the licentious Brethren of the Free Spirit, and of the pantheistic Beghards. He occupied a thoroughly independent position between the Church, on the one hand, and the different sects on the other; and the fact of his being a layman enabled him to do this with greater ease and safety than if he had been a member of any religious order. His theology was of a very simple kind, and he had not the perplexing logical mind which prevents a thinker from holding doctrines quite irreconcilable with each other. On most points of doctrine his opinions were substantially those of the old Catholic Church, but along with these he held two doctrines which, when pushed to their logical consequences, would have yielded results entirely subversive of most of the theology of the Church. These were the doctrines of self-renunciation and of private inspiration; and in the view of Nicholas they are so mutually related that when self-renunciation is complete inspiration follows. Nicholas and his followers made the dogma of self-renunciation the principal doctrine of their theology. Protestantism, it is true, teaches this doctrine too. Nicholas of Basle and his friends, however, differed radically from the reformed theology. The latter teaches simply the renunciation of

one's own merit in order to gain by confidence in the merit of Jesus Christ a standing before God and peace of conscience in spite of the sense of sin; making self-renunciation simply the absolute negation of one's own individuality in order to leave all things to God, while Nicholas's doctrine of self-renunciation is the barest and most absolute Quietism (q.v.), and if logically adhered to prevents every kind of human action and exertion. He went so far as to assert that "temptations to sin should always be faced and never shirked, nor are we to pray to be delivered from them; and in the same way it is not right to pray for any alteration of circumstances, nor even for the coming of the kingdom of heaven." The highest form of the divine life in man is, according to Nicholas, "resignation to the will of God, and prayer is a means of bringing about this state of resignation; hence the believer should only pray for a right and suitable frame of mind and will—that is, a frame of mind and will resigned to whatever is sent or is to be sent by God in his providence — while to pray for a change in one's circumstances, for forgiveness of sins, for freedom from temptation, for the coming of the kingdom, is to pray that what God sends may be made subject to us, not that we should be made to submit ourselves to it, and so tends to produce selfassertion, not self-renunciation."

(Comp the fifteenth and sixteenth articles in the sentence against Martin of Mainz, one of Nicholas's followers: "15. Quod perfectus-homino non debet pro inferni liberatione ac coelestis regni colloca-tione deum orare, nec illi pro aliquo quod deus est non servire, sed indifferens eius beneplacitum expectare. 16. Quod in evangeliis et in oratione dominica non debet stare sic: 'Et ne: nos inducas in temptationem,' quia negatio non ex Christi doctrina, sed alia quacunque negligentia.")

"When self-renunciation is complete, the soul of man having become entirely resigned to the divine will, becomes," Nicholas taught, "so entirely assimilated to the divine nature that it has continual and near fellowship with God. Thus the man who has so far triumphed over his natural inclination to self-assertion as to become wholly resigned to the ways of God, is always in familiar intercourse with the Spirit of God, who communicates to him all divine knowledge." Thus Nicholas claimed for himself and for such of his followers as had reached a state of perfection in self-renunciation a direct acquaintance with things divine. God revealed himself to them, they believed, not indirectly and only through the medium of the Holy Scriptures; but directly and immediately through dreams and

waking visions, and in this way taught them to understand perfectly all the sublimest mysteries in theology. It often happened that these revelations consisted in allegorical visions, as when Rulmann Merswin had a vision of a stone successively assuming three shapes, and was thereby taught to understand as he had never understood before the doctrine of the Trinity; while at other times, as in the vision which came to Tauler at his conversion, the revelation was expressed in ordinary language. This *private* inspiration, which Nicholas believed that he possessed, was quite different from the ordinary efforts of the human reason, and in this respect Tauler and Nicholas held opinions altogether opposed to the rationalism of Eckhart. It was a supernatural gift especially bestowed upon men from without, and showed itself in ways altogether different from the exercise of the ordinary reason. The men who were believed to be possessed of it had in it a new gift, altogether different from the capacities of their fellows, which made them independent of all churchly and other aids to a religious life, and they were, as possessors of the same spirit, brought into such a close spiritual fellowship with each other, that they could, while far distant, correspond with each other through alternate visions.

Of the private history of Nicholas we know very little, but it is evident that he traveled a great deal through Germany, propagating his opinions in a quiet, unostentatious manner. Gradually there grew up around him a society of Christians composed of men and women likeminded with himself, who loved and honored him as their spiritual father. It does not seem that this society had any definite place of association, or that its members proposed to themselves any practical or political ends and aims. The bond of association was the personal character of Nicholas, and the members were all men and women of pious lives and characters, who, in a profligate and disastrous age, amid the breaking up, as it seemed, of all mechanical aids to piety, were insensibly attracted towards Nicholas, and through him to each other. They called themselves "the Friends of God," to signify that they had reached that stage of the Christian life when Christ, according to his promise, would call them "no longer servants, but friends;" and they included in their number individuals who differed most widely in rank and circumstances. More than one monkish order had its representatives among the Friends of God. Tauler, Suso, and Henry of Nordlingen were Dominicans; Otto of Passau was a Franciscan, and there were numbers of laymen. Rulmann Merswin was a banker, Conrad of Brunsberg was grand-master of the Knights of St. John in Germany. There

were women too enrolled as members, for example, the two Ebners, Margaretha and Christina, and Anne, queen of Hungary, *SEE FRIENDS OF GOD*. From the fact that after the death of Nicholas of Basle (he was burned to death at Vienne, near Poitiers, after 1382) the association of his followers fell to pieces, it is evident that it was Nicholas's personal power and influence that kept them united. Nicholas of Basle was not only noted as a preacher; he also wielded a powerful pen, and wrote much for the edification of his followers. Indeed many were gathered as Friends of God by the influence of his writings. His principal works are, *Buch von den zwei Mannern* (who these two men were is not now known): *Die Bekehrung Tauler's*: — *Buch von den funff Mannern* (a religious biography of Nicholas himself and four of his companions): — *Von der Bekehrung eiizes Deutsch-OrdensRitters*: — *Von zwei Kloster-Frauen in Baiern and von zwei Klausnerinnen, Ursula u. Adelheit* (the memoir of two nuns in Brabant), believed to be simply a translation from the Welsh or Och Walloon dialect. See Vaughan, *Sours with the Mystics* (1873); Schmidt, *Nicolas von Basel, Leben u. Werke* (Vienna, 1866); ejusd. *Die Gottes-Freunde im 14ten .fahrh.* (Jena, 1854); *Meth. Quart. Rev. January*, 1869, art. i; *Brit. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1874*, art. i; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 4:1.84-186; Hodgson, *Reformer's and Martyrs* (Phila. 1867), p. 120 sq.

### Nicholas Of Clemange.

*SEE CLEMANGE.*

### Nicholas Of Cusa.

*SEE CUSA.*

### Nicholas, Damascenus

an ancient Peripatetic philosopher and writer on history, flourished in the reign of Augustus, and was ambassador from Herod, king of Judaea. He wrote a Universal History, in 144 books, of which a few fragments' only remain, together with comedies and tragedies of good reputation. See Lardner, *Works* (Index in vol. 9).

### Nicholas Of England,

a monastic who flourished near the close of the 12th century, is noted in the history. of Christian doctrine as the decided advocate of the Romish ultramontane view regarding the immaculate conception of Mary. He

wrote in most severe and condemnatory terms against abbot De la Celle, afterwards celebrated as bishop of Chartres. Of the personal history of the monk Nicholas we know only that he died before the close of the 12th century. The part he played in the doctrinal controversy above referred to is given by Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:333 sq. See also Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, v. 44.

### Nicholas Of The Flue.

*SEE FLUE.*

### Nicholas Of Frascati,

an eminent Italian prelate, flourished in the opening of the 13th century. We know but little of his personal history. In 1213 we find him mentioned as bishop of Frascati and cardinal, and employed in that year on a mission to England as papal legate. He was sent to bring to completion the arrangements made by Pandulf (q.v.) with king John, and was successful in this mission, for on Oct. 3 he publicly received in St. Paul's Cathedral from John a charter of surrender and the oath of fealty, and somewhat later received full compensation for all damage caused by the royal sequestrations of ecclesiastical property. It was also this cardinal Nicholas who removed the interdict then resting upon England and its king. Nicholas quitted Britain in Sept. 1213, and we hear scarcely anything of him thereafter. He died about 1220.

### Nicholas, Henry.

*SEE FAMILISTS.*

### Nicholas Hydruntius,

an Eastern ecclesiastic, lived in the beginning of the 13th century, in the reign of Alexius IV Comnenus. Nicholas was distinguished by his opposition to the Latin Church, against which he published several works, of which an account is given by Cave (ad ann. 1201) and Fabricius (*Bibl. Grec.* 11:289).

### Nicholas, Ilyin.

*SEE RIGHT-HAND BRETHREN.*

## Nicholas Of Leitomyšl

(or *Leitomischi*), one of the warm advocates of the Hussite movement, flourished as master at the University of Prague near the opening of the 15th century. In the memorable university meeting held on May 28, 1403, to examine the forty-five propositions ascribed to Wickliffe (q.v.), master Nicholas most enthusiastically and ably argued in behalf of the Bohemian party for the English theologian.

He declared that the propositions incorrectly represent Wickliffe, and branded these articles as having been falsified by a certain master Hubner, who more richly deserved to be burned than the two poor fellows who had been burned for counterfeiting saffron (an herb much sought for and used in those times). Huss himself, also, while he would not at the time agree to the unconditional acceptance of all the propositions, declared them at this time, and ever afterwards, as having been tampered with and interpolated by master Hubner. Nicholas remained steadfast to the cause of these anteReformers, and was much esteemed for the service he rendered to Christian truth, and as an example of holy living. He was called by Huss "the most sagacious counsellor" (*Mon. Hussi*, 2:42). See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 246; Gillett, *Life and Times of John Buss*, 1:38.

## Nicholas Of Lyra.

*SEE LYRA.*

## Nicholas Of Methone,

an Eastern ecclesiastic, to whom a number of works are attributed, was bishop of Methone, in Messenia. His writings, as far as known, are polemical essays on the person of Christ, the eucharist, the use of unleavened bread, the procession of the Holy Ghost, against the primacy of the pope, but especially against the heathenish Platonism of Proclus. All attempts to establish the personality of the author, or the exact time when he wrote, have heretofore proved unavailing. Some critics, as Cave and Oudin, place him at the close of the 11th century, and look upon him as a contemporary of Theophylact, bishop of Bulgaria, and of Nicetas of Heraclea. Cave, however, observes that some of the works may have been written by another, more modern, Nicholas. Others, and among them Fabricius, place him in the later half of the 12th century. This is also the opinion of Ullmann, who observes that in the midst of the controversy

between the Eastern and the Western churches, during the reign of Manuel I, a synod was held in 1166 at Constantinople, in which a Nicholas, bishop of Methone, was present, according to Allatius (*De perp. consensione*, p. 689). Nicholas was until recently known only as the author of *Ἀνάπτυξις τῆς θεολογικῆς στοιχειώσεως Πρόκλου Πλατωνικοῦ*, *Refutatio institutionis theol. Proci Platonici* (primum ed. J. Th. Voemel, Francf.-ad-M. 1825); and *Nicolai Methonensis Anecdota* (p. i, ii, ed. Voemel, Francf. 1825-26); and it appears from these works that he was an independent disciple of the ancient fathers, whom he studied and expounded with great perspicacity. He opposed heathen Platonism, while at the same time he adhered to that Christian and ecclesiastical Platonism which had been handed down from the Areopagists and others. Hence his doctrine concerning God is altogether ideal and transcendental. Nicholas considers the negative definitions of God as more correct than the positive. He regards God as so infinitely above man that the latter can have no conception of him. The small *Anecdota* begins with the expression, "The world is unfinished; the divine act of creation is ever enduring, and admits of no distinction of past or future. Were we to consider it as having a beginning or an end, it would imply a cessation of the divine activity, and thus represent the divine nature and power as subject to change. Yet the results of creation are finite; but this does not imply a change in the creative energy, only a variation in the proportion between its emitting and retaining properties" (*κατὰ προβολὴν καὶ συστολήν*, *Anecd.* 1:10). His views bear a great resemblance to those of Origen. On the doctrine of the redemption he goes much beyond all the ancient expositors, and seeks to prove dialectically the necessity of this divine means of grace. "Humanity," says Nicholas, "lay in the bonds of Satan; it possessed within itself no possible means of getting free from this bondage, since every sinner would have had first of all to free himself from this strange power, an effort which none could accomplish. Redemption could only come from the innocent and almighty, hence from God himself, and at the same time could only be accomplished in human form, and by the undergoing of human sufferings and death." From these principles results the necessity of the coming of a God-man, when it is admitted, moreover, that divine mercy wishes not the eternal death of the sinner. This forms a simplified counterpart of Anselm's theory, and similar views are expressed by subsequent Greek writers, for instance, very explicitly by Nicholas Cabasilas. Ullmann on this account believes that Nicholas made use of Latin sources. His criticisms on Proclus present also several interesting points. He states in the first place that in the

Greek Church of that time there were persons who in their attachment to the later Platonism deduced from it antichristian and anti-ecclesiastical consequences, while otherwise the polemics on the question had no practical result. The assertion of some of the earlier Greek theologians that the  $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ , as such, is not immortal, but obtains immortality only from its connection with the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$ , was repeated by our Nicholas in the Greek Church (comp. his *Refut.* p. 207, 208). A work by Nicholas on the eucharist was published: *Greece cum liturgiis Jacobi.* etc. (Paris, 1560, et in *Auctario Duceano*, 2:372). His other works remained in MSS. until 1866, when a Russian priest at Leipsic brought out the *Bibliotheca Eccles. continens Gromcorumn theologorum opera*, the large bulk of which in vol. 1 is devoted to Nicholas of Methone. There are eight of his productions inserted there, but his personal history is cautiously approached, as but little is known of it. Gass, the soundest modern critic of Middle-Age Greek theology, pronounces these writings of Nicholas of Methone as among the best products of that epoch of Byzantine theology. As to the time of Nicholas's activity, Gass holds that it is well-nigh impossible to speak with certainty until more of his writings are made accessible to modern critics. He refuses to reject or accept either Cave's or Ullmann's opinion on this point. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* (ed. Harl.) 11:290; Ullmann, *Dogmatik d. griech. K. im 12 Jahrh.* in *Stud. u. Krit.* of 1833, p. 647 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1:385; 2:16, 36, 41; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacres*, 13:555, 558, 571 sq.; Migne, *Patrologie Grecque*, vol. xxv.

### Nicholas Of Modon

(Peloponnesus), an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as bishop of Modon towards the close of the 11th century. Little is known of his life, but in the opinion of Ullmann he was, if estimated by his writings, one of the most distinguished men of his time. His theology is strongly impregnated with Neoplatonism. Thus, while pretending, like the pseudo-Denis the Areopagite, that we can give ourselves an idea of God only by analogy, and that we have no terms sufficient to express the divine, he enters into the greatest details upon the Trinity, upon the relation of the three persons who compose it, etc. We have of his works, *Libellus de corpore et sanguine Christi*, Greek and Latin, in vol. ii of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Du. Duc (*Auctarium Duceanum*) (1624, folio). — Among those of his works which remain unpublished we note, *Tractatus tres de processione Spiritus Sancti*: — *De primatu papce*, etc., See Ullmann, *Nikolaus von Methone*, in *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken* of 1833; Seisen, *Nicolaus*



*Methonensis, Anselmus Canturiensis, Hugo Grotius, quoad satisfactionis doctrinam* (Heidelberg, 1838, 4to).

## Nicholas Of Munster.

*SEE FAMILISTS.*

## Nicholas (St.) Of Myra

### Picture for Nicholas

(Lat. *Sanctus Nicholaus*; Ital. *San Niccolo*, or *Nicola di Bari*; Ger. *Der Heilige Nikolaus*, or *Niklas*), a highly popular saint of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in Italy, and revered still with greater devotion by the Eastern Church, and particularly the Russian Church, which regards him as a special patron, is generally supposed to have been one of the early bishops of Myra, in Lycia. Very few historical data are accessible regarding the personal history of this saint. There was a bishop of the name of Nicholas much venerated in the East as early as the 6th century; a church was dedicated to him in Constantinople about A.D. 560. The precise date of his episcopate is a subject of much controversy. According to the popular account, he was a confessor of the faith in the last persecution under Maximian. and having survived until the Council of Nice, was one of the bishops who took part in that great assembly. ¶ This, however, seems highly improbable. His name does not occur among the signatures to the decrees, nor is he mentioned along with the other distinguished confessors of the faith who were present at the council, either by the historians or, what is more important, by St. Athanasius. He may with more probability be referred to a later period; but he certainly lived prior to the reign of Justinian, in whose time several of the churches of Constantinople were dedicated to St. Nicholas. His great popularity and the devotion paid him rest mainly on the traditions, both in the West and in the East, of the many miracles wrought through his intercession. In the Greek Church he ranks next to the great fathers. In the West he began to be revered in the 10th century, and since the 12th has been one of the most popular of the saints in all Catholic Europe. What the historical records do not furnish is more than supplied by tradition. The stories of St. Nicholas are numberless, and many of them have even been treated in art. According to these legends Nicholas was born of illustrious Christian parents, when they had been many years married without having children; and it was thought that this son was given by God as a reward for the alms

which they had bestowed upon the Church and the poor, as well as for the prayers they had offered up. Their home was in Panthera, a city of Lycia, in Asia Minor. The very day of his birth this wonderful child arose in his bath, and, joining hands, praised God that he had brought him into the world. And from the same day he would only take the breast on Wednesday and Friday, thus knowing how to fast from the time he knew hunger. On account of his holy disposition his parents early dedicated him to the service of the Church. While still young Nicholas lost both father and mother, and he regarded himself as but God's steward over the vast wealth, of which He was possessed, and he did many noble acts of charity. At length he determined to go to Palestine. On the voyage a sailor fell overboard and was drowned, but St. Nicholas recovered him and restored his life; and when a storm arose, and they were about to perish, the sailors fell at his feet and implored him to save them, and as he prayed the storm went down. After his return from Palestine Nicholas dwelt in the city of Myra, where he lived unknown in great humility. At length the bishop of Myra died, and a revelation was made to the clergy to the effect that the first man who should come to church the next morning was the man whom God had chosen for their bishop. So when Nicholas came early to church to pray, as was his custom, the clergy led him into the church and consecrated him bishop. He showed himself well worthy of the dignity in every way, but especially by his charities, which were beyond account. Many acts of such wonderful import are told of him that they may well be believed to be the inspiration of an enthusiastic mind. At one time Constantine sent certain tribunes to put down a rebellion in Phrygia. On their journey they stopped at Myra, and Nicholas invited them to his table; but as they were to take their seats he heard that the prefect was about to execute three innocent men, and the people were greatly moved thereat. Then Nicholas hastened to the place of execution, followed by his guests. When he arrived the men were already kneeling, with their eyes bound, and the executioner was ready with his sword. St. Nicholas seized his sword, and commanded the men to be released. The tribunes looked on in wonder, but no one dared resist the good bishop. Even the prefect sought the saint's pardon, which was granted after much hesitation. After this, when the tribunes went their way, they did not forget St. Nicholas, for it happened that while they were absent in Phrygia their enemies poisoned the mind of Constantine against them, so that when they were returned to Constantinople he accused them of treason, and threw them into prison, ordering their execution the next day. Then these tribunes called upon St.

Nicholas, and prayed him to deliver them. That same night he appeared to Constantinople in a dream, and commanded him to release those whom he had imprisoned, and threatened him with God's wrath if he obeyed not. Constantine not only released them, but sent them to Myra to thank St. Nicholas, and to present him with a copy of the Gospels, which was written in letters of gold, and bound in covers set with pearls and rare jewels. Also certain sailors who were in danger of shipwreck on the AEgean Sea called upon Jesus to deliver them, for the sake of St. Nicholas, and immediately the saint appeared to them, saying, "Lo! here I am, my sons; put your trust in God, whose servant I am, and ye shall be saved." The sea became calm, and he took them into a safe harbor. Hence those who are in peril invoke this saint, and seek aid from him. His life was spent in doing all manner of good works; and when he died, it was in great peace and joy, and he was buried in a magnificent church in Myra. The miracles attributed to St. Nicholas after his death were quite as marvelous as those he is said to have performed while yet alive. Thus we are told, for example, that a man who greatly desired to have a son made a vow that, if this wish could be realized, the first time he took his child to church he would give a cup of gold to the altar of St. Nicholas. The son was granted, and the father ordered a cup to be made; but when it was finished it was so beautiful that he decided to retain it for his own use, and had another less valuable made for St. Nicholas. At length he went on the journey necessary to accomplish his vow, and while on the way he ordered the little child to bring him water in the cup which he had taken for himself. In obeying his father the boy fell into the water and was drowned. Then the father sorely repented of his covetousness, and repaired to the church of St. Nicholas, and offered the second cup; but when it was placed upon the altar it fell off and rolled on the ground, and 'this it did the second and third time; and while all looked on amazed, behold! the drowned child stood on the steps of the altar with the beautiful cup in his hand; and he told how. St. Nicholas had rescued him from death, and brought him there. Then the joyful father made an offering of both cups, and returned home full of gratitude to the good St. Nicholas. This story has often been told in prose and poetry, as well as represented in art. Again; a Jew of Calabria, having heard of all the wonderful deeds of St. Nicholas, stole his image from the church, and set it up in his own house. Whenever he left his house he put the care of his goods in the hands of the saint, and threatened that if anything should befall them in his absence he would chastise the saint on his return. One day the robbers came and stole his treasures. Then the Jew

beat the image, and cut it also. That night St. Nicholas appeared to the robbers all wounded and bleeding, and commanded them to restore what they had stolen; and they, being afraid at the vision, did as he bade them. Then the Jew was converted by this miracle, and was baptized. Another rich-Christian merchant, who dwelt in a pagan country, had an only son who was made a captive, and was obliged to serve the king of the country as a cup-bearer. One day, as he filled the king's cup, remembering that it was St. Nicholas's day, he wept. Then the king demanded the cause of his grief, and when the young man told him, he answered, "Great as is thy St. Nicholas, he cannot save thee from my hand!" Instantly the palace was shaken by a whirlwind, and St. Nicholas appeared and caught the youth by the hair, and set him in the midst of his own family, with the king's cup still in his hand. It happened that at the very moment when he arrived his father was giving food to the poor, and asking their prayers for his captive son. It is necessary to keep these traditions in mind when regarding the pictures of St. Nicholas, for in two different pictures there appears a boy with a cup, so that it is important to distinguish them by the accessories. Sometimes it is a daughter who is rescued from captivity.

The tomb of St. Nicholas was a famous resort for pilgrims for centuries. In 807 the church was attacked by Achmet, commander of the fleet of Harun Al Raschid. But the watchfulness of the monks prevented him from doing harm, and, putting to sea; he and his whole fleet were destroyed in punishment for their sacrilegious attempt. The remains of the saint rested in Myra until 1084, although several attempts were made by different cities and churches to possess themselves of these sacred (?) relics. At length, in the year mentioned, some merchants of Bari, who traded on the coast of Syria, resolved to obtain the remains of which they had heard such great wonders. At this time Myra was desolated by the Saracens, and the ruined church was guarded by three monks. The remains were taken without difficulty and carried safely to Bari, where a splendid church was erected for their resting-place. The Venetians, however, claim that they have the true relics of St. Nicholas, brought home by Venetian merchants in 1100. But the claims of Bari are generally acknowledged, and the saint is frequently mentioned as St. Nicholas of Bari.

It is a curious fact that in the Russian Church the anniversary of Nicholas's translation to Bari is still observed as a festival on May 9th. In Greek pictures he is represented like a Greek bishop, with no mitre, the cross in place of the crosier, and the persons of the Trinity embroidered on his

cope. In Western art he has the bishop's dress, the mitre, the cope very much ornamented, and the crosier and jeweled gloves. His attributes are three balls, which are on the book at his feet or in his lap. They are said to represent the three purses which he threw into the window of a poor nobleman, or three loaves of bread, emblematic of his feeding the poor; or, again, the persons of the Trinity. The first interpretation is the most general. *SEE NICHOLAS OF TOLENTINO*. He is chief patron of Russia, patron of Bari, Venice, and Freiburg, as well as many other towns and cities, numbers of them being seaport places. He is regarded in Roman Catholic countries as the especial patron of the young, and particularly of scholars. In England his feast was celebrated in ancient times with great solemnity in the public schools, Eton, Sarum Cathedral, and elsewhere; and a curious practice, founded upon this characteristic of St. Nicholas, still subsists in some countries, especially in Germany. On the vigil of his feast, which is held on December 6, a person in the appearance and costume of a bishop assembles the children of a family or of a school, and distributes among them, to the good children gilt nuts, sweetmeats, and other little presents, as the reward of good conduct; to the naughty ones the redoubtable punishment of the "Klallbauf." Numberless biographical sketches and narratives of his miraculous deeds abound. Some of them are in printed, others in MS. form. The most noteworthy are, *Leonis imperat. orat. gr. prod.* (Tolos. 1644); *Andrece Cretensis inter ejusdem' orationes Lat.* (ed. Combefis); *Vita et Metaphraste, et allis collecta* a Leonardo Justiniano, tom. i, ap. Lipom et ap. Surium, 6 Dec.; *Nicolai Studitfe*, in tom. ii *A uctar. novi*. Combefis. For other notices, especially those in MS. form, see Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca* (ed. Harl.), 10:298; 11:292; and Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, 6:760, 765, 952. See also Ceillier. *Histoire des Auteurs Sacres*, 11:347 et al.; Stanley, *Lect. on the Hist. of the East*. Ch. p. 200, 224; Clement; *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art*, s.v.; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Historica Sacra*, vol. ii, s.v.; Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain*, 1:415-31.

### Nicholas (St.),

surnamed PEREGRINAS, was an ascetic of note, especially in Apulea. He was a native of Attica, in Greece. His history is purely traditionary, and the dates, as well as the statements, are uncertain. His parents are said to have been poor, and he was not taught to read or bred to any trade. When he was eight years of age his mother sent him out to take care of sheep. From this time he began to sing aloud, *Kyrie eleison*, which he did night and

day; and this act of devotion he continued all his life.' His mother, according to the legends, thought he was possessed of the devil, and carried him to a neighboring monastery, where the monks shut him up and chastised him, but could not hinder him from singing his song. He suffered punishment patiently, and immediately began again. Returning to his mother, he took a hatchet and knife, and, clambering up a mountain, cut branches of cedar, and made crosses of them, which he stuck up in the highways, and in places inaccessible, praising God continually. Upon this mountain he built a hut, and dwelt there some time all alone, working continually. Then he went to Lepanto, where a monk joined himself to him, and never forsook him. Together they went into Italy, where Nicholas passed sometimes for a holy man, and- sometimes for a madman. He fasted every day till evening; his food was a little bread and water, and yet he did not grow lean. The nights he usually passed in prayer, standing upright. He wore only a short vest reaching to the knees, his head, legs, and feet being naked. In his right hand he carried a light wooden cross, and a script at his side, to receive the alms which were given him, and which he usually laid out in fruit, to distribute to the boys who went about with him singing along with him *Kyrie eleison*. His oddities caused him to be ill-used sometimes, even by the orders of the bishops. He is said to have performed various miracles, and to have exhorted the people to repentance. At last falling sick, and visited by multitudes who came to beg his blessing, he died, and was buried in a cathedral with great solemnity, and according to custom a great number of miracles were wrought at his tomb. See Fleury, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 13:586; Jortin, *Eccles. Rena.* 3:143; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacres*, 13:438.

### Nicholas, De Pistorio

a monastic who labored for the Christian cause in the missionary field, flourished in the second half of the 13th century. He was a member of the Dominican order, but allied -himself with the celebrated Franciscan John de Monte Corvino, and accompanied him in his missionary tour to Persia and India. Nicholas de Pistorio died in India some time after 1291. His memory is revered in all the churches of Christ for his great zeal in the cause of the Master.

## Nicholas Of Pskoff Or Plescow,

a Russian hermit who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, and whose legend was written by Horsey in 1570, was a great favorite of the people, and was believed to have supernatural power, because he went about unclothed without discomfort, enduring unmoved extreme heat and cold, and performed many other extraordinary things. He was noted also for the great good he did. He is particularly remembered as the savior of his native town from the destruction threatened by czar Ivan. ‘This prince came to Plescow with the savage intention of massacring the whole population there, as he had already done at Novgorod. According to the traditionary story, it was early morning when the czar approached the town. The bells of the churches — those voices of Russian’ religion — were sounding for matins, and for a moment his hard heart was melted, and his religious feeling was stirred. The hut of the hermit was close by; Ivan saluted him and sent him a present. The holy man, in return, sent him a piece of raw flesh. It was during the great fast of Lent, and Ivan expressed his surprise at such a breach of the rules of the Church. “Ivasko, Ivasko,” that is “Jack, Jack” — so with his accustomed rudeness the hermit addressed his terrible sovereign “thinkest thou it is unlawful to eat a piece of beast’s flesh in Lent, and not unlawful to eat up so much man’s flesh as thou hast already done?” At the same time he pointed to a dark thunder-cloud over their heads, and threatened their destruction by it, if he or any of his army touched a hair of the least child’s head in that city, which God by his good angel was preserving for better purpose than his rapine. Ivan trembled and retired, and Plescow was saved. See Strahl, *Gesch. v. Russland*, 3:213 sq.; Horsey, *Travels* (1591), p. 161 sq.; Karamsin, *Hist. of Russia*, 9:635 (11 vols. 8vo, to 1618); Mouravieff, *Hist. Russian Church*, p. 119.

## Nicholas The Sophist,

a Christian philosopher who flourished under the emperor Leo I, and down to the reign of Anastasius, consequently in the latter half of the 5th century, was a pupil of Proclus. Suidas (s. . Nsic.) mentions two works of his: *Προγυμνάσματα* and *Μελέται ῥητορικαί*. Part of the *Προγυμνάσματα* had been published previously as the work of Libanius, but has more recently appeared as the work of Nicholas in Walz’s *Rheto.; Graec.* 1:266-420. Suidas (s.v.) mentions another Sophist, a native of Myra, in Cilicia, and a pupil of Lachares, who taught at Constantinople,

and was the author of a **Τέχνηρητορική** and **Μελέται**. See Fabricius. *Bibl. Graec.* 6:134; Westermann, *Geschichte der griech. Beredtsamkeit* § 104, n. 10.

### Nicholas Of Strasburg,

a German mystic, was reader in the Dominican convent of Cologne about the beginning of the 14th century. He preached in many places, as at Strasburg, Freiburg, etc. In 1326 pope John XXII appointed him *nuntius et minister*, giving him the superintendence of the convents of his order in Germany. There are thirteen sermons of his extant, published in Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker*, p. 261 sq. the third and fourth are not complete. These sermon are not mystical, but rather of a practical character, insisting on inward piety and on the practice of the Christian virtues. They are, however, rich in images and allegories. Nicholas of Strasburg has sometimes been mistaken for NICHOLAS KEMPH DE ARGENTINE, who flourished some time later. The latter was born in 1397, became a Carthusian monk, and lived at Chemnitz in 1440. He died in 1497. Pez, in his *Bibliotheca Ascetica* (vol. 4, Regensb. 1724), gives the title of the writings of this Nicholas.

### Nicholas, (St.) Of Tolentino,

a Roman Catholic ascetic of the 13th century, whose personal history is enshrouded by mythical cobweb, was born in the little town of St. Angelo, near Fermo, in 1239. His parents the legend goes, had prayed earnestly to St. Nicholas for a son, and as they believed that this son was given them through the intercession of this saint, they named him Nicholas, and dedicated him to the service of the Church. At an early age he took the habit of an Augustine friar, and so great was the austerity of his life that it has been said that "he did not live, but languished through life." He was successful as a preacher, and his miracles and visions are numberless. He never allowed himself to taste animal food, and when he was very weak he refused a dish of doves that his brethren brought him, and waved his hand above the dish, when the doves arose and flew away. St. Nicholas of Tolentino died Sept. 10, 1309. Tradition teaches that at the 'hour of his birth a brilliant star shot through the heavens from St. Angelo, where he was born, and rested over the city of Tolentino, where he afterwards lived. In the year 1302 a plague visited the city of Cordova, and according to legend the governor caused the image of St. Nicholas of Tolentino to be carried through the streets of the city in solemn procession on the day



which was observed as the festival of that saint. Father G. de Navas, bearing a crucifix, met the procession, when the figure of Christ stooped from the cross and embraced that of St. Nicholas, and immediately the plague was stayed. He is also represented in art as restoring a child to life, and doing many other miracles. He is painted in the black habit of his order, with a star on his breast; he often bears a crucifix wreathed with lilies, typical of the purity and austerity of his life. Several of these are characteristic also of the representations of Nicholas of Myra (q.v.), with whom this Nicholas appears to have become partially confounded. See Clement, *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art*, s.v.

### Nicholas's-day

(ST.), a festival observed by the Romish and Greek churches on December 6, in honor of St. Nicholas of Myra (q.v.).

### Nicholas I

pope of Rome, one of the most celebrated of the Western pontiffs, who, next to Gregory the Great, may be regarded as the founder of the modern papacy, and the first advocate of the infallibility dogma, by giving authority to the Isidorian decretals, is surnamed "*the Great*" because of the stupendous work he performed for the establishing of the papacy of Rome as a secular and sovereign power, supreme to all others. He was a native of Rome, and the descendant of a noble family. The time of his birth is not exactly known; it falls near the opening of the 9th century. He early took holy orders, and was made cardinal deacon by pope Leo IV. On the death of pope Benedict III, in A.D. 858, Nicholas became the choice of the papal conclave, and was-at once elevated to the chair of St. Peter without consent or consultation of the secular power, as had been the custom since the days of Charlemagne. The emperor of Germany, Louis II, then, too, king of Italy, was at that time at Rome, and he was therefore present at the consecration of the papal candidate. Besides being consecrated, Nicholas submitted to coronation. This was a new ceremony in popedom. The farseeing successor of Benedict comprehended that the empire of Charlemagne was fast breaking up, and that this was his opportunity to secure greater power over the temporalities of the world. He therefore submitted to this additional ceremony to place himself by outward pomp and circumstance at least on a level with temporal princes. Superior by virtue of his ecclesiastical office, the same prince would of course enjoy

supremacy also as a secular ruler. and for this elevation Nicholas I now strove. That he succeeded may be learned from the impression left by him on his times, as we are told it in the *Regin. Chron.* ad ann. 868, pt. i, p. 579: "Since the days. of Gregory I to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicholas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign: to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle, to the wicked and unconverted a terror; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him."

The earliest incident of importance in his pontificate is his conflict with Photius (q.v.), who had been intruded into the see of Constantinople after the deprivation of Ignatius (q.v.). As soon as installed, Nicholas sent legates to Constantinople to urge the emperor Michael III to restore Ignatius to the patriarchal see, and at the same time to reclaim the dioceses of Illyricum, Apulea, Calabria, and Sicily, which the court of Constantinople had detached from the see of Rome during the schism of the Iconoclasts, and which, after that schism had been put down by the Eastern emperors, had not been restored (Thomassin, *Discipline de l'Eglise*, vol. i). The allegiance which the Roman pontiffs had paid to Charlemagne and his successors as emperors of the West had greatly widened the breach between the Roman see and the Byzantines; it was therefore hardly to have been expected that the Eastern emperor would 'consent to Nicholas's propositions. Rather did he altogether ignore the word from Rome, and when Nicholas excommunicated Photius, he, in return, at a council assembled at Constantinople, anathematized Nicholas and his followers, asserting at the same time that "since the seat of the empire had been removed from Rome to Constantinople, the primacy and privileges enjoyed till then by the Roman see had become transferred unto that of the new capital." The legates of Nicholas returned to Rome without having effected anything, the anathematized patriarch retaining his see by support from the emperor. It remained for Basil the Macedonian (q.v.) to effect the change asked for; but it was brought about, not because Rome had asked for it, but rather because the new ruler deemed it best to reinstate Ignatius (q.v.). At Rome in the mean time a new conflict was encountered. Nicholas had been appealed to by the unjustly divorced wife of Lothaire, king of Lorraine, the younger brother of emperor Louis, and had appointed legates to inquire into and report upon the case; and the legates—the archbishops of Trbyes and Cologne in a council held at Metz in 863, having exceeded their powers by giving a sentence in favor of

Lothaire, the pope declared their sentence null, and in a new council called at Rome in A.D. 864, deposed and excommunicated them. Louis now espoused their cause, and marched his troops to Rome, in order to enforce satisfaction. After some hostile demonstrations, the emperor, terrified, it is said, by his own sudden illness, and some fatalities which befell his followers, desisted from the enterprise, and withdrew his troops. Nicholas, once satisfied that he had his opponent in his power, constrained Louis to make submission; the papal decree was enforced, and Theutberga was formally reinstated in her position as wife and queen. Though by these acts Nicholas did not absolutely advance unexampled pretensions to supremacy in behalf of the Roman see, he yet did more than all his predecessors to strengthen and confirm it by the favorable juncture and auspicious circumstances which he seized to assert and maintain that authority. But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman see owes to Nicholas I; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church. Nicholas I not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom: if he did not promulgate he assumed them as authentic documents; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction, and thus established the great principle which Gregory I had before announced of the sole legislative power of the pope. Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, and commanded the same implicit obedience. The papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St; Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited to the latest of his successors. ( *SEE DECRETALS*, *SEE HINCMAR OF RHEIMS*, and *SEE INFALIBILITY*; and, besides the literature appended to these articles, comp. Jervis, *Hist. of the Ch. of France*, 1:3236; Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 24, 25; Guettee, *The Papacy*, p. 293 sq. et al.) During the reign of pope Nicholas I the Bulgarians and their king, Bogoris, were converted to Christianity, and submitted to the authority of Romp (comp. Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions during the Middle Ages*, p. 281 sq.). Nicholas is also noted as the pope who formally accepted for the Western Church the disputed *filioque* (q.v.) clause (comp. Lumby, *Hist. of the Creeds* Lond. 1875, 8vo], p. 37 sq.). Pope Nicholas died Nov. 13, 867. He was afterwards canonized. He wrote about one hundred epistles, which,

together with his decretals, are to be found in Mansi, vol. 15; a life of his is given in Muratori, *R. R. Ital. SS.* vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 301. See Giesebrecht, *Quellen d. f. j. h. Pabst-Gesch.* in the *Ahgem. Mon. — Schr.* Feb. and April, 1852; Hardouin, *Acta Concill.* etc., vol. v; *Hist. litter. de la France*, vol. v; Gess, *Merkwüirdigk. aus d. Leben u. d. Schiften Hinkmar's* (Getting. 1806); Bower, *list. of the Popes* (Lond. 1750, 7 vols. 4to); Gfrorer, *Kirchengech.* 3:1, 237; Gieseler, *Kirchengech.* 2:1; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vol. iii, ch. iv; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages) p. 123, 124, 136, 153, 166 n. 1, 182; Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:573-579; Hugo Limmer, *Pabst Nikolaus I, u. d. Byzantinische Staats-Kirche seizer Zeit* (Erl. 1857).

## Nicholas II

Pope, figures like the preceding as a most zealous advocate of papal supremacy. His original name was *Gerard of Burgundy*, and he was a native of that province. He entered the service of the Church, and for a time held the archbishopric of Florence. In 1059 he was elected successor to Stephen IX in the pontificate. An opposite faction had chosen John, bishop of Velletri, who assumed the pontifical office under the name of Benedict X. The Council of Sutri, however, disavowed him, and he was obliged to resign his claim. The principal opponent of this rival pope was Hildebrand, *SEE GREGORY VII*; he, had determined that Gerard of Burgundy should succeed Stephen IX, and the word of this wily churchman was law. The imperial party, which by request of the Roman nobles had consented to the advancement of the bishop of Velletri, was won over to the Hildebrandian candidate by Hildebrand himself; and the imperialists afterwards consented not only to the degradation, but also to the disfranchisement of their own candidate from all ecclesiastical offices. Such was the power of papal Rome under the guidance of the man celebrated in history as pope Gregory VII. Pope Nicholas II himself was a man of ordinary ability, and but little activity. His pontificate, it is true, witnessed the two great changes in the papal policy which laid the foundations of its vast mediæval power — the decree for the election of the pope by the cardinals of Rome, and the alliance with the Normans, *SEE PAPACY*; yet these changes were effected mainly through the exertions of Hildebrand — the man behind the throne. The former of these changes was brought about immediately after the accession of pope Nicholas II by authority of the second Lateran Council (q.v.), which he summoned A.D. 1059. The decree was ostensibly published to restore the right of election

to the Romans, but it contained a remarkable variation from the original form. The cardinal bishops (seven in number, holding sees in the neighborhood of Rome, and consequently suffragans of the pope as patriarch or metropolitan) were to choose the supreme pontiff, with the concurrence first of the cardinal priests and deacons (or ministers of the parish churches of Rome), and afterwards of the laity. Thus elected, the new pope was to be presented for confirmation to Henry, “now king and hereafter to become emperor,” and to such of his successors as should personally obtain that privilege. The decree is truly the foundation of that celebrated mode of election in a conclave of cardinals which has ever since determined the headship of the Church ( *SEE CONCLAVE*; compare Cartwright, *On Papal Conclaves* [Edinb. 1868, 12mo], p. 11-13). It was intended not nilvy to exclude the citizens, who had, indeed, justly forfeited their primitive right, but as far as possible to prepare the way for an absolute emancipation of the papacy from the imperial control; reserving only a precarious and personal concession to the emperors, instead of their ancient legal prerogative of confirmation. It was, indeed, provided, in effect, that future emperors should exercise the right of confirmation if they should have previously sought and obtained it from the Holy See. But of course an emperor was hardly likely to sue for this privilege; and even should the custom of seeking it be established, occasions would not fail to arise in which popes might feel themselves able and willing to refuse it. This bold innovation was made at a favorable moment, when, in fact, there was no emperor who could protest against it. Nicholas took an oath from his new vassals the Normans, whereby they pledged themselves that after his death they would recognize and defend as pope no other than the one who should be elected by the cardinals in accordance with the new regulations. In truth popedom was restored to Italy, to Rome. The great organized and simultaneous effort of the higher clergy to become as it were the chief feudatories, and to choose their monarch, was thus made possible. Yet the decree of a council would have proved only a mass of idle words, had not the papacy secured command also of some strong military force to maintain its independence against domestic and foreign foes. Either the emperor must still dictate, or the Roman barons overawe the election. The pope with all his magnificent pretensions, was but a defenceless vassal-a vassal dependent on foreign resources for his maintenance on his throne. The second great act of the pontificate of Nicholas II therefore was the conversion of the hostile and unbelieving Normans into the faithful allies, the body-guard of the pope. Another important event of the reign of

Nicholas II is the controversy with Berenger of Tours (q.v.) regarding the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. *SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. It was settled favorably to Romanism. Though Berenger afterwards, when beyond the power of his adversaries, recanted and reassumed his former position, the effect of the Lateran decree was, for a time at least, almost to suppress his doctrine. Pope Nicholas II died in 1061.' See *Vita Nicolai II Papce, ex Cardinali Aragonia*, in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 3:301; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 17:148; Jaffd, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, p. 384-389; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index in vol. vii); Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:115 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 3:295 sq.; Hallam, *Middle Ages* (Smith's edition), p. 339 sq.; Hifler, *Gesch. der deutschen Papste*, 2:295-360; Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:579-583.

### Nicholas III

Pope, was originally *John Cajetanus*, of the noble Roman house of Orsini, and bore the surname of "the Accomplished," because, as his Italian con, temporaries alleged, "in him met all the graces of the handsomest clerks in the world." Cajetanus was a man likewise of great ability, of irreproachable morals, and of vast 'ambition.' The last proved his strong enemy, and attached an infamous stain to his name. He is known in history as a Nepotist (see Dante's *Inferno*, 19:66, 95). Previous to his elevation to the papacy, which occurred Nov. 25, 1277, he had played no unimportant part in ecclesiastical affairs. In the papal chair he distinguished himself especially by his activity against the schismatics and heathens. He sent legates to Michael Palaeologus, and missionaries to the Tartars. He compelled Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, to resign his offices of vicar of the empire and governor of Rome, and with it to relinquish the supreme power which that title gave him in the city, and caused himself to be elected senator, thereby advancing the interests of the papacy; but he entrusted the discharge of the office to his relatives, and thus deprived the state of faithful and trustworthy officers, his relatives seeking simply to enrich themselves. Under pope Nicholas III's rule the power of the Romish see was further greatly increased, by his inducing the new Roman emperor, Rudolph of Hapsburg, to restore to it a number of its former possessions which the emperors had at various times wrested from Rome. (See Fontainni, *Del Donzino Temporale delia Santa Chiesa*, and his controversy with Muratori on the subject.) Pope Nicholas III was laboring to secure the union with the Greek Church resolved on at the Council of

Lyons in 1274, when he died, August 22, 1280. A treatise entitled *De electione dignitatum* is attributed to him. He embellished Rome considerably, and built a splendid palace near the church of St. Peter. See two short biographies in Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Scriptores*, vol. 3, pt. i, p. 606 sq.; also Leo, *Gesch. der ital. Staaten*, 4:627 sq.; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 22:436; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index in vol. vii); Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, 2:233 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 6:135 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 6:141 sq., 161 sq., 179, 188; Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:583-585.

## Nicholas IV

Pope (originally *Jerome*), was born of lowly estate at Ascoli, in the Papal States. At an early age he joined the Franciscans, and became general of the order in 1274. He was made cardinal by Nicholas III, and in 1288 was elected pope three times before he decided on accepting the office. He upheld the pretensions of Charles II of Anjou to the crown of Sicily against Alphonso of Aragon, and crowned the former. In a meeting of the nobility called by his legates at Tarascon in 1289 it was decided that Alphonso should renounce his claims on Sicily, and not recognize his brother James, who actually reigned there; and in exchange Alphonso was to be released from the ban pronounced against him, and Aragon declared a fief of the see of Rome. James, however, having succeeded his brother on the throne of Aragon, refused to recognize the acts of the assembly of Tarascon, and thereupon the ever-ready but now almost powerless bolt of excommunication was hurled against him by the pope. The part which Nicholas played in this whole transaction is dishonorable and discreditable to Romanism, which has never censured it. Not only did he unjustly visit James with the ban of excommunication, but unrighteously absolved Charles from a promise he had made, and which he, more honorable in thought than his ecclesiastical friends, regarded as binding, and was prevented from performing only by the pope's direct command. King Edward of England and Alphonso of Aragon arranged terms for the release of Charles, then their captive. Within one year Charles was bound by it to procure peace between France and Aragon, and, if not successful, he solemnly swore to return to his captivity. The pope not only crowned Charles king without reference to the result of the mission he had sworn to perform, but when Charles of Valois refused to relinquish his pretensions to Aragon, and king Philip to surrender the cities which he had seized in that kingdom, and Charles of Anjou believed himself bound to return to his

captors, the pope interfered, and issued a decree against his return. This was as monstrous an exercise of the absolving power," says Milman justly, "as had ever been advanced in the face of Christendom: it struck at the root of all chivalrous honor, at the faith of all treaties. It declared, in fact, that no treaty was to be maintained with any one engaged in what the Holy See considered an unjust war; that is, a war contrary to her interests. It declared that all obligations entered into by a person in captivity were null and void, even though oaths had been interchanged and hostages given for their performance" (*Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 6:175). Ptolemais, the last possession of the Christians in Palestine, having fallen into the hands of the Mohammedans, Nicholas IV sought actively, but in vain, to organize a crusade. He also sought to obtain the aid of the Moguls in that undertaking, and sent them missionaries of his order for that purpose, among them John of Monte Corvino (q.v.). Pope Nicholas IV died April 4, 1292, bewailing the tumults of the time and the failure of Europe to relieve the Christians in the East. He wrote commentaries on the Scriptures and on the Abagister Sentenc., and issued several bulls in favor of the Franciscans. See *Vita Nicolai Papae IV, ab Hieronymo Rubeo composito*, etc. (Pisa, 1761, 8vo); and the biography in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 3:612; Wetzler u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:584, 585; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 6:173 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 6:110,190 sq., 233 sq., 239.

## Nicholas V

Pope, one of the ablest and most esteemed incumbents of the papal chair, distinguished alike for his scholarship, tolerant views, and his stern integrity, was originally called *Tommaso Parentucelli*, also *Tommaso da Sarzana*, and was born at Sarzana, near Genoa, in 1398. He was educated at the high schools in Bologna and Florence, and was noted there for his zeal as a student. He entered the priesthood at the age of twenty-five, and rapidly rose to positions of honor. He was employed by successive popes in several important diplomatic missions to different countries, and discharged his trust most creditably. He was made bishop of Bologna by pope Eugenius IV; in 1445 he was made archbishop of Bologna; at Dun, 1446, this same pontiff presented him the cardinal's hat; and in 1447, upon the death of Engenius IV, the ability and prudence which had marked his course as papal legate during the troubled period of the councils of Basle and Florence, and in the difficult negotiations with the German and other churches which arose therefrom, pointed him out as a proper person for



the pontificate, and he was consequently chosen for this office on March 6 of that year. ‘The Council of Basle was in session at the time. It readily recognized him as pope. There was, however, a schismatic party in the Western Church which supported at this time a rival pope, under the name of Felix V. He had been elevated to the pontificate by vote of the Council of Basle in 1439. The schismatics, it is true, had in the mean time been reduced to a small number. Yet Nicholas respected even his feeblest opponents, and by kindness finally won them over, as well as their head, the rival pope, and thus restored peace to the Church by the abdication of Felix V in 1449. When dethroned the antipope was treated by Nicholas, as before, with courtesy and respect. He was made a cardinal, next in honor to the pope, and was appointed perpetual legate of the Holy See to Germany. His cardinals were received into the Sacred College. and all his collations of benefices were confirmed. But not only was the reign of pope Nicholas V signalized by the abdication of this the last of the antipopes; every part of Christendom, with the exception of the still unsubdued Hussites of Bohemia, paid regard to Nicholas, and honored in him a worthy son of the Church, and a proper incumbent in the chair of St. Peter. Indeed his reign, though brief, was marked by events of great moment, which exerted a controlling influence upon the history of Europe for the next fifty years, and, notwithstanding his hasty temper, he restored once more, by the mildness and equity of his government, the glory of the papacy. Not only Rome, but all Italy enjoyed unwonted tranquillity during his reign. “As if influenced by the example of the head of the Church,” says a contemporary, “the states and sovereigns of Italy seemed for a while to forget their feuds, and Italy enjoyed several years of internal peace: a rare occurrence in the history of the Middle Ages.” In 1450 pope Nicholas V celebrated the year of jubilee at Rome with great brilliancy, and the papal treasury was much enriched by the prodigious number of strangers which the occasion drew to Rome. In the same year he succeeded in making peace between king Alphonso of Naples and the republic of Venice. One of the most important events, however, of his reign was the coronation of the emperor Frederick III in 1452, on which occasion the latter swore to uphold the pope and the Romish Church at all junctures. Nicholas V was less fortunate in his transactions with Austria, in which his interference profited neither him nor the emperor: the pope having taken the emperor’s side, the Austrians and Hungarians appealed “*ab eo parum instructo ad eundem instruendum informandumque magis,*” or to a general council, and even dared to denounce the election of the pope as having been irregular.

The most painful event that occurred during the reign of Nicholas V was the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in the year 1453. It produced a melancholy impression upon his mind, from which he was unable ever after to recover. Self-reproach and shame because of his failure to send forward the fleet and the land forces which he had prepared for the relief of the besieged city are said to have hastened his death. He delayed to succor the city, it is generally believed, in the hope that the Greeks, when pressed beyond measure, would ratify the union of the Council of Florence on the condition that he would come to their rescue. But he delayed too long; and during the three remaining years of his pontificate he earnestly endeavored to rally and unite the Christian princes in a league for the recovery of the captured city. He failed, notwithstanding the efforts of the eloquent John of Capistrano (q.v.). As a patron of learning, pope Nicholas V did invaluable service to literature. Indeed, in the judgment of the literary world, the great distinction of the pontificate of Nicholas V lies in the eminent service which he rendered to the revival of letters dating from his age. The comparative repose in which he found the world at his accession enabled him to employ, for the discovery and collection of the scattered masterpieces of ancient learning, measures which were practically beyond the resources of his predecessors. He dispatched agents to all the great centers, both of the East and of the West, to purchase or to copy every important Greek and Latin MS. The number collected by him was above 5000. He enlarged and improved the Roman University. He remodeled, and may almost be said to have founded, the Vatican Library. He caused translations to be made into Latin of most of the important Greek classics, sacred and profane. He invited to Rome the most eminent scholars of the world, and extended his especial patronage to those Greeks whom the troubles of their native country drove to seek a new home in the West. Nicholas V, too, enriched Rome with many fine buildings, and restored the bridges, as well as the aqueduct of the Aqua Vergine; and yet in his dying hour, March 24, 1455, he could appeal for judgment to the personal knowledge of the cardinals, to the world, even to higher judgment, regarding his acquisition and his employment of the wealth of the pontificate: "All these and every other kind of treasure were not accumulated by avarice, not by simony, not by largesses not by parsimony, as ye know, but only through the grace of the most merciful Creator, the peace of the Church, and the perpetual tranquillity of my pontificate" (comp. *Blackwoods Magazine*. Nov. 1871, p. 604 sq.). See Vespasian, *Nicola V*, and Manetti, *Vita Nicolai V*, both in Muratori, "Scriptores," vol.

25; Georgius, *Vita Nicolai V* (Rome, 1742, 4to); Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen Lexikon*, 7:585-591; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 8:90 sq.; Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:125 sq. Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:371 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. 8:

## Nicholas V

the Antipope, whose original name was *Peter di Corbario* (or *Corvara*), was born in the Abruzzi; he, belonged to the extreme Franciscan faction; a man of such rigid austerity that no charge could be brought against him by his enemies but hypocrisy. The one imputation was that he had lived in wedlock for five years before he put on the habit of St. Francis. He took the vows with his wife's consent. He had won the confidence and esteem of the people as an ecclesiastic, and was therefore regarded by the emperor Louis of Bavaria as a proper person to fill the papal chair (1328) in antagonism to John XXII, then a forced resident of Avignon, because of his controversy with the emperor. *SEE JOHN XXII* All that pope John could do was to fulminate bulls and decrees against the emperor, and call open the electors to make choice of a new ruler. Of course all his requests were of no avail, for no one paid any attention to a pope away from Rome and in dispute with the emperor. But John was not the only sufferer. All this while the emperor, too, was losing ground; his popularity waned at Rome, and he found himself obliged to retire from that place. in Aug. 1328; and, as the influence of the Guelphs continued to gather strength throughout altar, he was forced to quit the country altogether, and to return to Germany in 1329. His pope was soon after delivered up to the legates of John, who compelled him to perform a solemn act of abjuration, and then sent him to Avignon, where he was confined as a prisoner for the remainder of his life. Nicholas was closely watched, and kept secluded from intercourse with the world, but allowed the use of books and all the services of the Church. He lived about three years and a half in this state, and died a short time before his triumphant rival See Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 7:103-111; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. vii; Riddle. *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:332 sq.

## Nicholites

a sect of religionists who professed nearly the same principles as the Quakers, and were ultimately incorporated with them, flourished in Maryland (Caroline Co.) in the latter half of the 18th century. Their chief

support and founder was Joseph Nichols, a man possessed of strong powers of mind. and a remarkable flow of spirits, though of limited education, and a husbandman by, occupation. His vivacity and humor caused his company to be much sought after, and gave him great influence over his companions. On the first day of the week, and at other times of leisure, many collected to hear his entertaining conversation. At one of these convivial meetings he was accompanied by an intimate friend, who was taken ill and died suddenly at the place where they were assembled. This solemn warning was through divine mercy made effectual in awakening the attention of Joseph Nichols, showing him the uncertainty of life, and producing a radical reformation in his character. His mind became enlightened and imbued with heavenly truth, and, being called to a holy life, he yielded obedience to the impressions of divine grace. When his neighbors came around him as usual, seeking mirthful entertainment, he appeared more serious, and proposed that they should spend their time more rationally than they had done, and that a portion of the Scriptures should be read. They assented to his suggestions, and for some time their meetings were gradually changed from scenes of mirth to seasons of serious thoughtfulness, until at length he was led to appear among them as a preacher of righteousness. His meetings attracted much attention, and crowds assembled to hear him. His ministry being attended with heart-searching fervor, many were so reached by it that they embraced his views, and endeavored to conform their lives to the dictates of that holy principle which he inculcated, believing it would lead out of all error and into all truth. Such was the authority and unction with which he sometimes spoke, and the deep feeling that pervaded the audience, that some would cry out audibly, and even prostrate themselves in the meeting. He traveled as a minister through the districts on the eastern shore of Maryland, in some parts of the western shore, and in Pennsylvania and Delaware. In his meetings he sat in silence until he believed himself called and qualified to preach. Sometimes, feeling no such qualification, the meetings terminated in silence. When asked whether he would preach that day, his answer was, "I mean to be obedient." His meetings were frequently held under the shade of trees, sometimes in private houses, and occasionally in the meeting-houses of Friends. As he continued to hold meetings for divine worship, a change in the habits and appearance of the people became conspicuous. He insisted on the doctrine of self-denial, and the subjugation of every appetite or desire that would lead the soul away from God. Hence the Nicholites were remarkably plain in their dress and in the furniture of

their houses; they bore a decided testimony against war, slavery, oaths, and a stipendiary ministry. On account of these testimonies, some of them suffered by distraint of their goods and imprisonment. William Dawson, for his testimony against a hireling ministry, was confined in Cambridge jail, thirty miles from his place of residence. He and James Harris were the first among them to set an example of justice towards the African race held in bondage. They liberated their slaves, and their example being soon followed by others, it became an established principle among the Nicholites that none of their members should hold slaves or even hire them of their masters. Some of them carried their zeal still further, among whom was James Homey, who refused to eat with slaveholders, or to partake of the produce raised by the labor of slaves. The Nicholites applied to the Legislature of Maryland and obtained an act authorizing them to solemnize their marriages according to their own order, and without the aid of a priest; also allowing them the privilege, in judicial cases, of affirming instead of taking an oath. In this act they were called "Nicholites, or New Quakers;" but the appellation which they gave themselves was Friends. Joseph Nichols was not permitted long to continue with the flock he had gathered, being called away by death. He had given evidence of his sincere piety by the practice of all the Christian virtues, and left a pure example that was encouraging to survivors. He had been remarkable for his liberality and kindness to the poor, insomuch that it was reported of him that he took off his coat and gave it to a poor slave who attended meetings without one; thus literally fulfilling the precept, "he that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none." Those who had been convinced and proselyted by his ministry, feeling the necessity of some organization, concluded to establish a regular order of Church discipline, which was effected about the year 1780. About this time several persons among them appeared in the ministry, and exercised their gifts to the edification and comfort of the members. Ground was purchased and held by trustees for the use of the society, and three meeting-houses, in Caroline Co., Maryland, were built. In which divine worship was held on First-days, and in the middle of the week. Their practice was to sit in silence in order to hold communion with the Father of Spirits, and wait for his aid to enlighten and strengthen them, without which they believed no acceptable worship could be performed. They also held meetings for discipline once a month, and adopted rules for Church government similar in principle to those established in the Society of Friends. After the Nicholites had continued as an independent association about twenty years, some of the most

discerning of its members concluded it might tend to mutual advantage if a union with the Society of Friends could be effected. Many Friends, traveling in the line of the ministry, had visited the meetings of the Nicholites, whose hearts were always open to receive them; they had read Friends' books, held social intercourse with them, and found the two societies were-one in the vital, fundamental principle of their profession. The strict rules of discipline adopted by the Nicholites began to be considered too strait for some of their members, especially their young people, who longed for greater liberty, and indulged themselves in the wearing of dyed garments. At length a proposition to unite themselves with the religious Society of Friends was brought before their monthly meeting, but not then adopted. After more than a year it was again brought forward and met with a similar result. When several months had elapsed, it was moved the third time, and afterwards the fourth time, the opposition at each becoming less. Finally, those who were unfavorable to the measure proposed that such as were prepared to unite with the Society of Friends had better do so; and such as were not prepared would continue as they were; and they added it might be of use to those who remained, as it would lead them to a serious examination that might result in entire unanimity. Accordingly a committee was appointed to attend the nearest monthly meeting of the Society of Friends, and lay the matter before them. The proposition for a union being laid before Third Haven Monthly Meeting, was deliberately considered, and a committee appointed to take an opportunity with the applicants in a collective capacity, and "treat the matter with them as way may open as to the grounds of their request; and report of their situation and state of unity in regard thereof to our next meeting." The result was that nearly all who had made application (about four hundred in number, including the children who were added) were received into membership; and most of those few who were not received acknowledged it was quite as well for them to be left at present. Those who had thus voluntarily withdrawn from the Society of the Nicholites, for whose use their meeting-houses were held, conceived that they had forfeited their claims to the property; but those who remained attached to the old order thought differently, and wished that they should all continue to meet together as they had previously done. They accordingly met together on First-days for divine worship in perfect harmony and mutual love. Their meetings in the middle of the week were held on different days, on account of the meetings for discipline held separately by each society, and the Nicholites continued the title of the property in their own name by

mutual agreement. After time and opportunity had been given for showing the effect of the union, those of the Nicholites who had remained and kept-up their organization, finding their apprehensions were not realized, and that those who had united themselves with Friends continued to be plain, self-denying, and upright in their conduct, concluded to follow their example, and were received into membership with Friends. Prior to the dissolution of their society, the Nicholites transferred to the Society of Friends the three meeting-houses they held in Caroline Co., Maryland, which were called Centre, Tuckahoe Neck, and North-west Fork. The first two still remain in the occupancy of Friends; the meeting-house at North-west Fork was in the year 1848 removed to another district, and the name changed to Pine Grove. The condescension and brotherly love manifested by the Nicholites while deliberating on the proposition to unite with Friends, and the subsequent joint occupation of their meeting-houses after a part of them had seceded, are worthy of especial attention, as an example of Christian charity rarely equaled in ecclesiastical history. See Janney, *History of the Religious Society of Friends*, vol. 3, ch. 18.

### Nichol(s), William, D.D.,

an English divine of great renown for his learning, was born at Donington, Buckinghamshire, in 1664. He was educated at St. Paul's School, London, whence, in 1679, he went to Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and afterwards removed to Wadham College. He became successively fellow of Merton College in 1684, and rector of Selbey, Sussex, in 1691. He died in 1712. He wrote, *A practical Essay on the Contempt of the World* (Lond. 1698, 8vo): — *The Duty of Inferiors towards their Superiors, in five practical discourses* (Lond. 1701, 8vo) — *A Conference with a Theist; containing an Answer to all the most usual Objections of the Infidels against the Christian Religion* (1698/1703, 4 vols. 12mo; 3d ed. with the addition of two conferences, Lond. 1723, 2 vols. 8vo), intended as a reply to Gibbon's *Oracles of Reason*, a rationalistic treatise, of which, as Leland has it, "it hath not left any material unanswered" (*Deistical Writers* [Lond. 1755, 3 vols. 12mo], 1:77): — *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Lond. 1723, 12mo); first written in Latin for the use of foreigners, and afterwards translated into English by the author, and published under the title of *A Defense of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England* (3d ed. Lond. 1730, 8vo). Dr. Waterland pointed it out as the best exposition of the Church of England view on the sacraments. It was answered, with an exposition of the Remonstrant view, by James Pierce in *Vindication of the Dissenters*

(1718, 8vo): *A Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer* (2d ed. with additional notes by bishop Overall, bishop Andrews, bishop Cofin, and Dr. J. Mills [Lond. 1712, fol.]): — *A Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer* (Lond. 1711. fol.): — *A Commentary on the first Fifteen and Part of the Sixteenth Articles of the Church of England* (Lond. 1712, fol.) — *Notes on the Rubric, on the Place for the Celebration of Common Prayer* (“Tracts of Anglican Fathers,” 1:328): — *On Sponsors and Confirmation* (ib. iii., 249): — *Historim Sacrae*, lib. vii, etc. (Lond. 1711, 12mo), etc. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 2:2195; Wood, *Athenae Oxonien.*; *Genesis Biog. Dict. s. .* (J. N. P.)

### Nichols, George

an American educator and divine, was born at Reading, Mass., near the opening of this century. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1824, and immediately after graduation entered the divinity school connected with that high school, and there completed his theological studies in 1828. He taught for a while, but was finally ordained, and called to the pastorate at Chicopee Falls. He left this charge to return to the task of teaching at Springfield, Mass., where he died, Feb. 18, 1841.

### Nichols, Ichabod, D.D.,

a Congregational minister of some note, was born at Portsmouth, N. H., July 5, 1784. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1802; then studied theology at Salem; and from 1805 to 1809 taught in his alma mater in the mathematical department. January 7, 1809, he was made associate pastor, with the Rev. Dr. Deane, of the First Congregational Church, Portland, and after his colleague's decease became sole pastor, continuing so until 1855, when he was given the assistance of a colleague. He then made Cambridge his residence, only attending to his pastoral obligations as his health would permit. He died Jan. 2, 1859. He was for many years vicepresident of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. ‘In his theology he was a Unitarian of the conservative school. He published in 1830 a work on *Natural Theology*, containing some original views and illustrations; and he left a work nearly ready for the press entitled *Hours with the Evangelists* (Boston, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo), which embraces an argument for the Christian revelations and miracles, directed mainly against the Straussian theory, and a series of “critical and philosophical comments’



on the principal epoch of the life of Jesus. A volume entitled *Remembered Words from the Sermons of the Rev. Nichols* appeared in Boston in 1860.

### Nichols, James

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Berkeley, Bristol County, Mass., Aug. 6, 1811. He was educated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., and studied theology in the seminary at Andover, Mass.; was licensed in 1838, and ordained in 1845 as pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Oneida, N.Y. This was his only charge. He was principal of the Synodical Academy at Genesee, N. Y., from 1850 to 1858, and was chaplain of the Western House of Refuge, Rochester, N. Y., from 1859 until he entered the army as chaplain of the 108th Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry. His exposed camp life ended in his contracting a fever, and he died Jan. 31, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 112. (J. L. S.)

### Nichols, John

an American missionary to India, was born at Antrim, N. H., June 20, 1790; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1813. Two years before, during a revival of religion in college, his mind; became permanently affected with religious truth. He yielded his heart to Christ, and on being convinced that it was his duty to serve him in the Gospel, entered the theological seminary at Andover in Oct., 1813. He was ordained at Boston, with the missionaries Swift, Graves, Parsons, and Buttrick, Aug. 2, 1817. He sailed for Bombay with his wife Sept. 5, 1817, and arrived Feb. 23, 1818. After toiling in his benevolent work nearly seven years, he died of a fever at Bombay Dec. 10, 1824. See *Memoirs of American Missionaries*, s.v.

### Nichols, John Cutler

a Congregational minister, was born at West Brookfield, Mass., Nov. 17, 1801; and was educated at Yale College, class of 1824. He then entered upon the study of theology in the Yale divinity school, and graduated in 1830. He was ordained as evangelist by the Brookfield Association Oct. 12, 1831, and went to labor in Canada. In 1834 he was called as pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Stonington, Conn., and remained in that charge until 1839. In 1840 he was offered and accepted the pastorate at Lebanon, Conn. In 1854 he left the ministry, and engaged in teaching, and was thus employed at Lynn, Conn., until his death, Jan. 8, 1868. See *Congreg. Qu.* vol x.

## Nichols, Joseph

*SEE NICHOLITES.*

## Nichols, Warren

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Reading, Mass., Jan. 26, 1803. He was the child of pious parents, and in his eighteenth year was converted, and from that time devoted himself to preparing for the work of the ministry. In 1828 he graduated at Williams College, Mass., and in 1832 at Andover Theological Seminary. After preaching one year in New England, he left in 1833 for the Mississippi valley, under the patronage of the New Hampshire Missionary Society, and labored for a short time at St. Charles, Mo. In 1834 he removed to Illinois, where he was actively engaged five years, a part of the time in connection with Dr. Nelson, in his institute for training young men for the ministry. In 1839 he went to Ohio, where he labored as a missionary for six years. At length failing health compelled him to retire from the ministry, and in 1855 he removed to Lima, Ohio. During his last years he labored as agent for the American Bible Society. He died June 7, 1862. Mr. Nichols was a man of much energy, of large views, a good citizen, and a faithful minister. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1.863, p. 306. (J. L. S.)

## Nicholson, David B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. was born in the county of Iredell, N.C., Feb. 1, 1809. He was converted and joined the Church at the age of nineteen. He soon after determined to enter the ministry, and was received on probation in the Virginia Conference in 1831; he was afterwards ordained deacon and elder, and for the space of eleven years supplied many, important charges. In 1842 he was appointed presiding elder of the Newbern District, and was continued in that office for the next twenty-five years, except the years 1861 and 1862, when he was in charge of the Magnolia Circuit. He was several times elected to the General Conference, and was twice called to preside over his own conference in the absence of the bishop. He died April 15, 1866. In all his official career — in quarterly, annual, and general conferences — his prudence and soundness of judgment created a great confidence in his opinions upon all matters touching the interests of the Church. His business habits were so exact and wise that, from time to time, he was elected a trustee of most of the institutions of the Church. His integrity in all

departments of action was of a stern and lofty style. He dealt justly, he loved mercy, he walked humbly in the sight of God. He was a good, faithful, devout man, a citizen without reproach, a Christian of great purity of heart and life. See *Min. of Ann. Conf. M.E. Church, South*, 1866-1869, p. 13.

### Nicholson, John

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Lewes, Del., Nov. 2, 1807; was converted in Philadelphia; joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1828; in 1835 was set off with the New Jersey Conference; in 1838 was returned to the Philadelphia Conference; 1838-41 was stationed in Philadelphia, and there he died, Oct. 11, 1843. John Nicholson "was a. man of study, of method, and of prayer." He was indeed one of the most diligent students of his time in the ministry of his Church. His talents were substantial rather than splendid, and his ministry in demonstration of the spirit and of power. Many conversions and much good resulted from his labors, and his memory is precious. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:468. (G. L. T.)

### Nicholson, William (1),

a noted English prelate, was born near the close of the 16th century, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. After taking holy orders, he was first rector of Landeilorwawr, 1629; subsequently canon-residentiary of St. David's, and archdeacon of Brecknock; ejected at the Rebellion, but elevated to the bishopric of Gloucester in 1660/1661, and held that see until his death in 1672. He maintained and defended the Church of England against its enemies in the days of its adversity, and is said to have been a person of great learning and piety. He was greatly admired by Dr. George Bull for his knowledge of the fathers and the schoolmen, and for his large stores of critical learning. He wrote, *Apology for the Discipline of the Ancient Church of England* (Lond. 1657-59, 4to): — "Ἐκθεσις πίστεως, or an Exposition of the Apostles' Creed, delivered in several Sermons (1661, fol.), very rare: — *A Plaine but Full Exposition of the Catechisme of the Church of England* (Lond. 1661, 1662, 1663, 1668, 1678, 1686, 4to; new ed. 1844, 8vo). See Nelson, *Life of Bishop Bull*, p. 206; Stoughton, *Fccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 1:492; Tulloch, *Rat. Theol. of England*, 1:361.

## Nic(h)olson, William (2), D.D.,

a learned English prelate, son of Joseph Nicholson, rector of Hemland, in Cumberland, was born at Orton, in that county, about 1655. After a preparatory training he was sent to Oxford, and entered Queen's College in 1670. He took the degree of B.A. in 1675-6, and M.A. in 1679. He was soon after invited by Sir Joseph Williamson, fellow of the same college, and then secretary of state to Charles II, to accompany him in his travels in Germany. Nicholson also visited France, and on his return to England wrote on what he had seen abroad. He was made fellow of his college in 1679. About the same time his merit recommended him to Dr. Edward Rainbow, bishop of Carlisle; he was presented with a province and deanery in that church; and afterwards (1702), having greatly distinguished himself in the literary world, was promoted to the see of Carlisle. Bishop Nicholson was deeply engaged in the Bangorian controversy, which began in 1717. In 1718 he was translated to the bishopric of Londonderry, in Ireland. Still continuing in favor at court, he was, Jan. 28, 1726, raised to the archbishopric of Cashell, and made primate of Munster in the room of Dr. William Paliser; but he was prevented from entering into the full possession of this last dignity by his sudden death, which occurred at Derry, Feb. 13, 1727. Brown Willis observes, in relation to his character, that he was a man of very great learning, to whom the world is much indebted, not only for what he has published on antiquity, but in the universal sciences. He was certainly endued with an industrious faculty, such as is requisite for an antiquarian. He frequently falls, however, into mistakes for want of sufficient accuracy, not only in respect to manuscripts, which might be excusable, but in regard to printed and common books; and moreover the character he gives of many authors appears not to be free from prejudice. The bestknown of his learned writings are his *Descriptions of Poland, Denmark, etc.*; the *English Historical Library* (1696); and especially his *Tracts* on the Bangorian controversy, entitled *A True State of the Controversy between the present Bishop and Dean of Carlisle*. He also published a *Sermon* preached in the cathedral church of Carlisle, and some other sermons preached at different times, but these have never been collected into a volume. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:416-421; Perry, *Hist. of the Ch. of England*, 3:387; Stephen, *Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland*, 4:61, 112, 133 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, s.v.; *Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v.

## Nickel, Goswin

a noted Jesuit, flourished as general of his order near the middle of the 17th century. He was successor to Alexander Gottfredi, who died in March, 1651. The dislike which the order cherished against the latter was considerably intensified against Nickel, who, though it cannot be said that he contemplated any radical reforms, generally speaking, was wont to insist obstinately on his own views, and in his manner and conduct was rough, repulsive, and wanting in due respect for others. By this he very soon offended the self-love of powerful members of the order so profoundly and so sensibly that the congregation general of 1661 took steps against him, such as might have been thought impossible, if we consider the monarchical character of the institute. He was finally deposed, and is seldom heard of after. For details as to the Jesuitical intrigues to bring about his deposition, see Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:247.

## Nickell, James Haggard

a Presbyterian minister, was born Aug. 1, 1829. He was educated at Cumberland College, Princeton, Ky., class of 1854; studied theology privately; was licensed in 1854, and ordained in 1855; and labored within the bounds of Princeton Presbytery at Salubria, Sharon, and Liberty churches, in Kentucky, until 1860, when he removed to Salem, Marion County, Ill., and there labored until his death, Nov. 20, 1864. Mr. Nickell was learned in Biblical and theological science, using his knowledge with rare skill. As a man, he possessed all the requisites which constitute a perfect gentleman; as a preacher, he was dignified, earnest; and impressive. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 301. (J. L. S.)

## Nickerson, Heman

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Orrington, Me., Sept. 3, 1797, and there spent his childhood and youth, enjoying the privileges of the common schools, and being trained in habits of industry and virtue by pious parents. When twenty-one years of age, under the labors of Rev. Enoch Mudge, he experienced religion and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Soon after he felt called to preach, and in 1821 was received into the New England Conference. At the organization of the Maine Conference he was one of the original members, and soon took a prominent position among his brethren. After filling important charges he was appointed presiding elder, and sustained the responsibilities

of that office twenty-one-years. With the exception of three years, from 1828 to 1831, his life was spent in the itinerant work. Poor health obliged him to take a superannuated relation in 1866, and that he was justified in this step is evident from the rapid decline of his health, finally terminating in his death Dec. 26, 1869. "Heman Nickerson was distinguished for solid and enduring qualities of mind and heart. A good judgment, clear perceptions of the truths of the Gospel, a firm adherence -to the doctrines and polity of the Church, and a manly utterance of his sentiments, made him a useful minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. His candor and knowledge of human character enabled him, when presiding elder, to put the right man in the right place. He was highly esteemed by his brethren in the ministry as a safe counselor and a judicious friend. In difficult questions his opinion was sought and his advice justly prized. Four times was he chosen a delegate to the General Conference." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 147.

### Nicklaushausen, John.

*SEE JOHN OF NICKLAUSHAUSEN.*

### Nicobulus

an Eastern ecclesiastic of whose personal history we know scarcely anything, was a friend and relative of Gregory Nazianzen. Nicobulus is noted as the author of a poem, addressed to his son of the same name, in reply to one by Gregory, in which the latter had begged him to allow his son to leave his native country for the purpose of studying eloquence. The poem of Nicobulus is found among those of Gregory, beginning **Τέκνον ἔμόν, μύθους ποθέων ποθέεις τὰ φέριστα** See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 9:311.

### Nicodemites

was the name given, in the times of the Reformation, to temporizing Frenchmen who, although reformers at heart, complied with Romish rites and customs, thus going to Christ secretly, and in the spirit of Nicodemus. Calvin wrote several tracts-against them, for instance, *The Sinfulness of Outward Conformity to Romish Rites* (in Calvin's *Tracts*, translated from the original Latin by Henry Beveridge, Edinb. 1849-51, 3 vols. 8vo). See Hardwick, *Reformation*, ch. ii, p. 118 note 3; Darling, *Cycl. Bibl.* 1:559.

## Nicodemus

(Νικόδημος, *conqueror of the people*), a Pharisee, a ruler (ἄρχων ‘, the usual title for a member of the Sanhedrim) of the Jews, and teacher (the article in ὁ διδάσκ. is probably only generic, although Winer and bishop Middleton suppose that it implies a rebuke) of Israel (~~400B~~John 3:1,10), whose secret visit to our Lord was the occasion of the discourse recorded by the evangelist. The name was not uncommon among the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:3, 2), and was no doubt borrowed from the Greeks. In the Talmud it appears under the form נִמְדִּיקָן, and some would derive it from יָקִין, innocent, מַד, blood (i.e. “Sceleris purus”); Wetstein, *N.T.*

1:150. In the case of Nicodemus ben-Gorion, the name is derived by R. Nathan from a miracle which he is supposed to have performed (Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s.v.).

Nicodemus is only mentioned by John (yet some German rationalists have sought or rather forced a comparison with the rich young man of ~~400C~~Mark 10:17-24), who narrates his nocturnal visit to Jesus, and the conversation which then took place at this the evangelist may himself have been present. A.D. 26. The high station of Nicodemus, and the avowed scorn under which the rulers concealed their inward conviction (~~400D~~John 3:2) that Jesus was a teacher come from God, are sufficient to account for the secrecy of the interview. A constitutional timidity is discernible in the character of the inquiring Pharisee, which could not be overcome by his vacillating desire to befriend One whom he knew to be a Prophet, even if he did not at once recognize in him the promised Messiah. Thus the few words which he interposed against the rash injustice of his colleagues are cautiously rested on a general principle (~~400E~~John 7:50), and betray no indication of his faith in the Galilean whom his sect despised. Even when the power of Christ’s love, manifested on the cross, had made the most timid disciples bold, Nicodemus did not come forward with his splendid gifts of affection until the example had been set by one of his own rank and wealth, and station in society (19:39). See Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 106 sq.; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 32.

In these three notices of Nicodemus a noble candor and a simple love of truth shine out in the midst of hesitation and fear of man. But Niemeyer (*Charakt.* 1:113 sq.) has endeavored to show that the apparent timidity of Nicodemus was but reasonable prudence. We can easily believe the tradition that after the resurrection (which would supply the last outward

impulse necessary to confirm his faith and increase his courage) he became a professed disciple of Christ, and received baptism at the hands of Peter and John. All the rest that is reported of him is very uncertain. It is said, however, that the Jews, in revenge for his conversion, deprived him of his office, beat him cruelly, and drove him from Jerusalem; that Gamaliel, who was his kinsman, hospitably sheltered him until his death in a country house, and finally gave him honorable burial near the body of Stephen, where Gamaliel himself was afterwards interred. Finally, the three bodies are said to have been discovered August 3, A.D. 415, which day was set apart by the Romish Church in honor of the event (Phot. *Biblioth. Cod.* p. 171; Lucian, *De S. Steph. inventione*).

If the Nicodemus of John's Gospel be identical with the Nicodemus ben-Gorion of the Talmud (see Delitzsch in the *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theologie*, 1854, p. 643 sq.), he must have lived till the fall of Jerusalem, which is not impossible, since the term **γέρων**, in ~~John~~ John 3:4, may not be intended to apply to Nicodemus himself. The arguments for their identification are that both are mentioned as Pharisees, wealthy, pious, and members of the Sanhedrim (*Taanith*, f. 19, etc.); and that the original name (altered on the occasion of a miracle performed by Nicodemus in order to procure rain) is said to have been **γυνωβ**, *Bonay*, which is also the name of one of five rabbinical disciples of Christ mentioned in *Sanhed. f.* 43, 1 (Otho, s.v. Christus). Finally, the family of this Nicodemus are said to have been reduced from great wealth to the most squalid and horrible poverty, which, however, may as well be accounted for by the fall of Jerusalem as by the change of fortune resulting from an acceptance of Christianity.

### Nicodemus, Gospel Of

(*Evangelium Nicodemi*), sometimes called the ACTS OF PILATE (*Acta Pilati*), an early forgery which circulated in the 3d and 4th centuries, **SEE APOCRYPHA**, is composed of the two oldest narratives of the Gospel history belonging to the category of the apocrypha, and not tainted with heresy; They are called the "Protevangel of James" and the "Acts of Pilate." The latter consists of two distinct parts: the one treats of the scenes in the praetorium, the other describes the descent of Jesus into hell. These two parts do not bear the same date; the first is earlier than the second, though both belong to a remote Christian antiquity. They were subsequently put together under the name of the "Gospel of Nicodemus." The "Acts of Pilate" come before the "Descensus ad inferos." The two



writings are always separated in old MSS. The same facts are differently narrated in them. The words of the thief upon the cross are not the same in both (Tischendorf, *Prolegomena*, p. 56). The name of Nicodemus, given to the completion of these two writings, dates from the Middle Ages. We have two editions of the "Acts of Pilate." The first is the oldest. Justin Martyr quotes from it directly (*Apol.* 1:35; 1:48. See also Tertullian, *Apol.* 21). The "Protevang. of James" narrates the circumstances which preceded the birth of Mary, the mother of Christ. The narrative is a parody on the birth of John the Baptist. Joachim and Anna, two pious Israelites advanced in years, are made, by the special favor of God, fruitful in their hoary age (*Protevang. Jacobi*, c. 6). This miracle is the foreshadowing of the high destiny awaiting the child, who is none other than Mary. She grows up like a lily beneath the shadow of the altar, in the midst of young companions pure as herself. She is the favorite of the priests, who watch over her education till the day of her marriage. In order to ascertain to whom she is to be entrusted, the high priest assembles a number of pious Israelites. A white dove springs from the rod of the old carpenter Joseph, who is marked out by this miraculous sign as the chaste guardian of the young virgin (*ibid.* c. 9). The annunciation takes place as in the Gospel. The circumstances of the birth of Christ are borrowed from St. Luke, with this difference, that Mary brings forth the divine child in a cavern and not in a stable. The sole design of the narrative is to give emphasis to the dignity and virginity of Mary. We have in it the first attempt to draw her out of the wise obscurity in which she is enveloped in the canonical Gospels, an attempt characterized by the asceticism which pervades all the sacred legends. The apocryphal gospels of the following age, such as the "Pseudo-Matthew;" the "Coptic Gospel of the carpenter Joseph;" the "Arabic Gospel of the Childhood of Mary," and, lastly, -that of the Nativity, enlarge upon those of the earlier period, and exalt more and more the part assigned to the mother of Jesus. We mention them only to show in what direction the Christian legend was tending from its very first essay in the "Protevang. of James."

The "Acts of Pilate" do not bear the stamp of any particular school. The anonymous writers endeavor to make the Jews, Christ's contemporaries, also his apologists. His trial before the Roman proconsul is expanded by the addition of a multitude of details. The sick whom he has healed appear at the bar of the tribunal, and one after another make their depositions in his favor, relating what he has done for them. His resurrection is afterwards

established by the testimony of the soldiers placed as a guard around the sepulcher, and further by the evidence of Joseph of Arimathea, to whom Christ appeared in the prison into which the Jews had thrown him and from which he was delivered by miracle. This outline is filled up in a very ingenious manner. It is just possible that some true incidents of the trial of Jesus may have been preserved by tradition, but it is impossible to distinguish with any certainty the true from the false. Nicodemus plays in all these scenes the part of the impartial judge — the character assigned to him in the fourth Gospel. The second part of this curious writing is occupied with the events that took place in the abode of the dead, during Christ's descent into it. This narrative is ascribed to the two sons of the aged Simeon, who came out of their tombs in the train of the risen Redeemer. While hell and its king are confounded and crushed beneath the foot of the Redeemer, the saints of the old covenant hail him with rapture; each one of them, from Adam to John the Baptist, recognizing him as the long-expected object of their hope. The great prophets repeat in his presence their most sublime oracles, in order to show how in him all are fulfilled. All the scenes of the invisible world are described in strains of glowing grandeur, almost Dantesque. The writing closes with a juridical comparison made by Pilate between the sacred writings of the Old Testament and the events which have just taken place at Jerusalem. This is the legal apology; the question of Christianity is debated after the fashion of an ordinary law case. We subjoin a specimen, describing the entrance of the converted thief into Hades:

**“5.** And while the holy Enoch and Elias were relating this, behold there came another man in a miserable figure. carrying the sign of the cross upon his shoulder.

**6.** And when all the saints saw him, they said to him, Who art thou? for thy countenance is like a thief's; and why dost thou carry a cross upon thy shoulders?

**7.** To which he, answering, said, Ye say right, for I was a thief, who committed all sorts of wickedness upon earth.

**8.** And the Jews crucified him with Jesus: and I observed the surprising things which happened in the creation at the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus.

**9.** And I believed him to be the Creator of all things, and the Almighty King; and I prayed to him, saying, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

**10.** He presently regarded my supplication, and said to me, Verily, I say unto thee, this day thou shalt be with me in paradise.

**11.** And he gave me this sign of the cross, saying, Carry this, and go to paradise; and if the angel who is the guard of paradise will not admit thee, show him the sign of the cross, and say unto him, Jesus Christ, who is' now crucified, hath sent me hither to thee.

**12.** When I did this, and told the angel who is the guard of paradise all these things, and He heard them, he presently opened the gates, introduced me, and placed me on the right hand in paradise,

**13,** saying, Stay here a little time, till Adam, the father of all mankind, shall enter in with all his sons, who are the holy and righteous servants of Jesus Christ, who was crucified.

**14.** When they heard all this account from the thief, all the patriarchs said with one voice, Blessed be thou, O Almighty God, the Father of everlasting goodness, and the Father of mercies, who hast shown such favor to those who were sinners against thee, and hast brought them to the mercy of paradise, and hast placed them amid thy large and spiritual provisions, in a spiritual and holy life. Amen.”

The Anglo-Saxons likewise possessed in their native idiom this pseudo-gospel. Probably it was considered a valuable supplement to the inspired records of the blessed Savior's life. See Soames, *Anglo-Sax. Church*, p. 252; Pressense, *Early Years of Christianity*, vol. iii (Heresy and Doctrine), p. 175 sq.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N.T.* 1:213; Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 293. The best edition is by Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* 1:478. **SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.**

### Nicolai, Christoph Friederich

an eminent German Rationalist, noted as a writer on aesthetics and other branches of philosophy, was born March 18, 1733, at Berlin, Germany, where his father was a bookseller. At the age of sixteen, just as he was beginning to make some proficiency in his studies, he was obliged to

abandon them, being sent to Frankfort-on-the-Oder for the purpose of learning the bookselling trade; yet such was his eagerness for information, his love of reading, and his perseverance, that he employed every moment of leisure, his evenings and the early part of every morning, in study, and, without other assistance than that of books, made himself a proficient in Greek, Latin, and English, and likewise acquired a knowledge of some parts of mathematics and philosophy. On his return to Berlin, in 1752, his attention to business did not interrupt his self-imposed studies, of which both English and German poetry then formed a considerable part; and in 1755 he produced his *Briefe iiber den jetzigen Zustand der Schonen Wissenschaften*, wherein he impartially discussed the pretensions of the two literary sects headed by Bodmer and Gottsched, the former advocating pure German, and the latter favoring a dependence on French taste and influence. Nicolai exposed the errors of both schools, and surprised the literati of the country by his keen criticisms. Indeed the work excited considerable attention, and led to his intimacy with Lessing and Moses Mendelssohn. After the death of his father he retired from business, leaving it to his brother, and determined to content himself with his own slender means in preference to the pecuniary advantages to be reaped by sacrificing his literary leisure and enjoyments. The unexpected death, however, of his elder brother, in 1758, put an end to this short interval of tranquil study, he being obliged to carry on the business for the benefit of the family in general. But this only increased his diligence and economy of time, and led to his connection with several literary enterprises, which he had before projected. In conjunction with Mendelssohn he had already commenced (1757) the *Bibliothek der Schonen Wissenschaften*, one of the earliest and best belleslettres journals in the language, which was afterwards continued, till the end of 1805, under the title of the *Neue Bibliothek*, etc. With Lessing and Mendelssohn, he established, in 1759, the *Briefe der Neuesten Literatur*; and in 1765 projected the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, of which periodical he continued to be editor till it reached its 107th volume. At the head of this periodical Nicolai played no unimportant part in that epoch of German history known as “the period of enlightenment.” The truth is, Nicolai possessed great abilities in certain directions. He was an able executive, and knew how to gather about him the best of his country’s talents. The appliances of the Universal German Library” are conceded even by his severest opponents to have been remarkable. It by no means confined itself to home talent. It commanded a survey of the literature of England, Holland, France, and Italy. Whatever

appeared in these lands received its immediate attention, and was reproached or magnified according to its relations to the peculiar creed of Nicolai and his colaborers. And what was this peculiar creed? The sundering of humanity and Christianity. Not the making of Christians in order to have men, but the making of men to become Christians or anything else they chose; and all this was claimed in the name of liberty of thought and of Protestantism. By appealing to the people in the name of the latter Nicolai betrayed an interest in Christianity, but it appears that he simply sought the moral development before he desired the religious training. So long as the work of purifying the public mind from the filth of superstition, and emancipating it from prejudices remained to be done, he labored with most salutary effect for the good of his countrymen in ethical and aesthetical directions; but when the victory over traditional absurdities had been gained, and the positive replenishment of the public mind with a nobler content became the main problem, his influence was most pernicious. An adept of illuminism, his unphilosophical mind was the skillful master of bold and unscrupulous arguments, which he used with great and undue acerbity against all who would oppose him or reject his plans. He was especially violent against the heroes of German philosophy, the very men who labored for the solution of the great problem then before the German people, the substitution of a positive for a negative principle, the part in which, as we have already said above, Nicolai failed. He was opposed by such men as Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Lavater, and Fichte. These men were laboring for the solution of a problem which he misunderstood. Of course they wrote simply in defense, yet they grew hot in the contest; and in determining the historic estimate of Nicolai, these writers should be granted no greater influence than the hostile criticism by Plato and Socrates of the Sophists should have in determining the usefulness of the latter. But let us hear Fichte on Nicolai's view of Protestantism, making due allowance for acerbity of tone in an opponent so decided as Fichte: "His (i.e. Nicolai's) Protestantism was a protestation against all truth which pretended to remain truth; against all that is above our senses, and against every religion which by faith put an end to dispute. To him religion was only a means of education for the head, in order to furnish materials for never-ceasing talk, but by no means a matter of the heart and the life. His liberty of thinking was freedom from all that was and is thought, the licentiousness of empty thinking, without substance and aim. Liberty of judgment was to him the right of every bungler and ignorant man to give his opinion about everything, whether he understood it or not,

and whether or not there was either head or tail in what he said." As to the general influence of the *Bibliothek*, the rationalistic Hase even goes so far as to declare that under Nicolai's management it "exercised an absolute sway as a tribunal of literature, and always exerted its secret influence in opposition to the ancient system of faith, and rejected everything which exceeded the limits of its own bald intelligence and morality. on the ground of a liability either to the reproach of superstition or the suspicion of Jesuitism." The truth is, if we carefully estimate Nicolai's system, we find that it professed to regard Christianity only as a historical development of natural morality and religion, and a popular system of instruction as to the best way to become happy in this world and the next. In consequence of the power possessed by the opposition among the influential classes, and its continued adherence to the general basis of Christianity, it would neither be discarded as a heresy, nor did it attempt to set up a peculiar Church of its own. By the thinkers of Protestantism it was looked upon as simply one among many theological views, and as heterodoxy by the side of orthodoxy. Yet, as Hagenbach has well said of the labors of Nicolai and his associates: "In this pronounced effort towards universal culture and popular illuminism, and in this intellectual activity, who would dare to say there was nothing but vanity and destructive sentiment and effort? Nay, who would deride it with cold and careless presumption, or condemn it with blind zeal? We must frankly confess that, with this perverted tendency, there was also a noble impulse towards something better than European humanity in general had previously possessed—an impulse to escape from the diminutive forms of a contracted and commonplace life into universal humanity, and to attain a safe and joyous consciousness of it. It was a tendency which we still call by the beautiful name of the public good." Nicolai did not contribute much to the *Bibliothek* himself, but the management alone of such a periodical, so largely circulated and read in its day, shows him to have been indefatigable, as in the meanwhile, notwithstanding all his other avocations, he produced many works.' Among these the most important in their bearings on religion and theology are, *Sebaldus Nothanker* (1773, etc.), a sort of religious novel, which had great success, and was translated into English, French, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish; a sharply satirical performance: — *Geschichte eines dicken Mannes* (1794), against the disciples of the Kantish philosophy, to which Nicolai objected that all its new views were incorrect, and all its correct views not new: — *Sempronius Gundibert* (1799), a satire against the Kantians. Besides these there are worthy of our notice, an *Autobiography*,

published in the *Bildnisse jetzt lebender Berliner Gelehrten*; and a work entitled *Ueber meine gelehrte Bildung, uber meine Kenntniss der Kritischen Philosophie und meine Schrifien dieselbe' betreffend, und iiber die Herren Kant, J. B. Erhard, und Fichte* (Berl. 1799). Nicolai died in Berlin in 1811. See Jordan's *Lexikon deutscher Dichter u. Prosaisten* (4:32); Gockingk, *Nicolazis Leben*, etc. (Berlin, 1820); Koberstein, *Gesch. d. deutschen National-Literatur* (in Index); Kurz, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit.* vol. ii; Fichte (J. J.), *Nicolais Leben -u. Sonderbare Meinungen* (Tubing. 1801); Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 539; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 2:118; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:297, 304, 306 sq., 312 sq., 346, 490; 2:178 sq., 263, 280; Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 44. See also the peculiar views of Dr. Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 117, 118.

### Nicolai, Jean

a French Dominican theologian, was born at Monza in 1594. He took the vows of the Dominican Order at the early age of sixteen, and his degree of D.D. at Paris in 1632. For twenty years he filled with high reputation the divinity chair in the house belonging to his order in the Rue St. Jacques, and became its prior in 1661. He spent a considerable portion of his time in commenting on the works of Thomas Aquinas, whose principles he attempted to reconcile with such as widely differ from the genuine notions of the Augustinian school; hence his criticisms have been greatly contested by the followers of Aquinas and St. Augustine. In 1657 he published *S. Thomae A quinatis Expositio continua super quatuor Evangelistas*, etc., in folio, with numerous notes; he afterwards edited the whole in 19 vols. folio. He also published the *Pantheologia* of father Rainer of Pisa (Lyons, 1655, 3 vols. folio). He was also author of *Gallice Dignitas adversus preposterum Catalanice assertorum vindicata*, etc. (Paris, 1664). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 37:959; Niceron, *Memoires*, vol. xiv, s.v.

### Nicolai, Melchior

an eminent German theologian, who flourished near the beginning of the 17th century as a university professor at Tubingen, was identified with the Lutheran controversy which was carried on in his time between the theologians of Giessen and Tubingen concerning the **κένωσις** and **κρύψις** of the divine attributes. The theologians of Tubingen (Luke Osiander, Theodore Thummus, and Melchior Nicolai) supposed that Christ, during

his state of humiliation, continued to possess the divine properties of omnipotence, omnipresence, etc., but concealed them from men. The divines of Giessen (Munzer and Feuerborn) asserted that he voluntarily laid them aside. For further particulars, see Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. ii, pt. i, p. 179 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 4:970 sq.; comp. Thummii **Ταπεινωσιγραφία** *sacra* (Tubing. 1623-4), and Nicolai, *Considerato Theolog.* vol. iv; *Quæstionum controversarum de profundissima* **κενώσει** *Christi* (ibid. 1622, 4to); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:353; Gass, *Gesch. der Prot. Dogmatik*, 1:277.

### Nicolai, Philip

a distinguished German theologian, noted also as a hymnologist, was born at Mengerlinghausen, in the principality of Waldeck, Germany, Aug. 10. 1556. His father was a Lutheran pastor. Philip followed him in his profession, and commenced his ministry in 1576 as assistant to him in his native village. Later he removed to Hardeck, whence he was expelled by the Papists. In 1596 he removed to Unna, in Westphalia. In 1601 he became pastor of St. Catharine's Church, Hamburg, where he died Oct. 26, 1608. While at Unna the city was visited by a fearful pestilence, which carried off more than 1400 persons. His mind becoming greatly affected by the appalling events happening around him, he was led to think much of death, heaven, and eternity. In the study of St. Augustine's *City of God*, and the contemplation of the eternal life, he became so absorbed that he remained cheerful and well in the midst of the surrounding distress. In 1598 he published his meditations for the benefit of others. The work is entitled *Freudenspiegel des ewigen Lebens*, or "The Joyous Mirror of Life Eternal." To this he appended two hymns that speedily gained a remarkable popularity. One has for a title, "Of the Voice at Midnight, and the Wise Virgins who met their Heavenly Bridegroom" — *Wacht ausf ruft uns die Stimme*, or, in the English version:

*“Awake, awake, for night is flying;  
The watchmen on the heights are crying  
Awake, Jerusalem, at last!”*

For this he composed a choral, which was afterwards used in Mendelssohn's "Elijah," to the words, "Sleepers, wake, a voice is calling." His other noted hymn was entitled "A Spiritual Bridal Song of the Believing Soul concerning her Heavenly Bridegroom" — *Wie schon leuchtet der Morgenstern*; in English, "O, morning star, how fair and



bright!" The choral which he composed for this was so popular that it was often chimed by city chimes, and it was invariably used at weddings and certain joyous festivals. These are two of the three hymns which he is known to have written; the third is not preserved. They mark an era in German hymnology. Hitherto the hymns of the Reformation had been distinguished by their simplicity and appropriateness to Church use; their models were the Psalms of the Old Testament, and they were addressed to God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, or to the Holy Trinity; or, in case of hymns of sorrow and penitence, to the Savior. But from the time of these hymns of Nicolai the mystical union of the soul with Christ became a favorite subject, and a class of hymns appeared finding their scriptural ground in the Song of Solomon and the Apocalypse, and called in Germany "Hymns of the Love of Jesus." They are for the most part vivid expressions of the sense of fellowship with Christ, of his presence and tender sympathy, of personal love and gratitude to him, which are among the deepest and truest, and at the same time most secret expressions of the Christian life. Gerhardt, "the prince of German hymnists," belonged to this school. For more than fifty years it gave the prevalent tone to sacred song, and its results are still seen in some of the tenderest and most spiritual hymns in use in the churches. Nicolai's complete works were published in 1617 by Dedekenn, and consist of four volumes in German and one in Latin. Their merits are very unequal. The history of the kingdom of Christ, which he wrote in Latin, and which was translated into German by Ortus in 1598, contains an account of the history of the world and of the Church, compiled from Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Apocalypse, in which he makes, for instance, the locusts (~~Rev~~ Revelation 9:7) to mean the Calvinists, and announces the end of the world for the year 1670. His *Freudenspiegel*, to which we have already referred above, is, on the other hand, a good and remarkable work, the exegesis of which is indeed more fanciful than correct, but which evinces a thoroughly religious and evangelical spirit. In the same strain is his *Theoria vitae ceterne*. The remainder of his works consists of sermons, which are remarkable neither for their form nor for their substance, and of a great number of controversial pieces. The most important of these works are, *Grundfeste d. Ubiquitat* (1604), and *De rebus antiquis Germanicarum gentium* (1578). It is not, however, as a theologian, but as a hymnologist that Nicolai's fame will shine longest in the Christian Church. See Curtze, *Nicolai's Leben u. Lieder* (Halle, 1859); Weis, *Theorie u. Gesch. des Kirchenliedes*; Koch, *Gesch. des*

*Kirchenliedes; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany; Miller, Singers and Songs of the Church; Schaff, Christ in Song.*

## Nicola'itans

(**Νικολαίται**), a class or sect mentioned twice in the New Testament (~~406~~ Revelation 2:6, 15). In the former passage the conduct of the Nicolaitans is condemned; in the latter, the angel of the Church in Pergamus is censured because certain members of his Church held their doctrine. Irenaeus, the first author extant who refers to these passages, says that Nicolas, one of the seven deacons of the Church in Jerusalem (~~406~~ Acts 6:5), was the founder of the sect (*Contra Haeres.* 1:26). But Epiphanius (*Advers. Faeres.* 1:25), with whom Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, and other fathers agree, says that Nicolas had a beautiful wife, and, following the counsels of perfection, he separated himself from her; but not being able to persevere in his resolution, he returned to her again, as a dog to his vomit; and not only so, but justified his conduct by licentious principles, which laid the foundation of the sect of the Nicolaitans. But the practice of putting away wives for the sake of sanctity belongs to a later period; nor can we conceive that taking back his wife would be considered a crime, in view of Paul's instructions (~~406~~ 1 Corinthians 7:3, 6). Suspicion is thrown on the whole passage by the further statement of Epiphanius, that *all the Gnostics* derived their origin from Nicolas; which is too absurd for controversy. Clement of Alexandria has preserved a different version of the story (*Strom.* 3:4, p. 522, ed. Potter), which Eusebius copies from him (*Hist. Eccles.* 3:29), and which is repeated by Augustine and other ancient writers: "The apostles," they say, "reprehended Nicolas for jealousy of his wife, who was beautiful; whereupon Nicolas produced her, and said, Any one might marry her who pleased. In this affair the deacon let fall the expression, 'that we should abuse the flesh;' which, though employed in a good sense by him, was perverted to a bad one by those who would gain to their licentiousness the sanction of a respectable name, and who from thence styled themselves Nicolaitans." Who can believe that a sect should take its rise and its name from a casual expression by a man whose obvious sense and whose conduct were opposed to the peculiarities of the sect? Grotius supposes that Nicolas, being reproved for jealousy of those Christians who saluted his wife with the kiss of peace, ran at once to the other extreme, and imitated the custom of the Lacedaemonians and of Cato, permitting others to have intercourse with her, affirming that it was no crime when both

parties consented. This is improbable, and unsupported by testimony. Nor is there sufficient evidence to connect the Nicolaitans of the apostolic age in any way with the Gnostics of succeeding centuries. The ingenious conjecture of Michaelis is worthy of consideration, who supposes that by Nicolaitans (<sup><6616></sup>Revelation 2:6, 15) the same class of persons is intended whom Peter (<sup><6025></sup>2 Peter 2:15) describes *as followers of the way of Balaam*; and that their name, Nicolaitans, is merely a Greek translation of their Hebrew designation, the noun Νικόλαος (from νικάω and λαός) being a literal version of מ[ ] בַּאֲרַם that is, מ[ ] אֲבִי, *the master of the people*; or, according to another derivation, *the devourer of the people* (so Hengstenberg, as if from אֲבִי בַּאֲרַם). **SEE BALAAM**. The custom of translating names, which prevailed so extensively in modern Europe, was undoubtedly practiced also among the Jews, as the example in <sup><4026></sup>Acts 9:36 (to which others might be added) shows. Accordingly, the Arabic version, published by Erpenius, renders the words τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, *the works of the Shuaibites*, the Arabic *Shuaib* being apparently the name for Balaam. The whole analogy of the mode of teaching which lays stress on the significance of names would lead us to look, not for philological accuracy, but for a broad, strongly marked *paronomasia*, such as men would recognize and accept. It would be enough for those who were to hear the message that they should perceive the meaning of the two words to be identical. Cocceius (*Cogitat. in* <sup><6616></sup>*Revelation 2:6*) has the credit of being the first to suggest this identification of the Nicolaitans with the followers of Balaam. It has been adopted by the elder Vitringa (*Dissert. de Argum. Epist. Petriposter. in Hase's Thesaurus, 2:987*), Hengstenberg (in loc.), Stier (*Words of the Risen Lord, p. 125, Engl. transl.*), and others. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. in Act. Apost. 6:5*) suggests another and more startling *paronomasia*. The word, in his view, was chosen, as identical in sound with אֲלֵנוּ *let us eat*," and as thus marking out the special characteristic of the sect. The only objection against this identification arises from the circumstance that in the passage <sup><6614></sup>Revelation 2:14, 15 both "they that hold the doctrine of Balaam" and "the Nicolaitans" are specified apparently as distinct. Yet even there the collocation of the two classes of heretics seems to imply some agreement between them, though not identity. See Janus, *De Nicolaitis*; Heumann, *De Nicol. e Catol. Haereticor. expung. in Acta. Eruditorum* (1712), p. 179 sq.; Storr, *Apol. der Offenbar. p. 260*; Miinscher, *Ueber die Nicol. in Gabl. Journal, v. 17 sq.*; Scheffler Tiburtius, *De Nicol.* (1825).

“We are now in a position to form a clearer judgment of the characteristics of the sect. It comes before us as presenting the ultimate phase of a great controversy, which threatened at one time to destroy the unity of the Church, and afterwards to taint its purity. The controversy itself was inevitable as soon as the Gentiles were admitted, in any large numbers, into the Church of Christ. Were the new converts to be brought into subjection to the whole Mosaic law? Were they to give up their old habits of life altogether to withdraw entirely from the social gatherings of their friends and kinsmen? Was there not the risk, if they continued to join in them, of their eating, consciously or unconsciously, of that which had been slain in the sacrifices of a false worship, and of thus sharing in the idolatry? The apostles and elders at Jerusalem met the question calmly and wisely. The burden of the law was not to be imposed on the Gentile disciples. They were to abstain, among other things, from ‘meats offered to idols’ and from ‘fornication’ (<sup>445D</sup>Acts 15:20, 29), and this decree was welcomed as the great charter of the Church’s freedom. Strange as the close union of the moral and the positive commands may seem to us, it did not seem so to the synod at Jerusalem. The two sins were very closely allied, often even in the closest proximity of time and place. The fathomless impurity which overspread the empire made the one almost as inseparable as the other from its daily social life. The messages to the Churches of Asia and the later Apostolic Epistles (2 Peter and Jude) indicate that the two evils appeared at that period also in close alliance. The teachers of the Church branded them with a name which expressed their true character. The men who did and taught such things were followers of Balaam (<sup>6125</sup>2 Peter 2:15; Jude 11). They, like the false prophet of Pethor, united brave words with evil deeds. They made their ‘liberty’ a cloak at once for cowardice and licentiousness. In a time of persecution, when the eating or not eating of things sacrificed to idols was more than ever a crucial test of faithfulness, they persuaded men more than ever that it was a thing indifferent (<sup>6123</sup>Revelation 2:13, 14). This was bad enough, but there was a yet worse evil. Mingling themselves in the orgies of idolatrous feasts, they brought the impurities of those feasts into the meetings of the Christian Church. There was the most imminent risk that its Agapae might be come as full of abominations as the Bacchanalia of Italy had been (<sup>6122</sup>2 Peter 2:12, 13, 18; Jude 7, 8; comp. Livy, 39:8-19). Their sins had already brought scandal and discredit on the ‘way of truth.’ All this was done, it must be remembered, not simply as an indulgence of appetite, but as part of a system, supported by a ‘doctrine,’ accompanied by the boast of a prophetic

illumination (<sup>401B</sup>2 Peter 2:1). The trance of the son of Beor and the sensual debasement into which he led the Israelites were strangely reproduced. These were the characteristics of the followers of Balaam, and worthless as most of the traditions. about Nicolas may be, they point to the same distinctive evils. Even in the absence of any teacher of that name, it would be natural enough, as has been shown above, that the Hebrew name of ignominy should have its Greek equivalent. If there were such a teacher, whether the proselyte of Antioch or another, the application of the name of his followers would be proportionately more pointed. It confirms the view which has been taken of their character to find that stress is laid in the first instance on the deeds' of the Nicolaitans. To hate those deeds is a sign of life in a Church that otherwise is weak and faithless (<sup>406B</sup>Revelation 2:6). To tolerate them is well nigh to forfeit the glory of having been faithful under persecution (<sup>404B</sup>Revelation 2:14,15). Comp. Neander's *Apostelgesch.* p. 620; Gieseler's *Eccl. Hist.* § 29; Alford on <sup>406B</sup>Revelation 2:6." See Neander, *Ch. fist.* 1:452; Guericke, *Anc. Ch. Hist.* p. 179; Killen, *Anc. Ch.* p. 206; Burton, *Eccl. Hist. 1st Century*, p. 274, 278, 281, 301, 303, 305; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 35. **SEE NICOLAS.**

## Nic'olas

(**Νικόλαος**, *conqueror of the people*; comp. Nicodemus), a native of Antioch, and a proselyte to the Jewish faith, who, when the Church was still confined to Jerusalem, became a convert; and being a man of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, he was chosen by the whole multitude of the disciples to be one of the first seven deacons, and he was ordained by the apostles (<sup>406B</sup>Acts 6:5), A.D. 29. The name Balaam is perhaps (but see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 210) capable of being interpreted as a Hebrew equivalent of the Greek Nicolas. Some commentators think that this is alluded to by John in Rev. 2:14; and Vitranga (*Obs, Sacr.* 4:9) argues forcibly in support of this opinion. **SEE BALAAM.**

"A sect of Nicolaitans is mentioned in <sup>406B</sup>Revelation 2:6, 15; and it has been questioned whether this Nicolas was connected with them, and, if so, how closely. The Nicolaitans themselves, at least as early as the time of Irenaeus (*Contr. Her.* 1:26, § 3), seem to have claimed him as their founder. Epiphanius, an inaccurate writer, relates (*Adv. Hear.* 1:2, § 25, p. 76) some details of the life of Nicolas the deacon, and describes him as gradually sinking into the grossest impurity, and becoming the originator of the Nicolaitans and other immoral sects. Stephen Gobar (*Photii Biblioth.* § 232, p. 291, ed. 1824) states — and the statement is corroborated by the

recently discovered *Philosophumena*, bk. vii, § 36) . — that Hippolytus agreed with Epiphanius in his unfavorable view of Nicolas. The same account was believed, at least to some extent, by Jerome (*Ep.* 147, vol. i, p. 1082, ed. Vallars, etc.) and other writers in the 4th century. But it is irreconcilable with the traditionary account of the character of Nicolas, given by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii 4, p. 187, Sylb. and apud Euseb. *H. E.* 3:29; see also Hammond, *Annot. ol Rev.* 2:4), an earlier and more discriminating writer than Epiphanius. He states that Nicolas led a chaste life, and brought up his children in purity; that on a certain occasion, having been sharply reprov'd by the apostles as a jealous husband, he repelled the charge by offering to allow his wife to become the wife of any other person, and that he was in the habit of repeating a saying which is ascribed to the apostle Matthias also that it is our duty to fight against the flesh and to abuse (παράχρησθαί) it. His words were perversely interpreted by the Nicolaitans as an authority for their immoral practices. Theodoret (*Haeret.* 'ab. 3:1), in his account of the sect, repeats the foregoing statement of Clement, and charges the Nicolaitans with false dealing in borrowing the name of the deacon. Ignatius, who was contemporary with Nicolas, is said by Stephen Gobar to have given the same account as Clement, Eusebius, and Theodoret, touching the personal character of Nicolas. Among modern critics Cotelieru:, in a note on *Constit. Apost.* 6:8, after reciting the various authorities, seems to lean towards the favorable view of the character of Nicolas. Professor Burton (*Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, lect. 12, p. 364, ed. 1833) is of opinion that the origin of the term Nicolaitans is uncertain, and that 'though Nicolas the deacon has been mentioned as their founder, the evidence is extremely slight which would convict that person himself of any immoralities.' Tillemont (*H. E.* 2:47), possibly influenced by the fact that no honor is paid to the memory of Nicolas by any branch of the Church, allows perhaps too much weight to the testimony against him; rejects peremptorily Cassian's statement — to which Neander (*Planting of the Church*, bk. v, p. 390, ed. Bohn) gives his adhesion — that some other Nicolas was the founder of the sect; and concludes that if not the actual founder, he was so unfortunate as to give occasion to the formation of the sect by his indiscreet speaking. Grotius's view, as given in a note on *Rev.* 2:6, is substantially the same as that of Tillemont." For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 46, 74, 77. **SEE NICOLAITANS.**

## Nicolas, Pere

a French preacher, was born in Dijon. His family name was *Peltret*. He belonged to the Order of Capuchins, and filled the offices of delinitor and provincial. He died in 1649 at Lyons. We have of his works, *L'Esprit du Chretien ecclesiastique et religieux* (Lyons, 1638, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Panegyriques ur les mysteres de Notre-Seigneur et de la Sainte Vierge* (ibid. 1688, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Panegyriques dessaints* (ibid. 1693. 2 vols. fol.): — Sermons under different titles (ibid. 1685 to 1696, 14 vols. 8vo). His *Careme* has been translated into Italian (Venice, 1730, 2 vols. 4to). See Denis de Genes, *Bibl. des Capucins*; Papillon, *Bibl. des auteurs e Bouirgogne*.

## Nicolas Of Amiens,

a scholastic philosopher, was born in the 12th century, probably in the French city after which he is surnamed. He is sometimes confounded with a cardinal Nicolas who flourished near the opening of the 12th century. It is a question, too, whether he be not the same person as a disciple of Gilbert de la Porre, discovered by Martene and Durand in their second *Voyage litteraire*, and designated by a manuscript note as having expounded more clearly the opinions of his master. It would seem, however, that there is little ground for this supposition likewise, for a disciple of Gilbert de'la Porree would not have failed to use in his books, as M. Petit-Radel has well pointed out, the sophistical language of 'the school,' from which the writings of Nicolas appear free. It is possible, nevertheless, that he may have been one of the disciples of this illustrious master. We have few other hints regarding the life of Nicolas d'Amiens. A letter of Alexander III tells us that about the year, 1165 he still possessed no benefice. A prebend had been promised to Nicolas by Thierry, bishop of Amiens, and when Thierry was suddenly removed by death, the pope ordered his successor, Robert, to fulfill immediately this promise. Nicolas enjoyed great credit at Rome. But by what services he had gained the powerful patronage of Alexander we are unable to say. Nicolas died after 1204. His writings now known are a *Chronique*, signalized by Mountfaucon in the library of the Vatican, and a treatise contained in the same library, also in the imperial library at Paris, under the title of *Arsfidei catholicae*. This treatise has never been published. It is contained in MS. No. 6506. It commences with these words: "Incipit prologus in *Artemfidei catholicae*, editam a Nicolao Andranensi." In the prologue the author addresses himself to pope Clement

III (1187 to 1191), which tells us at what date Nicolas d'Amiens composed his book. The object of the work is to oppose a barrier to the invasion of heresies, and the author declares that he will use only arguments of a logical order to combat them. Formerly, it is true, they were confuted by the authority of the Scriptures. But the Scriptures have fallen into contempt; henceforth everything must be proved according to the principles of Aristotle, and to make faith agree with reason. It is an undertaking from which the author does not shrink. He divides his treatise into five books: the first is upon the Supreme Cause; the second, upon the world, the angels, the creation of man, and free will; the third, upon the Son of God; the fourth, upon the sacraments; the fifth, upon the resurrection. At the commencement of each book, following a procedure peculiar to himself, he places several series of definitions, of theses, of universally admitted propositions (*communes animi conceptiones*), which shall serve as foundations to his theorems. Then he reasons in this manner. The definition of Cause is thus conceived: "Cause is that which gives being to another object called the *Caused*." The first universally admitted proposition is this: "Everything derives its being from the generating principle of the Cause." The first theorem is this: "All that which is the cause of the cause is the cause of the caused; either, for example, the caused A, its cause B, or the cause of B C." In first declaring the definition of Cause, he infers the hypothesis, the first proposition twice reproduced, and again the definition of Cause. Thus the theorem is demonstrated. That said, the author passes to the following theorem, which he demonstrates in still briefer terms. His fourth theorem (book first) is thus conceived: "Neque subjectam materiam sine forma, neque formam sine subjecta materia actu posse esse." This is a rash proposition, it conforms, it is true, to the principles of Aristotle; Aristotle does not admit the actuality of the first of forms, the soul, to the state of a separate substance: but is Nicolas d'Amiens of the same opinion? No, undoubtedly not. Here, then, he declares a proposition, all the consequences of which he does not suspect. At the same time it is certain that he rejects the thesis of matter without form, considered as anterior in order of generation to unformed matter; which is the thesis of the Platonicians, reproduced later by Duns Scotus. Nicolas d'Amiens is a very moderate realist, inasmuch as realism had just been condemned by the Church in the person of his master, Gilbert de la Porree. He prudently expresses himself upon the theorem of the divine attributes: "Deus est potentia qua dicitur potens, sapientia qua dicitur sapiens, caritas qua diligens; caeteraque nomina qua divinam naturam



dicuntur competere, de Deo licet improprie pmedicant divinam essentiam.” These are the express terms of St. Bernard arguing against Gilbert de la Porree before the Council of Rheims. See *Hist. litt. de la France*, xvii, 1.

### Nicolas, Cabasilas.

*SEE CABASILAS.*

### Nicolas, De Champagne

a French Benedictine monk, was born in the beginning of the 12th century. After having embraced a religious life in the abbey, of Moutier-Ramey, near Troyes, he went to Clairvaux in 1145, and there became one of the secretaries of St. Bernard. He was an able man, educated, learned, who expressed himself in Latin with much elegance; but, according to St. Bernard, he made a bad use of his knowledge and his talent. At last, after having committed numberless thefts, he left Clairvaux in 1151, and the illustrious abbe was obliged to denounce him to pope Eugenius as a robber of books and of money, and as a forger. His principal artifice was, according to this report, to write letters in the interest of persons who paid him for his services, and to affix to these letters false seals. It is believed that he retired to England. He, however, afterwards turned up in Moutier-Ramey, enjoying there the best reputation. He was patronized, recommended, and spoken of in the most honorable terms by popes Hadrian IV and Alexander III, and became secretary or chancellor of the count of Champagne. Henry the Liberal. Possibly he was wrongfully accused by St. Bernard, whose habitual vivacity may well be suspected of some anger, and consequently of some injustice. Nicolas died after 1176. We have of his works *Lettres*, to the, number of fifty-five, which have been published in the *Bibliothèque des Peres*, vol. 21. His *Sermons*, to the number of nineteen, are found in the *Biblioth. de Citeaux*, vol. 3 See *St. Bernardi Epistoke*, passim; *Hist. litt. de la France*, xiii, 553.

### Nicolas De Clemanges.

*SEE CLEMANGES.*

### Nicolas De Cusa.

*SEE CUSA.*

## Nicolas, Van Egmond

a Dutch theologian, was born in the County of Egmond near the close of the 15th century. He entered the Order of the Carmelites, took his degrees at Louvain, and was there received as doctor in theology. He distinguished himself by the bitterness of his words in his disputes with Erasmus. The pulpit was his arena; and when pope Hadrian VI imposed silence upon him, Egmond vented his wrath in anonymous libels. Erasmus, who frequently speaks of him in his letters, seems not much more moderate in regard to him, and describes him thus: “Homo natura fatuus, nec admodum doctus, moribus immanis, prae fracti animi impotenti impetu,” etc. He died in 1527. The following distich, in the form of an epitaph, was made against Nicolas:

*“Hic jacet Egmondus telluris inutile pondus;  
Dilexit rabiem, non habeat requiem.”*

See Erasmus, *Epistolce*; Paquot, *Mmnzaires*.

## Nicolas De Flavigny,

a French prelate, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. We find him at first dean of the church of Laugres in 1229. He had doubtless gained great renown by his learning and his character, for in that year (February 20), the Church of Besançon having been agitated by grave discords for two years, Gregory IX selected Nicolas de Flavigny to put an end to them, and made him archbishop. This choice resulted in removing the multitude of competitors, whose ambitious conspiracies had caused much scandal, and in restoring peace to the Church of Besançon. But scarcely was Nicolas established in his metropolitan chair than he was besieged by more turbulent agitators. They were the citizens of Besançon, his subjects and vassals, according to the feudal law, who, again insurgent, had pronounced the fall of his temporal authority. The citizens of Besançon were determined to conquer their independence; with this design they had already exiled one of their archbishops, and would persecute others: of all the adversaries who could oppose Nicolas, they were the most dangerous. He could not reduce them without having recourse to the emperor. Nicolas, at this formidable juncture, went to the emperor, claimed his titles, his rights, and obtained from Frederick II, in the month of December, 1231, a diploma full of menaces against the confederate citizens. They submitted, but with the firm resolution of again attempting to gain their civil independence. Thibault de Rougemont, viscount of Besançon, also

had great controversies with our archbishop. This viscount had arrogated to himself divers rights in the city formerly exercised by the metropolitan authority. Nicolas summoned him before his tribunal, and demanded an account of his abuses. The viscount at first resisted; yet as his power was not as formidable as that of the citizens, Nicolas himself, without the aid of the emperor, soon brought him to sign a formal disavowal of his pretensions. This occurred in 1232. About the same time Nicolas, having difficulty with the count de Montbeliard, who had permitted some usurpation of the domains of the monks of Lure, hesitated not to excommunicate him. Nicolas, then, was evidently a vigilant and firm prelate. In the month of August, 1235, he was in Mayence, where, as prince of the empire, he sat in the councils of Frederick II. He died Sept. 7, 1235, while returning from this city. In the last century, a manuscript work of Nicolas de Flavigny was found preserved at Citeaux, entitled *Concordiat' Evangeliorum Nicolai Crisopolitani*. It is not known where this work is now stored. The authors of the *Histoire litteraire de la France* have omitted the name of this writer. See Dunod de Charnage, *Histoire de l'Agglise de Besangon*, 1:196; Huillard Brehoilles, *Hist. Diplom. Frederici II*, vol. iv; *Gallia Christiana vetus*, vol. i.

### Nicolas De Flue.

SEE FLUE.

### Nicolas Von Hof

(NICOLAUS A CURIA), better known as *Nicolaus Decius*, a contemporary of Luther, was, like him, first a monk in connection with the Romish Church. From 1519 to 1522 he was prior of the monastery at Steterburg, in Wolfenbittel. In July, 1522, he left his position, because he had joined in the Reformation, and went to Brunswick, where Gottschalk Cruse or Crusius, a personal friend of Luther, especially attracted him by his evangelical preaching. For a time Nicolas occupied himself as a schoolmaster at Brunswick, but in 1523 he became a Lutheran pastor at Stettin, where he died, March 21, 1541. He is best known as the author of two hymns, which are still in use in the German Church, and have also been translated into English. The one, the most celebrated of his hymns, is his "Allein Gott in der Hoh' sei Ehr," said to be a free rendering of the old *hymnus angelicus*, "Gloria in excelsis Deo," which in its Greek version, Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ, had very early come into use in the Eastern

Church as the “great doxology,” and was introduced into the Latin Church about the year 360 by St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers (q.v.). The German version was published in 1529, and was designed to take the place of the Latin “Gloria.” An English translation is to be found in the *Moravian Hymn-book*, No. 165, where it is erroneously ascribed to Selnecker (“To God on high all glory be”). The other hymn, a very popular communion hymn, is his “O Lamm Gottes unschuldig,” based on ~~402~~ John 1:29, and founded on the ancient Latin hymn, “Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.” It is translated in Jacobi’s *Psalmodia Germanica*, 1:16 (“O Lamb of God, our Savior”) (London, 1722), and by Porter in Schaff’s *Christ in Song*, p. 583. See Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 1:419 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v. Decius; Miller, *Singers and Songs of the Church* (London, 1869), p. 38; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 19:402; *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben* (published by Schneider, Berlin, 1856); Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz*, p. 1327, s.v. (B. P.)

### Nicolas De Lyra.

SEE LYRA.

### Nicolas De Narbonne,

superior-general of the Carmelite Order, was born in Narbonne, or, as some suppose, in Toulouse. He was elected vicar-general of the order in the Eastern countries in the year 1250, and superior or prior-general of all the congregation, after the death of Simon Stock, in 1265. Almost all the other circumstances of his life are unknown, or related in terms which render them doubtful. Thus several writers of the order, in collecting obscure traditions, have even attributed to him miracles. His principal and most authentic title to celebrity is a work still unpublished, which the bibliographers call *Sagitta ignea* (the fiery arrow). As he recounts in it, in terms full of bitterness, the faults, the disorders of the Oriental Carmelites, and the misfortunes which have been their just punishment, this work has been several times quoted by the enemies of monastic institutions. See *Catal. Bibl. Cotton.* p. 90; *Hist. litter. de la France*, 19:129.

### Nicolas, Henri

a Dutch Anabaptist, was born in Leyden towards the close of the 15th century. We have few details of his life. We encounter him as the Anabaptist leader after Joris had retired from that position. Nicolas

believed himself, called to found a new religion, which he named the *House of Love*. He declared himself superior to Moses, who had taught only hope, — also to Christ, who had preached only faith, while he, Nicolas, brought to men the doctrine of charity. That did “not prevent him, however, from excluding from eternal happiness all those who would not believe in him. His principles, expressed by himself in some writings, such as the *Evangelium regni*, *Sententiae documentales*, *Prophetia spiritus amoris*, *Pacis super terram publicatio*, etc., found some adherents among the lower people of Holland. In 1540 he engaged in a discussion with T. H. Volkard Kornheert, who also wished to establish a new faith. In the last quarter of the 16th century, the sect of Familists, *SEE ANABAPTIST*, which had become his followers, after David Joris abandoned them, but was not numerous, endeavored to make proselytes in England. They joined themselves to the Dutch congregation in London; but the severe edicts pronounced against them by queen Elizabeth rendered their attempts at proselytism futile, and they soon died out. See Hoornbeck, *Summa controversiarum*; Altling, *Theologia Historica*; Camden, *Annales* (annee 1580); Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* 9:3, § 38; Wright, *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, 2:153. (J. H. W.)

### Nicolas, Michel

a Protestant French Rationalist, was born May 22, 1810, in Nimes. After having studied at Geneva and Strasburg, he completed his education by visiting, from 1833 to 1834, the German universities of Halle, Berlin, and Heidelberg. He was nominated suffragan pastor at Bordeaux in June, 1834, and pastor in title at Metz in 1835; he afterwards went to Montauban, where from 1838 he occupied the chair of philosophy in the faculty of Protestant theology. Deeply versed in the Oriental languages and ecclesiastical matters, he is justly regarded as one of the most instructive and laborious writers of the Reformed Church of France. He died in 1874. We have of his works, *Instruction Chretienne a l'usage des catechumenes* (Metz, 1838, 18mo): — *Reponse a la Lettre de l'abbe Lacordaire sur le saint siege* (ibid. 1838, 8vo): — *De la Destination du savant et de l'homme de lettres* (Paris, 1838, 8vo), translated from the German of Fichte: — *De l'Eclectisme* (Paris, 1840, 8vo), a refutation of the attacks of Pierre Leroux: — *Quelques considerations sur le pantheisme* (ibid. 1842, 8vo), translated into English: — *Jean-Bon Saint Andre, sa vie et ses ecrits* (ibid. 1848, 12mo), this notice contains two articles of that conventionalist, and among other things the recital of his captivity upon the shores of the

Black Sea: — *Introduction a l'étude de l'histoire de philosophie* (ibid. 1849-50, 2 vols. 8vo): *Considerations generales sur Videe et le developpement historique de la philosophie Chretienne* (ibid. 1851, 8vo), translated from the German of H. Ritter: — *Notice sur la vie et les ecrits de Laurent Angliviel de La Beaumene* (ibid. 1852, 8vo), which was sharply criticised by M. Nizard in the *Athenaeum* of Oct. 8, 1853: — *Histoire Litteraire de Nimes* (Nimes, 1854, 3 vols. 12mo): — *Histoire des artistes nes dans le departement du Gard* (ibid. 1859, 12mo): — *Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siecles anterieurs & l'ere Chretienne* (Paris, 1860, 8vo): — *Etudes critiques sur la Bible* (1862), a work of great merit for its scholarly treatment of the subject, and containing perhaps the clearest account of the controversy regarding the authorship of the Pentateuch as carried on between the school of De Wette and Ewald and the extreme Rationalists about 1835 in Germany. Prof. Nicolas may be classed among the moderate Rationalists, together with Colani and Coquerel, yet he had much that was akin to the conservative spirit of Pressense. M. Michel Nicolas founded, in connection with Messrs. Michelant and Emile Begin, *L'Austrasie, revue de la Moselle*, in which he inserted several articles; and he contributed to different periodical publications, such as *L'Evangeliste*, *Le libre Examen*, *La Revue theologique*, of Montauban; *La Revue de thologie*, of Strasburg; *Le Courrier du Gard*. *Le Bulletin de la Societe du Protestantisme Frangais*, *La Liberte de penser*) *La Revue Germanique*, etc. He was also one of the collaborators of the *Nouvelle Biographie Generale*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 37:1015; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 304, 448. (J. H.W.)

### Nicolaus Of Constantinople,

an Eastern prelate of note, flourished near the opening of the 12th century. He was patriarch from A.D. 1084 to 1111, and wrote several decrees and letters, of which an account is given by Cave (*Hist. Lit.* 2:156, ed. Basil.). See also Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:285.

### Nicolaus, Hagiotheodoretus

an Eastern prelate, flourished as archbishop of Athens in the 12th century, in the reign of Manuel Comnenus. He is known as the author of a commentary on the Basilica. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:633; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

## Nicole, Nicolas

a French architect, noted in ecclesiastical architecture, was born of poor parents at Besancon in 1701. He was first apprenticed to a blacksmith; but on visiting Paris he determined to relinquish his occupation, entered the free school of Blondel, and after studying some time under that master he returned to Besancon, and was commissioned to erect the church of Refuge, of which the beautiful facade has often been engraved. He afterwards executed the plan for the collegiate church of St. Anne of Soleure, and was invited by the authorities of that city to superintend the execution of the work. The church of the Magdalen, at Besancon, is also the work of Nicole, but it was not completed. These two latter works have been justly criticized as to the details. Nicole had a very lively imagination, and drew his designs with great facility; but his edifices have none of that ever-attractive simplicity which pre-eminently distinguishes the antique. Nicole was honored with the confidence of several successive intendants of the. province of Franche-Comte, and was consulted concerning all architectural projects. He died at Besancon in 1784.

## Nicole, Pierre

a celebrated Jansenist, and distinguished inmate of Port-Royal (q.v.), was born at Chartres, France, Oct. 19, 1625. At the age of fourteen, when he is said to have had a complete command of:Greek and Latin, his father sent him to Paris to study philosophy and theology. Here he became acquainted with the recluses of Port-Royal, who, desirous of attaching to themselves a man of such promise, induced him to join their order. Nicole began then to devote part of his time to the instruction of the youth brought up in that institution. After studying theology for three years he applied for a license; but the principles he had imbibed were not approved, either by the theological faculty or Paris, or that of any other Roman Catholic university, and he had to remain content with the degree of B.A., which he took in 1649. The leisure now forced upon him by want of employment by the state he devoted to the interests of the community of Port Royal, where he resided a while, and helped Dr. Arnaud, *SEE ARNAUD* in writing several works in defense of Jansenius, and of his doctrine. In 1664 Nicole went with Arnaud to Chatillon, near Paris, where he wrote against the Calvinists and the relaxed Casuists, for the avowed purpose, according to Jervis, of giving public proof of his zeal for the true faith. In 1676 Nicole was induced to seek again for holy orders. He was refused the necessary

consent by the bishop of Chartres, who disapproved of Nicole's Jansenistic opinions. Nicole was, however, evidently rather rejoiced than annoyed at thus being afforded an excuse for remaining in a position where he was not too near the van in the battle of controversy. Yet in his own province, as a clerical and polemical logician, he was bold and uncompromising; and it was not from the defense of his principles, but from their too conspicuous championship, that he shrunk. In consequence of a letter he had addressed to pope Innocent XI for the bishops of St. Pons and Arras, and of the death of the duchess of Longueville, the most zealous protector of the Jansenists, he was obliged to leave France in 1679, and retired to Belgium. He came back, however, in 1683, and took a great part in two celebrated quarrels of the time — that of the studies suited to monastic institutions, where he joined Mabillon in defending devotion to science and learning in place of pure asceticism; and that concerning *quietism*, in which he opposed the devotees of that mental epidemic. He was a man of simple habits and candid mind, and some ludicrous incidents have been told arising out of his absence of mind. He died Nov. 11, 1695. His works are many and voluminous. He was the principal author of *La Logique, ou 'Art de Penser* (1668), known as the Port-Royal Logic. Of the first three volumes of *La Perpetuite de la Foi de l'Eglise Cwaholipue touchani l'Eucharistie*, which is generally associated with the name of Arnaud, Nicole is known to have been the principal writer (see Jervis, 2:14,15). Hume admired the logical clearness with which Nicole in this work showed the impossibility of one mind sufficiently examining all subjects connected with religion to form a creed for itself on the principle of private judgment; and stated that the difficulty so ingeniously set forth suggested to him the skeptical argument in his 'Dialogues on Natural Religion.' Nicole's principal works are, '*es imaginaires et les visionnaires, ou lettres sur 'hersie imaginaire* [Anon.] (h Mons, 1693, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Pensees* (Paris, 1806, 18mo): — *Traite de la grace genrale* (1715, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Epigrammatum delectus* (1659, 12mo): — *Essais de Morale, contenus en divers traites sur plusieurs devoirs importants* (Paris, 1733, etc. 25 vols. in 26, 12mo), which is an able exposition of the subject from the Cartesian' stand-point. See Goujet, *Hist. de la vie et des ouvrages de Nicole* (1733, 12mo); Besoigne, *Vie de Nicole (Hist. du Port-Royal, vol. iv)*; Saverien, *Vies des Philosophes Modernes* (vol. i); Niceron, *Memoires*, 29:285-333; *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* etc. s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France* (Lond. 1872, 2 vols. 8vo), 2:14 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. ii,



§ 228, p. 324; and the literature appended to the article PORT-ROYAL  
*SEE PORT-ROYAL* . (J. N. P.)

### Nicolettus, Paulus

an Augustinian monk of Udine in Frauli, also called *Venetus* from his long residence in Venice, studied at Oxford in 1390, was distinguished as a philosopher and subtle theologian, became general of his order in 1412, taught in the principal universities of France and Italy, and theology at Perugia in 1427, and died at Venice or Padua, June 5, 1428. He wrote a number of theological treatises; see Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Nicoll, Alexander

a noted English prelate, was born in 1793. He was canon of Christ Church and regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, and was noted for his knowledge of the Oriental tongues. While sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library he drew up a catalogue of the MSS. brought from the East by Dr. E. D. Clarke, which was published, and gained him great reputation. He also undertook and nearly completed the general catalogue of the Eastern MSS. begun about one hundred years before by Uri. After his death a volume of his sermons was published with a memoir (1830, 8vo). Nicoll died Sept. 24, 1828. See Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, 4:92; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Author.*, vol. ii, s.v.

### Nicoll, Robert

an English writer of poetry of a religious coloring, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1814. He worked too hard and too fast for his constitution, and paid the penalty by an early death, which occurred in 1837. He published a volume of *Songs and Lyrics* (1835). A second volume of his poems, with numerous additions and a memoir of his life, was published by Mrs. Johnstone (1842, 12mo; 3d ed. 1852, 12mo; 4th ed. 1857, 12mo). Among his best pieces are "We are Brethren" and "Thoughts of Heaven." See *Tait's Magazine*, 1842; *Westminster Rev.* 37:219 sq. Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Nicolle, Charles-Dominique,

a French educator of note, was born in Pissy-Poville Aug. 4, 1758. He commenced his studies in the College of Rouen, and came to Paris to finish them in the College of Sainte-Barbe, where he was professor and prefect

when the Revolution broke out. Being then charged with the education of the son of M. de Choiseul-Gouffier, in 1790 Nicolle conducted this pupil to his father, ambassador from France to Constantinople. Three years after Nicolle went to St. Petersburg, and there founded a boarding-school, which soon attracted the children of the first noble families of that capital, and in the direction of which he was aided by other French ecclesiastics. particularly by the abbe Pierre Nicolas Salandre, who died vicar-general of Paris July 18, 1839. The duke de Richelieu, founder and governor of Odessa, called the abbe Nicolle to that city, who was then given by the emperor Alexander the title of visitor of all the Catholic churches of Southern Russia. Later Nicolle became the director of the Richelieu Lyceum, and he displayed an admirable devotion during a frightful pestilence which desolated Odessa in 1812. Certain business took him again to Paris in 1817, and Louis XVIII appointed him one of his honorary almoners. On his return to Russia, the abbe Nicolle was so much annoyed by the Russian clergy, jealous of his success, that he laid down his commission and returned to France, where he received in 1820 the title of member of the Royal Council of Public Instruction. Feb. 27, 1821, he became rector of the Academy of Paris, and co-operated with his brother in restoring a house of education destined to replace the ancient College of Sainte-Barbe, and which has become the College Rollin. The rectorship of abbe Nicolle furnishes a curious episode in the history of French public instruction. Nov. 18, 1822, he presided for the first time over the opening session of the medical faculty, where Desgenettes pronounced the funeral eulogy of Dr. Halle, an incumbent, like himself, of the medical chair. The students had never seen abbe Nicolle, whom, however, they knew by reputation as the particular friend of the duke de Richelieu, then very unpopular in his capacity of responsible minister. This agitated figure which they saw in the presidential chair, instead of the manly and fearless form of Cuvier, excited at first whisperings and murmurs. Where it was necessary to impress respect upon a hostile and almost seditious audience, the abbe flattered through weakness, promising his good will to this undisciplined crowd, who did not wish it, and who replied by furious clamors to the obsequious discourse which the rector timidly delivered. Desgenettes came afterwards, and, far from calming, only exasperated the malicious passions which animated the assembly. One phrase, in which the orator alluded to the Christian death of Prof. Halle, was awkwardly repeated by him three times, and, exaggerated by gestures, increased the exhibition of a scandalous dislike. No poor comedy was ever more hissed. A few days

after, the School of Medicine was disbanded, and illustrious professors were forever excluded from it, with the exception of Desgenettes and Antoine Dubois, who entered it again after the Revolution of 1830. The office of rector having been suppressed in 1824, abbe Nicolle retained his position in the Royal Council of Public Instruction, and was permitted to retire Aug. 17, 1830. He was an officer of the Legion of Honor after May, 1825, and became in 1827 honorary canon of Paris and vicargeneral of that diocese. He died in Soisy-sous-Engghien (Seine-et-Oise) Sept. 2, 1835. After his return to private life he occupied himself with writing his ideas upon education, and published them under the title of *Plan d'education, ou projet d'un collige nouvelau* (Paris, 1833, 8-o). See Frappaz, *Vie de l'Abbe Nicolle* (1857, 8vo); De Beaurepaire, *Notice sur l'Abbe Nicolle* (1859, 8vo).

### Nicolls, John

a renegade English theologian of the 16th century, who originally held a vicarship in Wales, but went to Antwerp and turned Catholic. After two years he returned to England, renounced Catholicism, and wrote in English the lives of certain wicked popes, cardinals, bishops, monks, and Jesuits. He afterwards traveled over France; and, finally, relapsing again to Romanism at Rouen, wrote in Latin, about 158, a public confession of his mendacity. See Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Nicolopoulo, Constantin

a Greek philologist of note, was born at Smyrna in 1786, of a family originally from Andrizena, in the Morea. He commenced his studies in Smyrna and finished them in Bucharest, under the skillful Hellenist Lampros Photiades. Nicolopoulo early made himself known by his poems in modern Greek. He went to France while young, and earned his living by private lessons; he afterwards taught Greek literature in the Athenaeum of Paris, and finally became attached to the library of the Institute. He had, through economy, and by imposing upon himself great privations, made a rich collection of books, which he designed for the city of Andrizena. In 1840 he obtained a pension, and, preparing to retire to Greece, he sent to that country several boxes of books; but in beating the volumes upon his arm to remove the dust from them, he inflicted upon himself a wound which soon became aggravated in an alarming manner. Nicolopoulo was carried to the hospital named L'Hotel Dieu, Paris, where he died, June 15,

1841. He had made no will, and left no heirs. The Domaine caused the rest of his library to be sold at a villainous price. The masterpiece of Nicolopoulo is an *Ode sur le printemps* (Greek, with a French translation, Paris, 1817, 8vo). He was the collaborator of several literary journals, and of the *Revue encyclopedique*; to which he furnished, among other articles, a "Notice sur la vie et les ecrits de Rhigas." He undertook himself a periodical review in modern Greek, entitled *L'Abeille*, which had three numbers, 1819-21; later he published at his own expense, and to be distributed gratis to the students of Athens and Egina, another philological review, entitled *Jupiter Pan-hellenien*-one number appeared (Paris, 1835, 8vo). He placed at the head of the *Dialogue sur la revolution Greagieue* of Greg. Zalik a "Discours adresse a tons les jeunes Grecs sur 'importancee dla litterature et de la philosophie Grecques" (in Greek). He revised the Greek text of the *Euclide* of F. Peyrard (Paris, 1814-18), and of the *Almageste* of Ptolemetis published by the abbe Halma (1817). A musical amateur and pupil of Fdtis, Nicolopoulo was the editor of the *Introduction a la theorie et a la ratiqne de la musique ecclisiastique* of Chrysanthe de Medyte, and of the *Doxastika*, a collection of noted hymns of the Greek Church collected and arranged by Gregoire Lampadarios (1821, 8vo). He was corresponding member of the Archaeological Institute of Rome. See *La Presse*, Dec. 13, 1841; Querard, *France Litter.* s.v.; Fetis, *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens*, s.v.

### Nicolosius, Johannes Baptista, D.D.,

a Sicilian -priest and geographer, was born Oct. 14, 1610. He became a great linguist, made himself beloved for his prudence and eloquence, was a long time maintained by Ferdinand Maximilian, margrave of Baden, and afterwards chaplain at St. Maria Maggiore in Rome. He wrote several geographical works, and died at Rome Jan. 19, 1670. See Jdcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Nicols, William

an English prelate, was born at Stratford Nov. 1, 1591. He studied at Oxford. After filling various ecclesiastical offices, he became bishop of Gloucester in 1660, and died Feb. 5, 1672. He wrote several theological works, enumerated by Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

## Nicolson (Or Swetnam), John

an English Jesuit, was born at Northampton in 1581. He became a preacher, was driven from his native country, and died as a penitentiary at Loretto, Nov. 4. 1622. He wrote a few theological works, for which see Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

## Nicolucci, Johannes Dominicus

an Italian Dominican of Meldola, in the diocese of Forli, who was skilled especially in canon law, flourished about 1693, and wrote two or three theological works, which are enumerated in Jocher's *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

## Nicomachus Of Gerasa,

in Arabia (Eastern Palestine), a Neo-Pythagorean philosopher who flourished in the times of the Antonines, probably from about 140 to 150 A.D., is noted as the author of *Arithmetica* (Paris, 1538; Leipsic, 1817; and again in 1861, 1866, and 1867), in which he teaches the pre-existence of numbers before the formation of the world in the mind of the Creator, where they constituted an archetype, in conformity with which he ordered all things. Nicomachus thus reduces the Pythagorean numbers, as Philo reduces the ideas, to thoughts of God. Nicomachus defines number as definite quantity (*πλήθος ἀρισμένον*, 1:7). In the *θεολογούμενα ἀριθμητικά* (which is in the *Bibl.* of Photius [cod. 187], and is ascribed to this Nicomachus), he expounds the mystical signification of the first ten numbers, according to which number 1 was God, reason, the principle of form and goodness, and 2 the principle of inequality and change, of matter and evil. etc. The ethical problem for man, he teaches, is solved by retirement from the contact of impurity, and reunion with God. He indirectly exercised no small influence on European studies in the 15th and 16th centuries. Boethius did but abbreviate Nicomachus's larger work on arithmetic, now lost. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* 2:1195; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grec.* v. 629.

## Nicomedes

a Christian of some distinction at Rome, who, during the rage of Domitian's persecution, A.D. 98, did all he could to serve the afflicted followers of Christ: comforting the poor, visiting the confined, exhorting the wavering, and confirming the faithful. For thus acting he was seized by

the ferocious hand of power, sentenced as a Christian, and scourged to death; through which he passed to meet the approving sentence of his Lord. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 14.

## Nicon

a monk of Rhethus in Palestine, who is said to have compiled, about 1060, a work in Greek containing an abstract of Scripture, ecclesiastical law, etc., which has never been published in full. See Cotelierius, *Monum. Eccles. Grac.*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, 1:275. **SEE NIKON.**

## Niconians

is the name given by Russian dissenters to the orthodox members of the Established Church who accepted the reforms introduced by patriarch Nikon in 1654. **SEE NIKON.**

## Nicop'olis

(**Νικόπολις**, *city of victory*), a city mentioned in <sup><50182></sup>Titus 3:12 as the place where, at the time of writing that epistle, Paul was intending to pass the coming winter, and where he wished Titus to meet him. Titus was at this time in Crete (<sup><50105></sup>Titus 1:5). The subscription to the epistle assumes that the apostle was at Nicopolis when he wrote; but we cannot conclude this from the form of expression. We should rather infer that he was elsewhere, possibly at Ephesus or Corinth. He urges that no time should be lost (**σπουδάσον ἐλθεῖν**); hence we conclude that winter was near.

### Picture for Nicop'olis 1

Nothing is to be found in the epistle itself to determine which Nicopolis is here intended. There were cities of this name in Asia, Africa, and Europe, and many of them have been advocated in this connection. The question, however, is in reality confined to three of these places at most. One Nicopolis was in Thrace, near the borders of Macedonia. The subscription (which, however, is of no authority) fixes on this place, calling it the Macedonian Nicopolis: and such is the view of Chrysostom and Theodoret. De Wette's objection to this opinion (*Pastoral Briefe*, p. 21), that the place did not exist till Trajan's reign, appears to be a mistake. Another Nicopolis was in Cilicia; and Schrader (*Der Apostel Paulus*, 1:115-119) pronounces for this; but this opinion is connected with a peculiar theory regarding the apostle's journeys. We have little doubt that Jerome's view is correct, and

that the Pauline Nicopolis was the celebrated city of Epirus (“ scribit Apostolus de Nicopoli, quee in Actiaco littore sita,” Jerome, *Procmm.* 9:195). For arrangements of Paul’s journeys, which will harmonize with this, and with the other facts of the Pastoral Epistles, see Birks, *Hores Apostolicae*, p. 296-304; and Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (2d ed.), 2:564-573. It is very possible, as is observed there, that Paul was arrested at Nicopolis, and taken thence to Rome for his final trial. It is a curious and interesting circumstance, when we look at the matter from a Biblical point of view, that many of the handsomest parts of the town were built by Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:5,3). It is likely enough that many Jews lived there. Moreover, it was conveniently situated for apostolic journeys in the eastern parts of Achaia and Macedonia, and also to the northward, where churches perhaps were founded. St. Paul had long before preached the Gospel at least on the confines of Illyricum (<del>519</del> Romans 15:19), and ‘soon after the very period under consideration Titus himself was sent on a mission to Dalmatia (<del>510</del> 2 Timothy 4:10).

## Picture for Nicop’olis 2

This city was founded by Augustus in commemoration of the battle of Actium, and stood upon the place where his land-forces encamped before that battle. From the mainland of Epirus, on the north, a promontory projects some five miles in the line of the shore, and is there separated by a channel half a mile wide from the opposite coast. This channel forms the entrance of the Gulf of Ambracius, which lies within the promontory. The naval battle was fought at the mouth of the gulf, and Actium, from which it took its name, and where Antony’s camp was stationed, stood on the point forming the south side of the channel. The promontory is connected with the mainland by a narrow isthmus. Upon it Augustus encamped, his tent standing upon a height, from which he could command both the gulf and the sea. After the victory he enclosed the place where his tent was pitched, dedicated it to Neptune, and founded on the isthmus the city of Nicopolis (Dion Cas. li; Strabo, vii, p. 324), and made it a Roman colony. It was not more than some thirty years old when visited by the apostle, and yet it was then the chief city of Western Greece. The prosperity of Nicopolis was of short duration. It had fallen to ruin, but was restored by the emperor Julian. After being destroyed by the Goths, it was again restored by Justinian, and continued for a time the capital of Epirus (Mamertin. *Julian*, 9; Procopius, *Bet. Goth.* 4:22). During the Middle Ages the new town of *Prevesa* was built at the point of the promontory, and Nicopolis was deserted. The

remains of the city still visible show its former extent and importance. They cover a large portion of the isthmus. Wordsworth thus describes the site: "A lofty wall spans a desolate plain; to the north of it rises, on a distant hill, the shattered *scena* of a theater; and to the west the extended, though broken, line of an aqueduct connects the distant mountains with the main subject of the picture — the city itself" (*Greece*, p. 229 sq.). There are also the ruins of a mediaeval castle, a quadrangular structure of brick, and a small theater, on the low marshy plain on which the city chiefly stood, and which is now dreary and desolate (*Journal of R. G. S.* 3:92 sq.; Leake, *Northern Greece*, 1:185 sq.; Cellarius, *Geogr.* 1:1080). The name given to the ruins is *Paleoprevesa*, or "Old Prevesa." See Bowen, *Athos and Epirus*, p. 211; Merivale, *Rome*, 3:327, 328; Smith, *Diet. of Greek and Roman Geogr. s.v.*; Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (4to ed.), 2:353 sq.; Krenkel, *Paulus der Apostel* (Leipsic, 1869), p. 108.

### Nicquet, Honorat

an ascetic French author, was born in Avignon August 29, 1585. Admitted in 1602 into the Order of the Jesuits, he taught rhetoric and philosophy during several years; his superiors, informed of his merit, called him to Rome, where they entrusted to him the double duties of censor of the books and theologian of the provost-general. On his return to France he devoted himself to the pulpit, and sought less to please than to reach and edify his hearers. Then he directed successively the colleges of his order at Caen, Bourges, and Rouen. In this latter city he established, under the name of (*Euvres de la Misericorde*, a charitable society designed to aid the poor and the sick. He died at Rouen May 22, 1667. We have of his works, *Le Combat de Geneve, ou falsifications faites pour Genive en la translation Francoise du Nouveau Testament* (La Flkehe, 1621, 8vo; Alen9on, 1638, 8vo): — *Apologie pour l'ordre de Fontevrauld* (Paris, 1641, 8vo): — *Histoire de l'ordre de Fontevrauld* (ibid. 1642, 4to; Angers, 1642, 1686, 4to); it was composed at the entreaty of the nuns of this order, and dedicated to their superior-general, Jean Baptiste de Bourbon: — *Gloria Beati Roberti de Arbrissello* (La Fleche, 1647, 12mo); the life of this personage is already found in French in the preceding work: — *Titulus sancte Crucis, seu historia et mysterium tituli Crucis* (Paris, 1648, 1675, 8vo; Anvers, 1670, 12mo): *Physiognomia humana, lib. iv distincta* (Lyons, 1648, 4to): — *De sancto angelo Gabriele* (ibid. 1653, 8vo): — *La Vie de Nicolas Gilbert, instituteur de l'ordre de l'Annonciade* (Paris, 1655, 8vo): — (*La Vie de sainte Solange, vierge et martyre* (Bolirges, 1655, 8vo): —



*Le Serviteur. de la Vierge, ou traite de la devotion envers la nmere de Dieu* (Rouen, 1659. 1665, 1669, 12mo): — *Stimulus ingrati animi* (ibid. 1661, 8vo): — *Nomenclator MAarianus, sive nomina Virginis 11Mariae* (ibid. 1664, 4to): — *Iconologia Mariana* (ibid. 1667, 8vo). He left in manuscript a collection entitled *Elogia seu Nomenclator sanctorum et celebriorum in Ecclesia scriptorum*, owned by the library of the novitiate of Rouen. See Solwell, *Bibl. script. Soc. Jesu*, p. 350, 351; Lelong, *Bibl. Hist. de la France*, s.v.

## Nid, Council of

(*Concilium Niddanum*), was an ecclesiastical assemblage convened A.D. 705 near the River Nid, in Northumbria, by Bertwald of Canterbury, assisted by Bosa, bishop of York, John of Hagustald, and Eadfrid of Lindisfarn. Several abbots, and the abbess St. Elfrida (daughter of Oswy, king of Northumberland), were present, together with Wilfred, whom Bosa succeeded in the bishopric of York. Wilfrid was reconciled with the other bishops of the province, but it does not appear that he was restored to his bishopric, which Boss retained until his death, and. after him John of Hagustald (or Hexham) was translated thither. See Eddius, cap. 57; Labbe, *Conc.* 6:1389; Wilkins, *Conc.* 1:67; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.; Soames, *Hist. of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 83; ejusd. *The AngloSaxon Church under the Latins*, p. 376.

## Niddui

(~~ylWRnæ~~) the lesser sort of excommunication used among the Hebrews. He who had incurred this was to withdraw himself from his relations, at least to the distance of four cubits. It commonly continued thirty days. If it was not then taken off it might be prolonged for sixty or even ninety days. But if within this term the excommunicated person did not give satisfaction, he fell into the *cherem*, which was the second sort of excommunication; and thence into the third sort, called *shammatha*, the most terrible of all. **SEE ANATHEMA.**

## Nider, Nieder, Or Nyder, John

a distinguished German Roman Catholic theologian, was born towards the close of the 14th century. He joined the Dominicans at Colmar in 1400, then went to .study philosophy and theology at Vienna, in Austria, and was ordained at Cologne. He afterwards returned to Vienna, and became prior

of the Dominican convents of Nuremberg and Basle. In 1428 he accompanied the general of the Dominicans on a tour through Franconia, and attracted such attention by his preaching that he was sent as delegate to the Council of Basle in 1431, of which he was one of the most distinguished theologians. Appointed by that assembly to convert the Hussites, he at first undertook to do so by mildness and persuasion: he wrote them letters full of encouragement and of good advice, went himself to see them at Egra, and induced them to present their complaints to the council. The conferences, opened with the representatives of Bohemia, led, however, to no result. But in a second mission, in -which Nider took part with ten other nuncios, he showed none of his former moderation. He was one of the ecclesiastical leaders of the crusade which desolated Bohemia, burning towns and villages, destroying the country, and murdering thousands of people. After his return to Basle he broke off his connection with the council, and even refused to have anything more to do with it. Nider died in 1438, according to Cave, and in 1440, according to Echard. Among his numerous works we notice *Praeceptorium divine legi., seu de decem praeceptis* (Cologne, 1472, fol.; Strasb. 1476; Paris, 1507, 1515, etc.): — *Manuale confessorum* (Paris, 1473, fol.; 1489, 1513, 4to): — *Tractatus de lepra morali* (Paris, 1473, fol.; 1489, 4to; 1514, 8vo): *Contra perfidos Judaeos* (Essling, 1475, fol.): — *Consolatorium timoratae conscientiae* (Paris, 1478, 4to; Rome, 1604, 8vo): — *Aurei sermones totius anni* (Spire, 1479, fol.): — *Alphabetum divini amoris* (Alost, 1487, 8vo; Paris, 1515, 1526, 4to); this work was sometimes attributed erroneously to Gerson: — *Sermones* (Strasb. 1489, fol.): — *Dispositorium moriendi* (no date nor name of place, 4to): — *De modo bene vivendi* (Paris, 1494, 16mo): — *De reformatione religiosorum* (ibid. 1512, 12mo): — *De contractibus mercatorum* (ibid. 1514, 8vo): — *Formicarium, seu Dialogus ad vitam Christianam exemplo conditionum formicæ incitativus* (Strasb. 1517, 4to; Paris, 1519, 4to; Douai. 1602, 8vo, etc.): the author confesses that all he says on sorcerers and magic in the *Formicarium* he had learned from a judge at Berne and from a Benedictine monk. Lenfant considers Nider as the author of *De visionibus et revelationibus* (Strasb. 1517). See Bzovius, *Annales eccles.*; Echard et Quetif, *Bibl. Scriptor. ord. Prædicat.* 1:792; Touron, *Hist. des hommes ill. de l'ordre de St. Dominique*; Dupin, *Bibl. des auteurs eccles. X<sup>e</sup> siècle*; Lenfant, *Hist. du concile de Constance*, lib. v; Quicherat, *Procès de Jeanne d'Ar.* 4:502; Wessenberg, *Gesch. der Kirchenversammlungen*, 2:100, 507; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 381. (J. N. P.)

## Nidhogg

is a name for the huge mundane snake of the ancient Scandinavian cosmogony. It is represented as gnawing at the root of the ash *Ygdrasill*, or the mundane tree. In its ethical import, as Mr. Gross alleges, Nidhogg, composed of *nid*, which is synonymous with the German *neid*, or envy, and *hoygr*, to hew, or gnaw, signifying the *envious gnawer*, involves the idea of all moral evil, typified as the destroyer of the root of life. See Thorpe, *Northern Mythol.* vol. i; Keyser, *Religion of the Northmen*.

## Niebuhr, Barthold Georg

one of the most acute critics of modern times, noted for his valuable contributions to philology and history, and for his scholarly criticisms of classical institutions, was born at Copenhagen Aug. 27, 1776, and was the son of Karsten Niebuhr (see the next article). When two years old Barthold's parents removed to the little Holstein town of Meldorf, and there he spent his youthful days. The quiet of the country afforded him grand opportunities for study; besides, he enjoyed favorable association with the most eminent scholars of the land, who were wont to frequent the house of Karsten Niebuhr. The aptitude for learning which Barthold Georg Niebuhr displayed almost from infancy led him to be regarded as a juvenile prodigy; but, unlike many other precocious children, his powers of acquiring knowledge kept pace with his advancing years, and, after a carefully conducted preliminary education, under the superintendence of his father, he was sent to the University of Kiel, and two years later to that of Gottingen, to study law. Thence he proceeded in his nineteenth year to Edinburgh, where he devoted himself more especially to the natural sciences. On his return to Denmark he held several appointments under the Danish government, but his strongly pronounced hatred of Napoleon led him to enter the Prussian civil service in 1806. In 1810 he exchanged his public situation for the post of historiographer to the king, and about the same time was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences. Shortly afterwards he was made a lecturer in the then newly opened university at Berlin. In this position his treatment of Roman history, by making known the results of the new and critical theory which he had applied to the elucidation of obscure historical evidence, established his position as one of the most original and philosophical of modern historians. He was now the acknowledged master of more than twenty languages, and in the possession of a mass of facts by the aid of a remarkably retentive

memory; and these advantages augmented again by an unusual intuitive sagacity, it was generally conceded, fitted him well for the task of the true historian, that is, the sifting of the real from the false historic evidence. But, not satisfied with these remarkable qualifications, he embraced his earliest opportunity to visit Rome, and as Prussian ambassador at the papal court, from 1816 till 1823, seized the occasion for testing on the spot the accuracy of his conjectures in regard to many questions of local and social bearing. On his return from Rome, Niebuhr took up his residence at Bonn as adjunct professor, and by his admirable lectures and expositions contributed very materially to the development of classical and archaeological learning at that German high school. He availed himself of every means for promoting and encouraging the labors of other scholars. It was partly with this view that he set on foot the *Rheinische Museum*, a philological repository, in which the shorter essays and scattered thoughts of learned men might be given to the world. The first volume of this appeared in 1827, under the joint editorship of Bockh, Niebuhr, and Brandis, three of the greatest lights in the field of philological science. At the same time he undertook, and that mainly for diversion (he was now busy with his life-work, *the History of Rome*), a new edition of the Byzantine historians. He was thus employed when the Revolution of 1830 roused him from the calm of his literary pursuits. Niebuhr's sensitive nature, unstrung by physical debility led him to take an exaggerated view of the consequences of this movement, and to anticipate a recurrence of all the horrors of the former French Revolution, and the result was to bring about a state of mental depression and bodily prostration which ended in his death, Jan. 2, 1831. Among the many important works with which Niebuhr enriched the literature of his time, the following are some of the most noteworthy: *Römische Geschichte* (Berl. 1811-1832, 3 vols.; 2d ed. 1827-1842; 1833, 1853); the first two volumes have been translated by J. C. Hare and C. Thirlwall, and the third by Dr. W. Smith and Dr. L. Schmitz: — *Grundzüge für die Verfassung Niederlands* (Berl. 1832): — *Griech. Heroengeschichte* (Hamb. 1842), written for his son Marcus: the *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften* (Bonn, 1828-1843, 2 vols.) contain his introductory lectures on Roman history, and many of the essays which had appeared in the "Transactions of the Berlin Academy." Besides these, and numerous other essays on philological, historical, and archaeological questions, Niebuhr cooperated with Bekker and other learned annotators in re-editing *Scriptores historiae Byzantinae*; he also discovered hitherto unprinted, fragments of classical authors, as, for

instance, of Cicero's *Orations* and portions of Gains, published the *Inscriptiones Nubienses* — (Rome, 1821), and was a constant contributor to the *Rheinische Museum für Philologie*, and other literary journals and societies of Germany.

It is difficult to conceive a more excellent and delightful person than Barthold Niebuhr appears to have been; there are few of whom we have read who have combined so blameless a character and so amiable a disposition with such boundless acquirements and such brilliant intellectual qualities. His *History of Rome* is perhaps the most original historical work that this age has produced. To understand what he has done in this work, we should keep in mind the state of knowledge on the subject before his time, and not go so far as the stricter sort of skeptical critics, like e.g. the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis, who does not hesitate to declare Niebuhr's effort to construct a continuous Roman history out of such legendary materials as we possess as, on the whole, a failure. The disjointed ruins had lain for ages in a confused heap, though there was hardly a child in Europe who was not familiar with their rude outlines, and many a skillful and laborious workman had vainly endeavored to reduce them to symmetry and order. Niebuhr, by a series of combinations which will appear most surprising to those who are best capable of appreciating works of genius, succeeded in reconstructing from the scattered fragments a stately fabric, which, if it is not identical with the original structure, is at least almost perfect and complete in itself. Macaulay approved of Niebuhr's theory, and Dr. Arnold professed never to venture to differ from him except where he manifestly had evidence not accessible to Niebuhr. There cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose, as some have done, that Niebuhr was a skeptic whose sole delight was to render insecure the basis of historical evidence. He has actually done more than any other student of antiquity towards extracting truth and certainty from the misty and mystical legends of early tradition, and towards substituting rational conviction for irrational credulity. The great object which he proposed to himself in all his philological speculations was to reproduce a true image of the past by getting rid of the deceitful influence of the present. This view he often expresses in very plain terms. Thus, he says in his introductory lecture on Roman history (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 93), "As there is nothing which Eastern nations find more difficult to conceive than the idea of a republican constitution, as the people of Hindûstan cannot be induced to regard the East India Company as an association of proprietors, or in any

other light than as a sovereign, just so is it with even the acutest of the moderns when they study ancient history, unless they have contrived by critical and philological studies to shake off the influence of their habitual associations.” In a letter to count Adam Moltke, he exclaims (*Lebensnachrichten*, 2:91), “Oh how people would cherish philology did they but know how delightfully it enables us to recall to life the fairest periods of antiquity. Reading is the most trifling part of it; the chief business is to domesticate ourselves in Greece and Rome at the most different periods. Would that I could write history so vividly as to discriminate what is fluctuating and uncertain, and so develop what is confused and intricate, that everyone, when he heard the name of a Greek of the age of Thucydides or Polybius, or a Roman of the days of Cato or Tacitus, might be able to form a clear and adequate idea of what he was.” The very existence of such a general design presumes a lively fancy and active imagination; but though these are qualities often possessed by shallow and superficial persons, they are very rarely combined with that extensive and minute learning for which Niebuhr was distinguished. The range of his acquisitions was really wonderful. In the words of one of his most ardent admirers, “While his horizon was ever widening before him, it never sunk out of sight behind him; what he possessed he always retained; what he once knew became a part of his mind, and the means and instrument of acquiring more knowledge; and he is one of the very few examples of men gifted with a memory so tenacious as to seem incapable of forgetting anything, who at the same time have had an intellect so vigorous as in no degree to be oppressed or enfeebled by the weight of their learning, but who, on the contrary, have kept it in orderly array, and made it minister continually to the plastic energy of thought” (*Philol. Mus.* 1:271). Some abatements must, however, be made from this general eulogy. While Niebuhr’s great work has been neglected or censured, with equal injustice, by persons who have been too indolent to encounter the labor of studying it or incapable of appreciating the method of critical investigation which the author has adopted, it may be doubted, on the other hand, whether many scholars, both in Germany and England, have not been too willing to acquiesce in all Niebuhr’s results, to adopt whatever he has written, and sometimes even to receive as established truths assertions unsupported by evidence or directly opposed by express testimony. Some recent German writers have indeed taken a middle course; they adopt the general views and critical method of the historian, but they find much in the details that is defective or erroneous. It cannot be denied

that the ardent imagination of Niebuhr, and his power of combining and constructing sometimes led him to form a complete theory before he had examined all the evidence; one consequence of which is that, under the influence of his own creations, he sometimes extracts a meaning from a passage which the words do not contain, and at other times arbitrarily rejects evidence when it interferes with his own hypothesis. It is true that this same power and his intuitive sagacity have sometimes enabled him to supply a link in a chain when all direct evidence was wanting, and the certainty of his conjectures in such cases is at once felt by the symmetry and consistency which they impart to the whole fabric of the theory.

It must be remarked that Niebuhr's style is very faulty. It is generally deficient in perspicuity, and though eloquent passages and striking descriptions are found here and there, it wants that sustained dignity which we mark in the writings of some other distinguished historians. He occasionally, too, betrays very crude and ill-formed opinions on the internal polity of other countries: witness his remarks on the relative position of England and Ireland. But with all the drawbacks which the most rigorous criticism can exact, the feeling with which we contemplate his character and attainments is one of almost unmixed admiration. He was, in fact, a rare combination of the man of business, the scholar, and the man of genius. If he had had no other claim to celebrity, he would have deserved to be mentioned among the general linguists whose attainments have from time to time astonished the world. Indeed, he was recognized as the chief of philologists in the most learned country of Europe. A very pleasing picture of his mode of living has been given by the late professor Sandford, who visited him at Bonn in 1829 (see *Blackwood's Magazine* for Jan. 1838, p. 90 sq.); a warm testimony to the benevolence of his character and the goodness of his heart is furnished by Lieber in his *-Reminiscences of Niebuhr*; and we see the whole man in all his relations, social, literary, and political, in the highly interesting collection of his letters, edited by Madame Hensler (*Lebensnachrichten iiber Barthold Georg Niebuhr, aus Briefen desselben, etc.* (Hamburg, 1838, etc.)), or even more completely in Miss Winkworth's admirable translation of that work (with important additions and valuable essays by Bunsen, etc. (3 vols., 1852)). See also *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1852, i. 542 sq.; 1856, 1:244-251; 1860, 1:546; 1868, 2:290,291; *Edinburgh Review*, 79, art. i; 96, p. 49 sq.; *The (Lond.) Quar. Rev.* 55:126 sq.; *Westminster Rev.* Dec. 1843; *North Brit. Rev.* Aug. 1852; *For. Qu. Rev.* June, 1828; July, 1831; *Fraser's Magazine*, July and

Dec. 1852; *North Amer. Rev.* April, 1823; *Littell's Living Age*, May 9, 1846, art. v; April 3, 1852, art. ix; Sept. 4, 1852, art. i; Nov. 20, 1852, art. vii; *Harper's Magazine*, Dec. 1873, p. 63 sq.; *English Cyclop. s.v.*

## Niebuhr, Karsten

a distinguished German traveler in the Orient, noted for his valuable contributions to the modern researches of Oriental customs, etc., was born at Lidingworth, in the duchy of Lauenburg, March 17, 1733, of humble but worthy parentage. His early educational advantages were rather limited, but a thirst for knowledge kept him busy in study, even while employed as a tiller of the soil. He was especially fond of mathematics, and achieved such success in the study of geometry that he was considered competent to fill the position of land-surveyor in his native district. The little income secured from this position he laid out in books, and by the aid of a good library fitted himself for the university. He was admitted at Gottingen, and there studied until, in 1756 or 1757, he was offered a place in the corps of Hanoverian engineers. About 1760 he entered the Danish service, and in the year following was offered employment by the Danish government in a scientific expedition to Arabia, which was then going out at the expense of that government for the purpose of enlarging Biblical knowledge, especially of the Old-Testament Scriptures. The project originally contemplated only the mission of a single Arabic scholar, but it was finally extended to include a mathematician for purposes of astronomical and geographical observation (and for this place Niebuhr was chosen), a naturalist, a draughtsman, and a physician. Niebuhr delayed the expedition eighteen months in order to fit himself properly for the task, and, as the result proved, this step was truly proper, for he alone lived to return from the expedition, and from him alone we have obtained the valuable results of that liberal act of the Danish king, Frederic V, and his learned minister, count von Bernstorff — most noble patrons of learning. The other members of the expedition to which Niebuhr belonged were the noted Orientalist of that day, professor Frederick Christian von Haven, Peter Forskil as naturalist, Christian Charles Cramer as physician, and George William Baurenfeind as painter or draughtsman. By the royal instructions for the expedition, a perfect equality was established among the five members; and they were enjoined to decide every difference of opinion regarding their course by plurality of voices, or, if votes should be equal, by lot. They sailed from Copenhagen in January, 1761, in a frigate of the Danish royal navy, and arrived, not without some accidents, at



Constantinople, whence, after a short residence, the travelers proceeded in a merchant vessel to Alexandria, ascended the Nile, and reached Cairo in November, 1761. Having carefully explored the Pyramids and other antiquities of Lower Egypt, they crossed the desert to Mount Sinai and Suez, embarked at that port in an Arab vessel, and landed at Loheia, in Arabia Felix, the destined seat of their mission, in December, 1762. They crossed the country, mounted on asses, the usual conveyance, and, after visiting several places of interest, finally arrived at Mocha, where the philologist Von Haven unfortunately died, in May, 1763. The surviving travelers, proceeding from thence to Sana, the capital of Yemen, were favorably received by the imam; but they had meanwhile lost another of their number, the naturalist Forskal, who died on the road. His companions returning to Mocha, there embarked in an English vessel for Bombay, on the voyage to which place the painter Baureqfeind expired; and at Bombay Niebuhr had the affliction of burying the last of his fellow-travelers, the physician Cramer. The fact is admitted by Niebuhr that his ill-fated friends persisted in living after the European manner under the burning sun of Arabia; and it may be surmised that they lost their lives through that disregard to necessary habits of abstinence for which the Danes in their tropical colonies are remarkable, even above all other people. Niebuhr himself, who had suffered severely from illness with the rest of his party, after their decease adopted the same diet as the natives of the countries in which he was traveling, and thenceforth enjoyed excellent health. Sailing from Bombay, he visited Persia, including the ruins of Persepolis; ascended the Euphrates; proceeded by way of Bagdad and Aleppo to the Syrian coast; embarked for Cyprus, returned from that island to the continent; saw Jerusalem and Damascis; passed through Aleppo, and over Asia Minor to Constantinople; and finally returned to Copenhagen in November, 1767. Niebuhr was welcomed in Denmark as he deserved. The government undertook at its charge the engraving of all the plates of his travels, which were to be presented to him as a free gift; and he was left to publish the result of his labors at his own cost and for his own profit. Resolving to commence with the description of Arabia, he printed, in the year 1772, his volume under the title *Reischreibung von Arabien*, and it became the text-book of every writer, from the historian Gibbon almost down to the present day, whoever has had occasion to treat of the ancient and modern aspect of that country. The depth of research, the fidelity of delineation, and the accuracy of detail which it exhibits on the geography of Arabia, and the enduring character and condition of its inhabitants, have rendered

this work of Niebuhr classical. He has sometimes been compared, and the comparison is just and appropriate, with the historian of Halicarnassus: both travelers were characterized by accuracy of observation, strict veracity, and a simplicity of narrative which art alone can never attain. The appearance of this work was followed in 1774-78 by two volumes of equal merit and interest, narrating his *Reisen in Arabien und den angrdnzenden Landern*. To these volumes it was his intention to add a third, enriched with the result of his inquiries into the state of the Mohammedan religion and Turkish empire, and containing his astronomical observations; but some causes, not sufficiently explained, delayed this publication, until a fire, which in 1795 destroyed the king's palace at Copenhagen, and with it the original plates both of his published and unedited works, put an end to the design. The third volume was, however, published in 1837, owing to the liberality of the bookseller Perthes of Hamburg, and the affection of Niebuhr's family; particularly of his daughter, under the title of *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und andern umliegenden landern*. It contains his remarks on Aleppo, his voyage to Cyprus, and his visit to Jaffa and Jerusalem, his return to Aleppo, and journey thence through Kdniyeh to Constantinople, and an abridged account of his route through Bulgaria, Wallachia, Poland, and Germany, to Denmark. After the publication of the first two volumes of his travels he contributed to a German periodical journal, among other papers, two on the *Interior of Africa* and the *Political and Military State of the Turkish Empire*. His principal works, which were published in German at Copenhagen, have been translated into French and Dutch, and reprinted at Amsterdam and Utrecht. Niebuhr himself likewise edited and published, in his usual generous spirit, at his own cost, some of the reports of his traveling companions. He lived for a long period after his return, and even at one time projected an expedition into Africa; but his wife dissuaded him from the project, and he retired to quiet life in the little village of Meldorf, where he performed the duties of a civil functionary. It was during this period of his life that Barthold Georg was born to him. (See the preceding article.) Karsten Niebuhr died April 26, 1815, leaving the character of being at once one of the most truthful and scientifically exact travelers of modern times. See *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1843, p. 480 sq.; 1844, p. 83 sq.; *Biblical Repository*, vol. viii; *Christian Examiner*, 1852, p. 413 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia* and the biographical sketch published by his son (Kiel, 1817).

## Niedermeyer, Louis

a musical composer, who deserves a place here for his devotion to the cultivation of sacred music, was born April 27, 1802, in Nyon, canton of Vaud, Switzerland. His father, a native of Wirtzburg, had settled and married in Switzerland; himself gifted with much natural talent for music, he was the first teacher of his son. The latter, at the age of fifteen, was sent by his parents to Vienna, where he received for two years lessons upon the piano from Moscheles, and in composition from Forster. After having published in that city several of his essays, consisting of morceaux for the piano, he went to Rome, continued there the study of composition under the direction of Fioravanti, master of the pontifical chapel, and afterwards went to Naples, where Zingarelli undertook the completion of his musical education. It was during his sojourn at Naples that the young artist wrote his first opera, entitled *Il Reo per amore*. Niedermeyer had conceived the idea of founding, like the ancient institution created by Choron under the Restoration, and suppressed in consequence of the Revolution of 1830, a school for religious music, designed to form-by the study of the *chefs-d'œuvres* of the great masters of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries-singers, organists, chapel-masters, and composers of sacred music. With the support of Fortoul, then minister of public instruction and of worship, he obtained a subsidy from the state, aid in the course of the year 1853 he opened his school, associating with himself M. Dietsch as inspector of studies. This establishment, situated in Paris, and in which literary education is placed on a level with musical studies, soon began to prosper and produce distinguished subjects, which have been placed in different cathedrals or churches of France. Constantly occupied from that time with the cares claimed by his school, Niedermeyer neglected nothing which could contribute to improve education. It is thus that, dissatisfied with the wholly arbitrary manner in which church music is generally accompanied, he published in 1855, in collaboration with M. J. d'Ortigne, a *Traite d'accompagnement du plain-chant*, founded upon new principles, which soon circulated throughout France and in-foreign countries. It was also with the design of propagating among all classes a taste for good religious music that he established in 1856 the journal *La Maîtrise*, the direction of which he abandoned in 1858; now entrusted to M. d'Ortigne. He was occupied with a large work upon organ accompaniment for church music, which was soon to appear, when death suddenly came, on March 14, 1861. This composer, whose talent has more than one trait of resemblance with

that of Schubert, has produced, besides many pieces of detached song, some very remarkable melodies. We have also several masses by Niedermeyer, and a great number of pieces of religious music for singing and for the organ. In the music that he has written for the piano, we remark particularly a brilliant rondo with accompaniment for four hands, fantasias, airs varied upon themes by Rossini, Weber, Meyerbeer, Bellini, etc. See *Fetis, Biographie universelle des Musiciens*; Castil-Blaze, *L'Academie imperiale de Music, Histoire litteraire, musicale, etc.*; Vapereau, *Dictionnaire universel des Contemporains; Documents particuliers.*

### Niedner, Christian Wilhelm, D.D.

a noted German theologian, distinguished especially as a Church historian, was born August 9, 1797, at Oberwinkel, in Saxony, and was the son of a minister. He was educated at Leipsic, where he began his studies in 1816. In 1829 he was honored by his alma mater with a professorship in theology, and he held that position until 1850, when he removed to the Wittenberg highschool. In 1859 he accepted the professorship of theology in the university at Berlin, and was shortly after made counselor of the Brandenburg Consistory. He died Aug. 13, 1866. Few men of recent date have done so much for historical theology as Prof. Niedner. He labored unceasingly with true Christian devotion to secure everywhere the genuine historical evidence, and for this purpose even founded a magazine, the *Zeitschrift fur historische theologie*, in 1845, which at the close of the year 1875 was discontinued. His principal work is his *Lehrbuch d. christl. Kirchengesch.* (Leips. 1846, and often; new edition prepared just before his death [Berl. 1866, 8vo]), which is something between a text-book and a manual, presenting not merely a dry collection of thoughts, but an abundance of elementary views of individual subjects. He has also published several small text-books on Church history, history of doctrines, and history of philosophy, which are highly esteemed for the thorough scholarship they evince. (J.H.W.)

### Niello-work

(i.e. *Black work*, from Latin *Nigellum*) is the technical term for a method of ornamenting metal plates in imitation of pencil drawing, by engraving the surface, and rubbing in a black or colored composition, so as to fill up the incised lines, and give effect to the intaglio picture. It is not quite certain when this art was originated; Byzantine works of the 12th century still exist

to attest its early employment. This art must have been known at quite an early date in Christian culture. The monk Theophilus speaks of it, and the patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople sent, in 811, to pope Leo two jewels adorned with niello. Marseilles was eminent in this art during the reigns of Clovis II and Dagobert. As an art it is claimed to have been brought to high perfection at Florence; and was practiced by Benvenuto Cellini. The finest works of this kind belong probably to the first half of the 15th century, when remarkable excellence in drawing and grouping minute figures in these metal pictures was attained by Maso di Finiguerra, an eminent painter, and student of Ghiberti and Massacio. In the hands of this artist it gave rise to copper-plate engraving, and hence much interest attaches to the art of niello-cutting. Genuine specimens of this art are rare, some of those by Finiguerra are very beautiful and effective, the black pigment in the lines giving a pleasing effect to the surface of the metal, which is usually silver. Those of his works best known are some elaborately beautiful pattines wrought by him for the church of San Giovanni at Florence, one of which is in the Uffizia, and some are in various private collections. In the collection of Ornamental Art at South Kensington there are no less than seventeen specimens of niello-work. See Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, s.v.; Elmes, *Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

**Nielson, Hauge.**

*SEE HAUGE.*

**Niem**

*SEE DIETRICH OF NIEM.*

**Niemeyer, August Hermann, D.D.,**

an eminent German theologian and educator, was born at Halle Sept. 1, 1754. He began the study of theology in 1771; became private tutor in the philosophical faculty of his alma mater, the university of his native place, in 1777; then successively professor extraordinary and inspector of the seminarists of the theological faculty in 1779; ordinary professor and inspector in 1784; and finally chancellor and rector perpetual of the university in 1808. He resigned the last-named office at the reorganization of the university, at the close of the war of liberation, but remained its chancellor until his death, June 7, 1828. He rendered eminent services to the university during the wars, and was one of those who contributed most

to its reorganization. As a theologian, at a time when scientific theology did not yet exist, he may be considered as belonging to the rationalists, but his was a mild and sincere rationalism. Says Hagenbach, "He combined a mild type of piety with noble humanity" (*Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 2:108). As a writer he was very prolific, having composed and published a large number of theological and educational works; but they are now laid aside on account of their want of system, and are merely mentioned in treatises on the history of modern theology. The most important of his works is *Theologische Encyclopadie u. Methodologie, ein sicherer Wegweiserf. angehende Theologen*, etc. (Leips. 1830, 8vo). Among the others we notice *Charakteristik der Bibel* (Halle, 1775-1782, 5 vols. 8vo; 6th ed. 1830), an excellent work in its day, and one that won for Niemeyer when yet a young man a wide circle of readers, and called forth the most enthusiastic plaudits, but which has been much surpassed *since*: — *Handbuchf. christl. Religionslehrer* (Halle, 1790, 2 vols. 8vo; 6th ed. 1827): — *Grundsätze d. Erziehung u. d. Unterrichts* (Halle, 1796, 3 vols. 8vo; 9th ed. 1834-6): — and especially his *Geistliche Lieder, Oratorien u. vermischte Gedichte* (Halle, 1814, 8vo), which, though not of the highest flight, are distinguished for their simple heartiness. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 10:327; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 2:2202; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, xl, 942; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:51; and especially Jacobs u. Gruber, *Zur Erinnerung an Niemeyer's Leben und Wirken* (Halle, 1830); Rein, *Erinnerungen* (1841); Fritzsche, *Ueber des verewigten A. H. Niemeyer's Leben* (1828).

### Nieremberg(ius), John Eusebius Of,

a learned Spanish Jesuit, was born at Madrid about 1590. He studied law at the University of Salamanca, but afterwards became a Jesuit. He was then sent by the order on a mission to some part of Castile, and on his return to Madrid became professor in the college. In 1642 he gave up teaching in consequence of ill-health, and died April 7, 1658. He wrote *Obras y dias, manual de seio res y principes* (Madrid, 1628, 1641 4to): — *Sigalion, sive de sapientia mythica*, lib. viii (ibid. 1629, 8vo): — *Vida d S. Ignacio* (ibid. 1631, 8vo), often reprinted: — *De ado. ratione in spiritu et veritate*, lib. iv (Antwerp, 1631): *De arte voluntatis*, lib. vi (Lyons, 1631, 8vo; transl. into French by L. Videl [Paris, 1657, 4to]): — *Vida divina 3 camino real para la perfeccion* (Madrid, 1633; transl. into Latin by Martin Sibenius): — *Practica del catechisns Romano y doctrina Christiana* (ibid. 1640; transl. into Italian); — *Theopoliticus, sive brevis elucidatio et rationale divinorum*

*operum atque providentice humane* (Antwerp, 1641, 8vo): — *Prodigio del amor divino y fineza de Dios con los hombres* (Madrid, 1641, 4to): — *Stromata Sacrcce Scripture* (Lyons, 1642, fol.): — *Corona virtuoso y virtud coronata, sive de virtutibus inprincipe requisitis* (Madrid, 1643i 4to): — *De la devocion y patrociniio de S. Miguel, protector de Espana* (ibid. 1643, 4to): — *Doctrinac ascetics* (Lyons, 1643, fol.): — *Causa y remedio de los males publicos* (Madrid, 1642, 8vo): — *La curiosafilosofia y tesoiro de maravillas de la naturaleza* (ibid. 1643, 4to): — *Claros varones de lae compania de Jesus* (ibid. 1643, 4 vols. fol.; Alonso de Andrada added 2 vols. to -it in 1666): — *Gloria de S. Ignacio y de S. Francisco Xavier* (ibid. 1645, fol.): — *Tratado de la constancia en la virtud* (ibid. 1647, 4to): — *pistolk* (ibid. 1649): — *Imitacion de Christo de Thomas de Kempis* (Antwerp, 1650, 8vo): — *Vida del B. Francisco de Borja, an introduction to the works of that writer which he published* (Madrid, 1651, 3 vols. fol.): — *De immaculata conceptione Virginis Marie* (Valence, 1653, 4to): — *Diferencia de la temporal y eterno* (Madrid, 1654, 24mo; transl. into Arabic by P. Fromage): — *Trophace Mariana*, lib. vi (Antwerp, 1655, fol.): — *Cielo estellado de Maria* (Madrid, 1655, fol.): — *Exceptiones concilii Tridentinipro omnimoda puritate Deiparce expensi* (Antwerp, 1656, 8vo), etc. See Sotwell, *Bibl. Script. soc. Jesu*; Antonio, *Nova Bibl. Hispana*, 1:685; Moreri, *Grand Dict. Hist.*; Franckenau, *Bibl. Hispana*, p. 319; Cuvier, *Hist. des Sciences Naturelles*, vol. ii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:59 sq. (J. N. P.)

### Niethammer, Friederich-Emmanuel

a German philosopher, was born in 1766, at Beilstein in Wurtemberg. Nominated in 1793 professor of philosophy and theology in Jena, he received in 1803 a chair in the high school at Wurzburg; in 1807 became a member of the Superior Council of Public Instruction in Munich; was afterwards elected member of the Academy of Sciences. of that city, and obtained in 1829 the position of first counselor of the Superior Consistory. He distinguished himself by his struggle against the introduction of principles exclusively utilitarian on the subject of education. He died in 1846. We have of his works, *Versuch einer Ableitung des moralischen Gesetzes aus den Formen der reinen Vernunft* (Jena, 1793): — *Ueber Religion als WissenschaJt* (Neustrelitz, 1795): — *Versuch einer Begründung des vernunftmassigen Offenbarungsglaubens* (Leipsic, 1798): — *Der Streit des Philanthropismus und Hunanismus.* (Jena, 1808): —

*PPhilosophisches Journal* (Jena, 1795-1800, 10 vols.); from the fifth volume, conjointly with Fichte.

### Nieto, David Ben-Pinchas

(or, as his full name is, *Signor Hachacham B. David Netto Rab del Kehilla Kedosha, de Londres*), a Jewish savant, noted as a philosopher, physician, poet, mathematician, astronomer, historian, and theologian of extraordinary ability, was of Spanish descent, and was born at Venice, Italy, in 1654. He practiced medicine at Leghorn, occasionally preaching in the synagogue. While there he wrote in Italian a work entitled *Pascalogia*, a disquisition on the paschal festival of the Christian Church, in which he pointed out the causes of the differences between the Greek and Latin churches on the time of Easter, and between them and the synagogue on that of the Passover. This book he dedicated to the “Altezza Reverendissima di Francesco Maria Cardinale de Medici.” The fame of his talents led the congregation of London to invite him to be their head in the place of Jacob Abendana (q.v.). Nieto accepted the call, and arrived at London in 1701. In 1704 he published a theological treatise on *Divine Providence, or Dialogues on the Universal Law of Nature*. In 1718 he published a *Jewish Calendar*, entitled מגילת היום טוב. In Hebrew he published his שם ד' פתח ד' וואי, i.e. *The Fire of the Law*, impugning the doctrine of R. Nehemiah Chajun: — *The Rod of Judgment* (שם ד' חפ"ח), or second part of the *Kusari*, to prove the divine authority of the oral law (Engl. transl. by Laz. Lw [London, 1842]): — a contribution to the history of the Inquisition, *Noticias reconditas y posthumas del procedimiento de las Inquisicione de Espana y Portugal*, etc.: — and, besides some pulpit discourses, and *A Reply to the Sermon of the Archbishop of Cranganor* at the auto-da-fe at Lisbon in 1705, he wrote among other polemical pieces one against the doctrines of Sabbathai Zewi, who at that time, as one of a succession of impostors of the same class, had been making a sensation among the Jews as a pretender to the Messiahship. Nieto died in 1728. That he was a very learned man may be seen from a passage of one of the funeral sermons which were delivered at his grave, wherein he is spoken of as a “theologo sublime, sabio profundo, medico insigne, astronomico francoso, poeta dolce, — pregador facundo, logico arguto, physico engenhoso, rhetorico fluente, author jucundo, nas linguas prompto, historias notorioso, posto que tanto em ponco, a guy se encerra, que e muito, e pouco, em morte ha pouca terra.” See *Fiirst, Bibl. Jud.* 3:33 sq.;



De Rossi, *Dizionario* (Ger. transl.), p. 246 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain*, p. 372 sq.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 472 sq.; Glatz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:322, 333, 361; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3:235; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literat.* p. 213; Kayserling, *Geschichte d. Juden in Portugal*, p. 325 sq.; *Sephardim*, p. 299, 307; *Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner*, vol; i (1870), Beilage, p. 9, 17. (B. P.)

### Nieuwentyt, Bernard,

a learned Dutch mathematician and philosophical writer, was born at Westgraafdyk, in Holland, Aug. 10, 1654. He was at first intended for the Church by his parents, but afterwards devoted himself to mathematics. He was one of the early opponents of infinitesimal calculus, and became involved in discussions with Leibnitz, Bernouilli, and Hermann. He died at Purmerend May 30, 1718. Among his works, those having a bearing on theology are, *A Refutation of Spinoza*. (Amst. 1720, 4to), and *Het regt Gebruik der Werelt-beschouwingen* (ibid. 1715, 1720, 1727, 4to). This work, very well conceived, but written in a tedious, diffuse style, was translated into English by Mr. Chamberlayne, a member of the Royal Society of London, under the title of *The Christian Philosopher* (Lond. 1719, 3 vols. 8vo); a French translation was afterwards published under the title of *L'Existence de Dieu demonstrge par les merveilles de la nature* (Paris, 1725, and Amst. 1760, 4to, with numerous plates), and also into German by J. A. Segner, *Rechter Gebrauch d. Weltbetrachtung*, etc. (Jena, — 1747, 4to). This work has led to a charge of plagiarism against Dr. Paley (q.v.), who stands accused of having embodied the principal argument of the *Christian Philosopher* in his *Natural Theology* without any acknowledgment. See *L'Europe Savante*, 8:394; *Bibl. Bremensis*, 2:356; Niceron, *Memoires*, vol. 13 and 20; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:68; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1849. (J. N. P.)

### Nifanius, Christian

a German theologian, was born at Sechlingen, in Dithmar, March 11, 1629, He was successively superintendent of the Lutheran churches of Corbach, Eisenberg, and Ravensberg. He died June 5, 1689. We have of his works, *De pneumatices existentia* (Rostock, 1655, 4to): — *De gsntilium in Vetere Testamento ad regnum coelorum vocatione* (ibid. 1655, 4to): — *Centuria thesium pansophicarum* (Giessen, 1658, 4to): — *Commentarius in Joannem Anti-Grotianum* (ibid. 1658, 1659, and 1684, 4to): —

*Metaphysica contracta* (ibid. 1662, 8vo): — *Ostensio quod Carolus Magnus in quam plurimis fidei articulis formaliter non fuerit papista* (Frankfort, 1670, 8vo): — *Carolus Magnus exhibitus confessor veritatis evangelicæ in Augustana confessione* (ibid. 1679, 8vo): — *Justinus philosophus exhibitus veritatis evangelicæ testis et confessor* (ibid. 1688, 8vo); and a large number of theological dissertations. See Molier, *Cimbria literata*, vol. ii; Pipping, *Memoriar. theologorum*.

## Niflheim

in the old Scandinavian cosmogony, was a place consisting of nine worlds reserved for those who die of disease or old age. Hela, or death, there exercises her despotic power. In the middle of Niflheim, according to the Edda, lies the spring called Hiergolmer, from which flow twelve rivers. See Anderson, *Norse Mythology* (Chicago, 1875, 12mo), p. 187 et al.

## Nifo

(Lat. *Niphus*), AUGUSTINUS, an Italian philosopher and commentator, was born about 1473 at Jopoli, in Calabria (although he signed himself *Sessanus*, as if a native of Sessa). He had scarcely commenced his studies when he was forced to flee from his paternal home to escape ill treatment. At Naples he met a citizen of Sessa, who took him to his home to be the preceptor of his children. In teaching his pupils Nifo instructed himself, and later he accompanied them to Padua, where he followed a philosophical course. He next returned to Sessa, but shortly after went to Naples, where he became professor of philosophy. His celebrity commenced with a treatise, *De intellectu et demonibus*, in which he maintained, following the sentiment of Averroes, that there is but one universal soul, one single intelligence, and that no other spiritual substances exist, with the exception of those who preside over the movement of the heavens. These doctrines, borrowed from a vague Neo-Platonism — the Alexandrine pantheism then prevalent — justly scandalized the theologians; but the bishop of Padua interposed, and Nifo was left to promise that he would correct his book. He afterwards proved his orthodoxy by writing against the philosophical treatise *Pomponace*. In 1513 Leo X called him as professor to the academy at Rome. Nifo was afterwards created Count Palatine, and received permission to bear the name and the arms of the house of the Medici. Several of his works indeed are signed *Augustinus Niphus Medices*. Notwithstanding these favors, he did not remain at Rome. He went to

teach at Pisa, then at Bologna, and finally, in 1525, at Salerno, where he passed the remainder of his life. His death occurred about the middle of the 16th century. Nicéron mentions forty-four of his works, which have scarcely any interest today; they consist largely of commentaries upon Aristotle and Averroes. The original treatises of Nifo have but little more importance than his commentaries; it will suffice to quote a few of them: *De intellectu libri sex et de Daemonibus libri tres* (Venice, 113, 1527, fol.; the 1st ed. in 1492): — *De immortalitate animæ, adversus Petrum Pomponatium* (ibid. 1518, 1524, fol.); in this work, undertaken by the order of Leo X, Nifo has proposed to demonstrate that, following the principles of Aristotle, the soul is immortal: — *Opuscula moralia et politica*. (Paris, 1645, 4to). See Paul Jove, *Elogia*, No. 92; Toppi, *Bibliotheca Neapolitana*; Naude, *Notice sur Nifo*, Introduction to *Opuscula moralia*; Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, s.v.; Nicéron, *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire des hommes illustres*, vol. 18; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. vii, pt. i, p. 340; Gin guene, *Histoire littéraire d'Italie*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:72; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 2:13, 467.

### Nigel Of Ely,

an English ecclesiastic of the 12th century, was a native of Normandy. His uncle Roger was bishop of Salisbury and chancellor of England, while his brother Alexander was bishop of Lincoln. He is said to have studied under Anselm of Laon. Appointed treasurer of king Henry I, he gained the favor of that prince, who at the death of Hervey presented him with the bishopric of Ely. Nigel was subsequently elected by the clergy, but not caring to assume the charge of governing his diocese he remained at court. English ecclesiastical writers give an unfavorable account of his morals. In order to live in grand style he despoiled the churches and convents, and his conduct drew severe rebukes from Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury. After the death of Henry, Stephen ascended the throne, and he showed himself less partial to Nigel, who then took part in various conspiracies of the lords against Stephen. His goods were sequestered, and he himself was banished from the kingdom. Being allowed to return he resumed his office, but was interdicted by Adrian IV for new excesses, and died May 30, 1169. Nigel had a natural son named Richard, who was afterwards bishop of London. It is known that one of the great cares of Gregory VII had been the reform of the manners of the English episcopate. What is related to us of Nigel proves sufficiently that this reform had not then been effected. See *Hist.*

*litter. de la France*, 13:403; *Anglia Sacra*, 1:97; *Angl. hist. script.* 1:266; Piper, *Monumental Theology*, § 78; Inett, *Hist. of the Eng. Ch.* Vol. ii, bk. ix, § 10,16, and 19.

## Ni'ger

(Νίγερ, i.e. Lat. *niger*, or *black*) is the additional or distinctive name given to the Symeon (Συμεών) who was one of the teachers and prophets in the Church of Antioch (<sup><410></sup>Acts 13:1). He is not known except in that passage. The name was a common one among the Romans; and the conjecture that he was an African proselyte, and was called *Niger* on account of his complexion, is unnecessary as well as destitute otherwise of any support. His name, Symeon, shows that he was a Jew by birth; and, as in other similar cases (e.g. Saul, Paul — Silas, Silvanus), he may be supposed to have taken the other name as more convenient in his intercourse with foreigners. He is mentioned second among the five who officiated at Antioch, and perhaps we may infer that he had some pre-eminence among them in point of activity and influence. It is impossible to decide (though Meyer makes the attempt) who of the number were prophets (προφήται), and who were teachers (διδάσκαλοι). *SEE SIMEON.*

## Night

(l yǝḏ la'yil [with h paragogic, hl y] i la'yelath], **νύξ**), the period of darkness, from sunset to sunrise, including the morning and evening twilight, as opposed to “day,” the period of light (<sup><1005></sup>Genesis 1:5). Following the Oriental sunset is the brief evening twilight **אַבְנֵי**, *nesheph*, <sup><845></sup>Job 24:15, rendered “night” in <sup><351></sup>Isaiah 5:11; 21:4; 59:10), when the stars appeared (<sup><809></sup>Job 3:9). This is also called “evening” **בְּרַח**, *ereb*, <sup><107></sup>Proverbs 7:9, rendered “night” in <sup><1427></sup>Genesis 49:27; <sup><804></sup>Job 7:4), but the term which especially denotes the evening twilight is **חֹשֶׁךְ** [**hfi**] [**] alathd** (<sup><157></sup>Genesis 15:17, A. V. “dark;” <sup><526></sup>Ezekiel 12:6, 7, 12). *Ereb* also denotes the time just before sunset (<sup><631></sup>Deuteronomy 23:11; <sup><89></sup>Joshua 8:29), when the women went to draw water (<sup><1241></sup>Genesis 24:11), and the decline of the day is called “the turning of evening” (**בְּרַח**, **תְּמוֹצֵת**) <sup><1263></sup>Genesis 24:63), the time of prayer. This period of the day must also be that which is described as “night” when Boaz winnowed his barley in the evening breeze (<sup><802></sup>Ruth 3:2), the cool of the day (<sup><1008></sup>Genesis 3:8), when the shadows begin to fall (<sup><1061></sup>Jeremiah 6:4), and the wolves prowl about (<sup><3008></sup>Habakkuk 1:8; <sup><308></sup>Zephaniah 3:3). The time of midnight (**חֲלוּץ** [**hl y]** [**hix**] [**ḡ**])

*half of the night*, <sup><807></sup>Ruth 3:7, and **twøj jhl ylbai**, the plural form, <sup><2104></sup>Exodus 11:4), or greatest darkness, is called in <sup><1009></sup>Proverbs 7:9, *the pupil of night* (**hl yj i woyaa** A. V. “black night”). The period between midnight and the morning twilight was generally selected for attacking an enemy by surprise (<sup><1079></sup>Judges 7:19). The morning twilight is denoted by the same term, *nesheph* as the evening twilight, and is unmistakably intended in <sup><1812></sup>1 Samuel 31:12; <sup><1874></sup>Job 7:4; Psalm cxix. 147; possibly also in Isaiah v , 11. With sunrise the night ended. In one passage (<sup><1830></sup>Job 26:10, **Ëvj** , *choshek*) “darkness” is rendered “night” in the A. V., but is correctly given in the margin. *SEE DAY*.

As figuratively the term of human life is often called a day in Scripture, so in one passage it is called *night*, to be followed soon by day: “The day is at hand” (<sup><1812></sup>Romans 8:12). Being a time of darkness, the image and shadow of death, in which the beasts of prey go forth to devour, night was made a symbol of a season of adversity and trouble, in which men prey upon each other, and the strong tyrannize over the weak (<sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 21:12; <sup><3146></sup>Zechariah 14:6, 7; comp. <sup><6223></sup>Revelation 21:23; 22:5). Hence continued day, or the absence of night, implies a constant state of quiet and happiness. Night is also put, as in our own language, for a time of ignorance and helplessness (<sup><3116></sup>Micah 3:6). In <sup><1906></sup>John 9:4, by a natural figure, night represents death. Children of the day and children of the night denote good men and wicked men. The disciples of the Son of God are children of the light: they belong to the light, they walk in the light of truth; while the children of the night walk in the darkness of ignorance and infidelity, and perform only works of darkness (<sup><1916></sup>1 Thessalonians 5:5). *SEE NIGHT-WATCH*.

NIGHT (Latin *Nox*). The ancient Greeks and Romans deified Night, and called her the daughter of Chaos. Orpheus reckons her the most ancient of the deities, and calls her the mother of gods and men. The poets describe her as clothed with a black veil, and riding in a chariot, attended by the stars. The sacrifice proper to her was a cock, being a bird that is an enemy to silence. Night had a numerous offspring, as Madness, Contention, Death, Sleep, Dreams, Love, Deceit, Fear, Labor, Emulation, Fate, Old Age, Darkness, Misery, Complaint, Partiality, Obstinacy, etc. All this is plainly allegorical. Pausanias has left us a description of a remarkable statue of the goddess Night. “We see,” he says, “a woman holding in her right hand a white child sleeping, and in her left a black child, asleep likewise, with both its legs distorted. The inscription tells us what they are,

though we might easily guess without it. The two children are *Death* and *Sleep*, and the woman is *Night*, the nurse of them both.” See Broughton, *Hist. of Religion*; Smith, *Dict. of Classical Biog. and Mythol.* 2:1218.

## Night-hawk

### Picture for Night-hawk

is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of **smj Tj** *tachmas*’ (apparently from **smj** ; *to act violently*), the name of one of the unclean birds mentioned in the Pentateuch (only <sup><B1116></sup>Leviticus 11:16; <sup><B145></sup>Deuteronomy 14:15; Sept. **λαούξ**, Vulg. *noctua*). Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2:830) has endeavored to prove that the Hebrew word denotes the “male ostrich,” the preceding term (**hn[ŷAtB]**, *bath yaanah* (A. V. “owl”), signifying the female of that bird. The etymology of the word points to some bird of prey, though there is great uncertainty as to the particular species indicated. The Sept., Vulg., and perhaps Onkelos, understand some kind of “owl;” most of the Jewish doctors indefinitely render the word “a rapacious bird;” Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v.) and Rosenmüller (*Schol. ad* <sup><B1116></sup>*Leviticus* 11:16) follow Bochart. Bochart’s explanation is grounded on an overstrained interpretation of the etymology of the verb *chamas*, the root of *tachmds*; he restricts the meaning of the root to the idea of acting “unjustly” or “deceitfully,” and thus comes to the conclusion that the “unjust bird” is the male ostrich. But it is not at all probable that Moses should have specified both the *male and female* ostrich in a list which was no doubt intended to be as comprehensive as possible. **SEE OSTRICH**. The not unfrequent occurrence of the expression “after their kind” is an argument in favor of this assertion. Michaelis believes some kind of swallow (*Hiaundo*) is intended: the word used by the Targum of Jonathan is by itto (*Pict. Bib.* <sup><B1116></sup>Leviticus 11:16) and by Oedmann (*Vermnisch. Samnm.* i.p. 3, c. iv) referred to the swallow, though the last-named authority says, “it is uncertain, however, what Jonathan really meant.” Buxtorf (*Lex. Rabbin.* v. **atypæj** ) translates the word used by Jonathan, “a name of a rapacious bird, *harpyja*.” It is not easy to see what claim the swallow can have to represent the *tachmas*, nor is it at all probable that so small a bird should have been noticed in the Levitical law. The rendering of the A.V. rests on no special authority, though from the absurd properties which, from the time of Aristotle, have been ascribed to the night-hawk or goatsucker, and the superstitions connected with this bird, its claim is not entirely destitute of every kind of

evidence. As the nighthawk of Europe (*Caprimulgus Europceus*), or a species very nearly allied to it, is an inhabitant of Syria, there is no reason for absolutely rejecting it in this place, since it belongs to a genus highly connected with superstitions in all countries; and though a voracious bird among moths (*Phalene*) and other insects that are abroad during darkness, it is absolutely harmless to all other animals, and as wrongfully accused of sucking the udders of goats, as of being an indicator of misfortune and death to those who happen to see it fly past them after evening twilight; yet, besides the name of *goatsucker*, it is denominated *night-raven*, as if it were a bulky species, with similar powers of mischief to those which day birds possess. Other provincial names for this bird are *moth-hawk*, *night-jar*, *churn-owl*, *fern-owl*, etc. The night-hawk is a migratory bird, inferior in size to a thrush, and has very weak talons and bill; but the gape or mouth's wide; it makes now and then a plaintive cry, and preys on the wing; it flies with the velocity and action of a swallow, the two genera being nearly allied. Like those of most night-birds, the eyes are large and remarkable, and the plumage a mixture of colors and dots, with a prevailing gray effect; it is finely webbed, and entirely noiseless in its passage through the air. Thus the bright eyes, wide mouth, sudden and inaudible flight in the dusk, are the original causes of the superstitious fear these birds have excited; and as there are in southern climates other species of this genus, much larger in size, with peculiarly contrasted colors, strangely disposed feathers on the head, or paddleshaped single plumes, one at each shoulder, projecting in the form of two additional wings, and with plaintive loud voices often uttered in the night, all the species contribute to the general awe they have inspired in every country and in all ages. We see here that it is not the bulk of a species, nor the exact extent of injury it may inflict, that determines the importance attached to the name, but the opinions, true or false, which the public may have held or still entertain concerning it. The night-hawk is abundant in Western Asia; and from its peculiar jarring note, and its strange manners, appearing only in the twilight, and wheeling like the bats round and round a tree, or continually passing and repassing before the eye at short intervals, it is generally viewed with superstitious awe by the uneducated. These movements, however, are prompted by the instinct to capture large insects, which are either attracted round the blossom of the tree, or are playing to and fro in a circumscribed space.

As the Sept. and Vulg. are agreed that *tachmas* denotes some kind of owl, it is probably safer to follow these versions than the modern commentators.

The Greek **γλαύξ** is used by Aristotle for some common species of owl, in all probability for the *Strix fammea* (white owl) or the *Syrnium stridula* (tawny owl); the Veneto-Greek reads **νυκτικόραξ**, a synonyme of **ᾠτος**, Aristot., i.e. the *Otus vulgaris*, Flem. (long-eared owl): this is the species which Oedmann (see above) identifies with *tachmas*. “The name,” he says, “indicates a bird which exercises power, but the force of the power is in the Arabic root *chamash*, ‘to tear a face with claws.’ Now it is well known in the East that there is a species of owl of which people believe that it glides into chambers by night and tears the flesh off the faces of sleeping children.” Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 196; Lond. 1766) alludes to this nightly terror, but he calls it the “Oriental owl” (*Strix Orientalis*), and clearly distinguishes it from the *Strix otus*, Lin. The Arabs in Egypt call this infant-killing owl *massasa*, the Syrians *bana*. It is believed to be identical with the *Syrnium stridula*, but what foundation there may be for the belief in its child-killing propensities we know not. It is probable that some common species of owl is denoted by *tachmas*, perhaps the *Strix flammea* or the *Athene meridionalis*, which is extremely common in Palestine and Egypt. The goatsucker is thus confounded with owls by the Arabian peasantry, and the name *masasas* more particularly belongs to it. But that the confusion with the **tyl wæ æ** or *lilith*, is not confined to Arabia and Egypt is sufficiently evident from the Slavonic names of the bird, being in Russian, *lilok*, *lelek*; Polish, *lelek*; Lithuanian, *lehlis*; and Hungarian, *egeli*; all clearly allied to the Shemitic denomination of the owl. **SEE NIGHT-MONSTER**. If **γλαύξ** is the true equivalent of *tachmas*, we can be at no loss for the species; for the Greeks applied that term to an owl with eyes of a gleaming blue color. This is true only of the white or barn owl (*Strix fammea*), all the other European owls having eyes of a brilliant yellow or fiery orange. The white owl is abundant in Palestine and in the regions surrounding the Levant; it is indeed spread over the whole of Europe, Africa, Asia, and North America; for, though specimens from the remoter regions have been considered distinct, their differences are too slight to build upon them with certainty a specific diversity. **SEE OWL**.

### Night-monster

occurs in the margin of the Auth. Ver. at <sup>2344</sup> Isaiah 34:14, as the rendering of the Hebrew *lilith* (**hyl wæ æ**) derived, from *layil* (**l yæ**), *night*. The text has *screech-owl*, but the marginal reading is preferable. The word doubtless refers to the night-specters or ghosts, supposed by superstitious Hebrews to frequent the desert. The Sept. renders **ὄνοκένταυροι**, which,



as Bochart (*Hieroz.* pt. ii, lib. vi, p. 840) shows, refers, not to animals, but to ghostly appearances. (See also Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* p. 1140; Gesen. *Comment.* in <sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 13:22; 34:14.) **SEE SPECTRE.**

### Night-vision

(*hl y| i`yøj* } <sup><2317></sup>Isaiah 29:7, etc.; Chald. *ay| y| AyDæawzj* , <sup><2719></sup>Daniel 2:19, etc.). The perplexing but fascinating subject of the visions of sleep has in all ages attracted observation and speculation; but the laws which govern the countless images and fancied experiences of this realm of dream” are even now imperfectly understood. The subject owes its importance, in Biblical studies, to two facts: first, that these visions were often made the means of divine revelation; and, second, that even when uninspired, they were highly valued and diligently studied by many characters in Scripture history. On the immediate cause of dreaming, however, the views of the ancients were various, and generally absurd. The first really rational explanation seems to be that of Aristotle, who taught that the impression produced by perception remains after the object is removed, and affects the perceptive faculties during sleep. An opinion much more general among the heathen, and revived and supported with much acuteness in England by Baxter (*Essay on the Phenomenon of Dreaming*, 3d ed. 1745), was that spiritual beings have access to the mind during sleep, and fill it with dreams. But the theory generally followed by English writers is that of Dugald Stewart (*Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, 1:328 sq.), who explains dreams as caused by the natural and spontaneous action of the mental faculties, freed from obedience to the will, but subject to their own usual laws of association. Some find a strong analogy between dreaming and insanity. Dr. Abercrombie states the difference to be that the erroneous impression, in the one case, is permanent, and affects the conduct, but in the other is temporary, and vanishes on awaking. But the distinction is really far wider; for in dreams the will is simply at rest, while in insanity it is a slave to the diseased action of the mental faculties or active powers. **SEE DREAM.**

In regarding dreams as of great importance the Jews agreed with all other ancient nations (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 316 sq.). It was the general belief that by means of them, and especially of those which occurred in the last hours of the night, or “morning dreams” (*Odys.* 4:839 sq.; *Mosch.* 2:2, 5; *Hor. Sat.* 1:10, 31 sq.; *Cic. Div.* 1:51), they could obtain a knowledge of the future (comp. <sup><1575></sup>Genesis 37:5 sq.; 41:11 sq.; <sup><10713></sup>Judges 7:13 sq.; *Wisd.*

18:19; <sup><079></sup>Matthew 27:19; see *Il.* 1:63; Herod. 1:34; Philostr. *Apoll.* 8:7, 5; Theophr. *Char.* xvii; Macrob. *Somn. Scip.* 1:3; Curt. 3:3, 2; Arvieux, *Nachr.* 4:325 sq.). The ancient philosophers taught various doctrines as to the significance of dreams (see Herod. 7:16; Cic. *Div.* 2:58-62). At a very early period dreams became a medium of divine revelation (<sup><028></sup>Genesis 20:3; 31:10 sq., 24; 46:2; <sup><086></sup>1 Samuel 28:6; <sup><085></sup>1 Kings 3:5; <sup><835></sup>Job 33:15; <sup><225></sup>Jeremiah 23:25 sq.; comp. Josephus. *War.* 3:8,3), and they are especially associated with prophetic visions (<sup><026></sup>Numbers 12:6; <sup><301></sup>Joel 3:1; <sup><201></sup>Daniel 7:1); yet they are not prominent in the written prophecies until after the captivity (Daniel 8; 4 Esdras 11). The false prophets, also, gloried in their prophetic dreams (<sup><225></sup>Jeremiah 23:25, 27, 32; <sup><301></sup>Zechariah 10:2; comp. <sup><633></sup>Deuteronomy 13:1, 3, 5). But revelation, when communicated in dreams, came sometimes by a peculiar divine utterance of audible exhortation, warning, or instruction (see <sup><028></sup>Genesis 20:3, 6; 31:24; <sup><021></sup>Matthew 1:20 sq.; 2:13, 20; comp. <sup><026></sup>1 Samuel 28:6, 15; Pausan. 9:23, 2; Liv. 2:36; 21:22; Xen. *Cyrop.* 8:7, 2), sometimes by visible images and symbols (<sup><037></sup>Genesis 37:7; <sup><073></sup>Judges 7:13; <sup><835></sup>Job 33:15; comp. Herod. 3:124; v. 56; Curt. 3:3, 3; Josephus, *Ant.* 17:12, 3; Xen. *Anab.* iii, 1, 11), and sometimes by both together (<sup><022></sup>Genesis 28:12 sq.). In each case the vision needed an interpreter. Accordingly, interpreters (in Greek **ὄνειροπόλοι, ὄνειροσκόποι, ὄνειροκριταί**) who professed to be able to explain visions (comp. <sup><073></sup>Judges 7:13 sq.) were highly esteemed (Genesis xli; <sup><252></sup>Daniel 5:12), and this power was considered a distinguished gift of God (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 1:17). Princes and generals kept such men near them (Arrian, *Alex.* 2:18, 2; Curt. 4:2). The Chaldee interpreters were especially famous (<sup><202></sup>Daniel 2:2 sq.; 4:3 sq.; v. 12; see Diod. Sic. 2:28); while among the Jews the Essenes seem to have cultivated the art with the utmost diligence (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:12, 3). This profession was a means of support (Plutarch, *Aristid.* p. 27; Juvenal, 6:547). When dreams of fearful import occurred, the Greeks and Romans offered sacrifices (Aristoph. *Ran.* 1338 sq.; Martial, 11:51,-7). The whole subject of the divination of the ancients by visions is presented with tolerable completeness by Artemidorus, in the 2d century (*Oneirocritica*, five books), and Synesius in the 5th (*Logos peri enupnion*). **SEE DIVINATION.** The Hebrew word **מַרְאֵה** <sup><234></sup>Isaiah 65:4 is explained by the Sept. and Jerome as an allusion to the heathen custom of passing the night in the temples of the gods, in order to receive prophetic dreams from them, and especially revelations of the means of curing the sick (comp. Diod. Sic. 1:25; Cic. *Divinat.* i. 43, 96); but this is an error (see Gesen. *Comment.* ad

loc.).’ It appears from Josephus (*Ant.* 17:6, 4) that the later Jews were very attentive to dreams and visions (comp. also *War*, 3:8, 3). Much value is still ascribed to them in the East. (See Tavernier, *Reisen*, 1:271; comp. also Knobel, *Prophetism. d. Hebraer*, 1:174 sq.; Schubert, *Reise in das Morgenl.* 1:402; Ennemoser, *Gesch. d. Magie*, 1:112 sq.) **SEE VISION.**

Night-watch (**hrmwaj** *ashmuraḥ*, <sup><B616></sup>Psalm 63:6; 119:148, a *watch*, as elsewhere rendered; so the Gr. **φυλακή**). The Israelites, Greeks, and Romans divided the night into parts of several hours each, at the expiration of every one of which a change of guards took place (Dissen, *De partib. noctis et diei*, in his *Kleinen Schriften*, p. 127 sq.; Suidas, s.v. **φυλακή**). The ancient Hebrews, before the captivity, divided the night into three watches, like the Greeks. The first, which continued till midnight, was denominated **t/rmwajivao** *rosh ashmurdth* (<sup><A19></sup>Lamentations 2:19); the second was denominated **hnwkyTbt rmwaj** *ashmdreth hat-tikondlh*, and continued from midnight till the crowing of the cock (<sup><O719></sup>Judges 7:19); the third, called **r22qBhi rmwaj** *ashmoreth hab-bdker*, the morning watch, extended from the second watch to the rising of the sun (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1:486). These divisions and names appear to have originated in the watches of the Levites in the tabernacle and Temple (for these, see *Middoth*, 1:1 sq.; <sup><O21></sup>Exodus 14:21; <sup><O111></sup>1 Samuel 11:11). During the time of our Savior the night was divided into four watches of three hours each (Jerome, *On Matthew xiv*), a fourth watch having been introduced among the Jews from the Romans, who derived it from the Greeks (Lipsius, *De 3 Milit. Romans* p. 123; Veget. *De Re Mil.* 3:8; Censorin. c. 24; Pliny, v. 18). The Romans announced the beginning of each by the sound of a trumpet. This division became so familiar to the Jews that Josephus (*Ant.* v. 6, 5) makes Gideon (<sup><O719></sup>Judges 7:19) lead out his army *in the fourth watch*. The second and third watches are mentioned in <sup><O238></sup>Luke 12:38; the fourth in <sup><O145></sup>Matthew 14:25; and the four are all distinctly mentioned in <sup><O135></sup>Mark 13:35: “Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh; at even (**ὄψέ**, or the late watch), or at midnight (**μεσονύκτιον**), or at the cock-crowing (**ἀγεκτοροφωνία**), or in the morning (**πρωί**, the early watch).” Here the first watch was at even, and continued from six till nine; the second commenced at nine, and ended at twelve, or midnight; the third watch, called by the Romans *gallicinium*, lasted from twelve to three; and the morning watch closed at six. **SEE COCK-CROWING.** Talmudists, however, reckon only three night-watches (*Babyl. Berachoth*, 1:1, 6; Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 468 sq.), calling the fourth the morning: of the next day.

But this was perhaps merely for the purpose of preserving nominally the ancient custom of the Hebrews (but Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 364). The Roman custom was certainly in use among the soldiers of Herod (as is plain from ~~Acts~~ Acts 12:4; comp. Fischer, *Prolus. de Vit. Lexic.* p. 452; Wetstein, *N.T.* 1:416 sq.; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 347 sq.). It is still customary in the East to divide the night by the crowing of the cock, which is tolerably regular (Schubert, 1:402 sq.). The city watchmen are mentioned in ~~Song~~ Song of Solomon 3:3; 5:7; comp. Psalm 127. 1. **SEE WATCH.**

### Night-Watch

(*Lych-wake*, death-watch, or vigil). It was the custom for the faithful to observe nightwatches for the departed until the funeral, and make intercession for their souls; but in 1343 this practice was forbidden in England—as it had degenerated into an occasion for assignations, thefts, revels, and buffooneries. In private houses under pain of excommunication, the relations of the dead and those who said psalters alone excepted. In 1363 these wakes were kept in churches under the close supervision of the parish clergy. The wake still lingers in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. **SEE WAKES.**

### Nightingale, Joseph

an English dissenting divine, was born in Lancashire in 1775. He became a Wesleyan minister at Macclesfield, and soon after settled at London, where he supported himself principally by his literary exertions. At the time when he published his *Portraiture of Methodism* (Lond. 1807, 8vo) in many points a caricature — he had become a convert to Unitarianism. He died in 1824. He wrote, besides the above-mentioned work, *A Portraiture of the Roman Catholic Religion, or an unprejudiced Sketch of the History, Doctrines, Opinions, Discipline, and Present State of Catholicism* (Lond. 1812, 8vo): — *The Religions and Religious Ceremonies of all Nations accurately and impartially described; including Christians, Mohammedans, Jews, Brahmins, and Pagans, of all Sects and Denominations* (ibid. 1821, 12mo): — *Report of the Trial Nightingale vs. Stockdale, in an Action for a Libel, contained in a Review of the Portraiture of Methodism* (ibid. 1809, 8vo). See Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica.*, 2:2203; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v. (J. N. P.)

## Nigrante, Tectam Pallio

is the beginning of an evening hymn (*hymnus vespertinus*) by Magnus Felix Ennodius (q.v.), bishop of Pavia (Ticinum), where he died July 17, 521. Besides a number of theological works, he also wrote poems, among which are some hymns, which were published by Schott and Sirmond (Paris, 1611), and which are also found in the *Biblioth. Patrum Lugd.* This evening hymn has been translated into German by Rambach, *Anthologie christl. Gesange*, 1:94, and by Konigfeld in his *Lateinische Hymnen u. Gesdng*, 2d series, p. 67 sq. (Bonn, 1865).

## Nigrinus, Bartholomeus

a Roman Catholic divine, who flourished in Poland near the middle of the 17th century, was born of Socinian parents, and having been successively a Lutheran, and a minister of the Helvetian confession at Dantzic, finally obtained much influence at the Polish court under king Vladislav IV, after having accepted the Romish faith. The king was anxious to bring about in his realm the religious union of all his subjects, and thus to close the fearful strife which then threatened to end in a war for Conscience' sake. Nigrinus, having obtained access to the monarch; represented to him that it was an easy thing to unite all Christian confessions. The king supposed that an individual who had several times changed his religious persuasion must be well acquainted with all differences and causes of controversy, and consequently put faith in the feasibility of the project. Nigrinus further maintained, before the king and several bishops, that it would be possible to attain his object by means of a friendly discussion between some chosen doctors of the different confessions; and the king, giving heed to Nigrinus's persuasions, resolved to gather in a friendly meeting (*colloquium charitativum*) a number of divines of all the Christian confessions. Primate and pope consented, and it was finally called to convene at Thorn, Oct. 10, 1644. The date was later extended to Aug. 28, 1645; but when it convened it was soon made evident that a union of Protestants and Romanists was out of the question, the latter refusing to give up communion in one kind, the former to accept papal supremacy; and after several protests had been made on both sides, the inutility of continuing the discussions became evident, and the *colloquium* was closed November 21 with much less solemnity than it had been opened. Instead of producing, as had been hoped, a reconciliation of the adverse confessions, or even an approximation to it, the *colloquium* rather increased their mutual acrimony;

and each party published pamphlets charging its opponents with that ill success which was fairly attributable to none, because produced by the very nature of things. After this we hear no more of Nigrinus. See the articles **POLAND** *SEE POLAND* and *SEE THORN*. (J.H.W.)

### Nigroni, Giuio

a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born in 1553 at Genoa. At eighteen years of age he entered the Society of Jesus, taught rhetoric, philosophy, and theology, and became successively prefect of studies in the College of Milan, rector of the colleges of Verona, Cremona, and Genoa, and superior of the monastic house of Genoa and that of Milan. He died in Milan January 17, 1625. We have of his works, *Orationes xxv* (Milan, 1608, 4to; Mayence, 1610, 8vo): — *Sur la Maniere de bien gouverner l'Etat* (Milan, 1610, 4to, in Italian): — *Regulae communes Societatis Jesu, commentariis asceticis illustrate* (ibid. 1613, 1616, 4to; Cologne, 1617, 4to): — *Dissertatio subcesiva de caliga veterum* (Milan, 1617, 12mo; 3d ed. Dillingen, 1621, 8vo); it contains some curious details of the boots from which the emperor Caligula took his surname, and has been reprinted several times (Amsterdam, 1667, and Leipsic, 1733, 12mo) with an analogous work, *Calceus antiquus et mysticus*, by Benoit Balduin: — *Tractatus ascetici x* (Milan, 1621, 8vo; Cologne, 1624, 4to); these treatises at first appeared separately: — *De librorum amatoriorum lectione, junioribus maxime vitanda* (Milan, 1622, and Cologne, 1630, 12mo): — *Dissertatio de aula et aulicisimi fuga* (Milan, 1627, 8vo), under the anagram of *Livius Noringius*: — *Historica dissertatio de S. Ignatio Loyola et B. Cajetano Thiceneo, institutore ord. clericorum regul.* (Cologne, 1630, and Naples, 1631, 4to): — *Les Emblemes de l'Academie Parthenienne du College Romain de la Societe de Jesus* (printed at Rome in Italian, 1694, 4to). See Sotwell, *De Script. ord. Soc. Jesu*.

### Nihil Prebends

a title given at Bangor to unendowed canonries, held by the precentor, chancellor, and three canons, who were maintained by corrodies, pensions, and oblations.

### Nihilism

appears in philosophical and theological literature in three distinct forms.

**1.** In its first form it is a certain theory of knowledge, of its nature and extent, and of the reality of existence. It is the doctrine that we can have no knowledge of real things or existences, that nothing can be really known, and in its extreme form it is a denial of all existence itself. Nihilism is the result of continued and extreme philosophical *scepticism* (q.v.). As philosophy has ever had an intimate connection with theology, and has always involved skepticism in a greater or less degree, so nihilism in some form has accompanied the philosophical and theological thought of almost every age. Among the first developments of Greek philosophy we find the nihilism of Georgias, one of the Sophists, and a contemporary of Socrates. He taught

**(1)** that nothing exists; for if anything were, its being must be either derived or eternal; but it cannot have been derived, whether from the existent or from the non-existent (according to the Eleaticos): nor can it be eternal, for then it must be infinite; but the infinite is nowhere, since it can neither be in itself nor in anything else, and what is nowhere is not.

**(2)** That if anything were, it could not be known; for if knowledge of the existent were possible, then all that is thought must be, and the non-existent could not even be thought of; but such an error would be as great as if one should affirm that a contest with chariots took place on the sea, which is absurd.

**(3)** That if knowledge were possible, it could not be communicated, for every sign differs from the thing signified; how can any one communicate by words the notion of color, seeing that the ear hears not color, but sounds? In contrast with this sophistic nihilism of existence, Parmenides, in the previous century, had made the reality of existence the leading tenet of his philosophy. Only being is, he taught, and of the one true existence we may attain convincing knowledge by thought. In the philosophy of Plato, which has exercised a large and lasting influence upon Christian thought, the Idea, his fundamental conception, is pure archetypal essence, having an objective and real existence, and not merely an existence in thought. In Plato's philosophy appears the logically legitimate recognition of a relation in the subjective conception to objective reality, which is the one refutation of all nihilism. But there were poetical, fanciful elements in his philosophy, which by some were transformed into scientific, dogmatic formulas, and led to a skeptical reaction, and to nihilism, such as that of Pyrrho. *SEE PYRRHONISM*. According to him, real things were inaccessible to human

knowledge, and it is our duty to abstain from judging. His followers taught that “our perceptions and representations are neither true nor false, and can. therefore not be relied upon. The grounds of every proposition and its contradictory show themselves equally strong.” But then all these principles, after being applied to the assertions of those: who believed ill the truth and reality of knowledge and existence, were finally to be applied to their own principles in order that in the end not even these should retain the character of truthful and fixed assertions; so that those propositions, in which they professed to assert truthfully the falsity or uncertainty of other propositions, were themselves equally false and untrustworthy. Thus this nihilistic skepticism destroys itself at last by its own principles. Augustine, early in his life, passed through a period of this skepticism, and subsequently, after having been led by Ambrosius to an acceptance of catholic Christianity, earnestly and convincingly argued for certitude in human knowledge as a necessary element in it. He urges as an introductory consideration that the possession of truth is one of our wants, that it is necessary to our happiness, as no one can be happy who is not in possession of that which he wishes to possess, and he who seeks the truth without finding it cannot be happy. In his *De Beata Vita* he lays down the principle, which has been so fruitful in philosophy, that it is impossible to doubt one’s own living existence — a principle which in the *Soliloquia*, written immediately afterwards, is expressed in this form: Thought, and therefore the existence of the thinker, are the most certain of all things. This reminds us at once of the famous formula upon which Descartes found a solid place for his feet in the midst of nihilistic doubts: “Cogito, ergo sum.” Augustine finds a foundation for all our knowledge — a foundation invulnerable against every doubt in the consciousness we have of our sensations, our feelings, our willing and thinking; in short. of all our ‘psychical processes. He makes being, life, and thought coordinate. The existence of nihilism in the thought of the centuries subsequent to Augustine is evinced by the arguments with which theologians were constantly opposing it, and by the skepticism apparent in the writings of philosophizing theologians, as of Duns Scotus, who doubted in philosophy, but who yet in religion received the teachings of the Church on faith independently of philosophical reasoning. Descartes was led by comparing the different notions and customs of different nations and parties, by general philosophical meditations, and more especially by his observation of the great remoteness of all demonstrations in philosophy from mathematical certainty — to doubt the truth of all propositions received at



second hand. He began his philosophizing with universal doubt, with a nihilism which refused to acknowledge the certainty of any presuppositions or traditional opinions. He then set himself at work to discover if possible one proposition which is fully certain and beyond all doubt. One thing in the midst of his universal doubt was certain, and that, he says, is the fact that I do really doubt, or, as doubting is a species of thinking, that I do really think; and therefore that I do exist. Even admitting the existence of a powerful being bent on deceiving me, yet I must exist in order to be able to be deceived. When I think that I exist, this very act of thinking proves that I really exist; *Cogito, ergo sum*. From the clearness and distinctness which belong to this first truth, and which alone make us assuredly certain of it, Descartes deduced clearness and distinctness of perception as a criterion of the truth and certainty of knowledge. Objection, indeed, may justly be made to this criterion of certainty; but the fact of existence, given to us even in universal doubt, as Descartes found it and formulated it, is one, at least, of the starting-points of real knowledge, and an impregnable fortress against doubting nihilism itself. With Hume, again, we find skepticism and the limitation of knowledge extending very nearly to pure nihilism. Knowledge consists in impressions and ideas or thoughts, all derived from the senses and from experience, and so subjective as to give us little or no knowledge of objective realities or existences. So the only reality that we know in the relation of cause and effect is simple, bare succession. There is in the idea no knowledge of a real necessary causal nexus, either in its nature or as a fact. We only know that certain things are connected according to a constant rule, and that is all that the idea of cause and effect can contain. "The ultimate grounds of things are utterly inaccessible to the curiosity and investigation of man."

Kant, incited by Hume's skepticism, undertook, in his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, a more thorough examination of the origin, extent, and limits of human knowledge than had hitherto been given. Its object was to establish the distinction between phenomena and real things, or "things-in-themselves." The latter have a real objective existence, but out of relation to time, space, or causality, and hence out of the realm of all experience. He ascribes to these real things the function of affecting the senses, and thus giving the material of thought or the substance of phenomena. In this was a *realistic* element, while in their independence of space and time there is an *idealism* (q.v.). As to phenomena, their substance is given through impressions on the senses, derived in some way from the things in

themselves. But *theforms* under which we have a knowledge of these phenomena are a purely subjective product of the mind itself, by virtue of its spontaneity. They are forms of intuition, viz. of space and time, and forms or categories of thought, twelve in number, such as unity, reality, causality. As to the extent of our knowledge, in Kant's critique the things in themselves are unknowable for man. Only a creative, divine mind, that gives them reality at the same time that it thinks them, can have power truly to know them; they have neither unity nor plurality, nor substantiality, nor are they subject to the causal relation, or to any of the categories of thought. We can know Phenomenia, but phenomena only. They are the mental representations which exist in our consciousness, derived from the things in themselves by virtue of the function of these things to affect our senses, but known under those forms of intuition and thought which are the purely spontaneous, subjective creations of the mind itself. These forms of our knowledge have their origin in certain corresponding *a priori* judgments or cognitions, by which he means "those which take place independently, not of this or that, but of all experience whatever." The certainty and truthfulness of all our knowledge depend upon the truthfulness and validity of these *a priori* judgments or cognitions. The criteria of the truthfulness of these judgments are necessity and strict universality, it being assumed, as the basis of his system of *a priori* knowledge, that necessity and strict universality are derivable from no combination of experiences, but only independently of all experience. All cognitions or propositions that have these marks are true. But it is to be borne in mind that our knowledge under these forms is true and objectively valid, not in regard to things as they are in themselves, apart from our mode of conceiving them, but only in regard to empirical objects or the phenomena which exist in our consciousness in the form of mental representations. In what we call external objects, Kant sees only mental representations resulting from the nature of our sensibility. "The things which we perceive are not what we take them to be, nor their relations of such intrinsic nature as they appear to us to be; if we make abstraction of ourselves as knowing *subjects*, or even only of the subjective constitution of our senses generally, all the qualities, all the relations of objects in space and time, yes, and even space and time themselves, disappear: as phenomena they cannot really *existper se*, but only in us; what may be the character of things in themselves, and wholly separated from our receptive sensibility, remains wholly unknown to us." We can now perceive to what extent Kant in his philosophy had overcome nihilism. We have a true and

valid knowledge of everything in our experience, in our consciousness. What is in our consciousness, the phenomena, is real, and we have a real and truthful knowledge of it. Furthermore, there is a real objective existence of things, otherwise there would-be no phenomena, and no objects of thought. But beyond this there is much of the ignorance and uncertainty of nihilism. For the forms under which our knowledge is possible are so purely subjective, so purely independent creations of the mind itself, that they bring all the objects or material of knowledge to the mind in their own form and features and dress, so that we cannot be certain that our knowledge corresponds to the reality of things. All knowledge is thus *relative* to the human mind. It is conditional only, conditioned by those forms of the understanding which mold it into the form in which it is received. As the *a priori* judgments upon which all our knowledge is based arise from the constitution of the mind itself, a change in the constitution of the mind might involve a change in these fundamental *a priori* judgments and forms, and thus in the knowledge which is built upon them. They thus have for us a *regulative force*, but perhaps only a *relative truth and validity*. Man must use them; they are the condition and law of all his intellectual processes; but “he is not thereby authorized to assume that they hold good as the laws of minds which may be supposed to be constituted differently from those of human beings, or that they hold true of the knowledge which such beings acquire. On the one hand we cannot deny that they do hold true for other beings and their knowledge; and on the other we cannot deny that they do not.” In his most acute and thorough examination of the laws and operations of the human mind, and of the nature of our knowledge, Kant established more conclusively and firmly than had hitherto been done the fact, which lies at the basis of all true philosophy, of certain universal and necessary *a priori* or intuitive truths. But in assuming that these truths are the product of the mind’s own creative activity, independent of all experience, he gave to all our knowledge an uncertain relativity, and introduced an element akin to nihilism. To this it has been very justly objected that these truths are not given independently of all experience, but are so connected with and derived from our experience of the external objective world as to give us necessarily a truthful knowledge corresponding to the reality of things. Nor can the analogies derived from the senses, from such phenomena as the changes in the color of objects seen through differently colored glass, or occasioned by changes in the physical condition of the eye, be legitimately applied to objects and acts of the pure reason. We are not justified in

asserting that there may or might exist created or finite minds which know objects. without the relations of time, space, and causality, or under relations entirely different. Moreover, it has been observed that such a possibility or probability is inconsistent with the use made of those very relations in establishing them as having a regulative and real existence in the mind itself; for in the creation of the forms of thought by the mind the relations of cause and effect are assumed in this act as really and objectively belonging to it in the view of all beings. But, according to the possibility suggested, the relation of cause and effect may be just as unreal in the operations of the mind itself as we may suppose it to be in the phenomena which we conceive under that relation. Though necessarily employed in human thinking, that relation may be merely contingent upon the operation of that thinking, and may not belong to the constitution of the soul as viewed or known by any other being, whether creature or Creator (comp. Porter, *Human intellect*).

The subjectively creative activity of the reason assumed by Kant was taken as the leading principle in the systems of J. G. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, resulting in extreme forms of idealism. The views of Sir William Hamilton are closely related to those of Kant. He holds that we have native cognitions which are both universal and necessary. The necessity of a cognition may, however, be either *positive* or *negative*. It may either result from the power of the thinking principle, or from the *powerlessness* of the same to think otherwise. "To the positive cognitions belong the notion of existence and its modifications, the principles of identity, contradiction, and the intuitions of space and time." All these are discerned by the mind by a necessity which positively pertains to the objects discerned, and in the reality of which the mind absolutely confides. To negative cognitions belong the relations of *substance* and *phenomena*, and of *cause* and *effect*. These are necessary by virtue of the inability of the mind to think otherwise, and do not represent a positive relation. This necessity is embraced under his Law of the Conditioned. These cognitions are only true relatively.

Observing that such acute philosophers as Kant and Hamilton failed to find, either wholly or in part, positive assurance of certainty and reality for our knowledge, others have been incited to avoid, instead of meeting the difficulties, by seeking this assurance from another source. Jacobi and Schleiermacher found it in faith and feeling. Even Kant himself turns .from the uncertainty of the pure speculative intellect to what he calls the

practical reason, and rests upon the simple categorical imperative of duty. The practical reason commands unconditional faith in duty, without our asking or seeking any reasons or grounds. It commands us to believe in God as a true and perfect being. As such he will not deceive his creatures. Therefore we may implicitly trust the *priori* intuitions and judgments of the thinking reason which he has created. We may be sure that those fundamental truths are real, and that our knowledge in its forms and conceptions corresponds to the forms under which the world of reality exists. Hamilton also, following Kant and Schleiermacher, while asserting that we cannot *think* the infinite and unconditioned, yet concedes that we *know* the same *by faith*. Those who distinguish faith or feeling from the intellect, as an ultimate source of knowledge and ground of certainty, assume that the act of this faith or feeling is not intellectual, whereas it is in fact pre-eminently an intellectual act and power, conditioning all the special acts and cognitions of which the mind is capable. Some of the more recent German philosophers, as Chalbaeus, and Lotze especially, rest their confidence in the fundamental assumptions of the human intellect upon *ethical* grounds. "We must believe," they say, "that Nature is benevolent in her indications, and therefore true. We assume that goodness and veracity regulate both the objective relations of the universe which we study, and the subjective constitution of the intellect which interprets it. For those reasons we rely upon the categories both of thought and being." In treating of the relations of nihilism to the views of Kant and subsequent philosophers, we have had occasion to notice the idea of the relativity of our knowledge as involving something of nihilism, or nescience. This idea has become a prominent doctrine in modern philosophy, and has been held and applied in different ways by Ulrici and others in Germany; by Mansel in his *Limits of Religious Thought* by Mill, Tyndall, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer. It is the doctrine that the mind does not perceive things, but the relations of things-of things utterly unknown in themselves. In controverting the views of those adopting this doctrine, it is admitted by Dr. McCosh and others that there are senses in which man's knowledge is relative. He can know, for instance, only so far as he has a capacity of knowing. In this sense man's knowledge is all relative to himself. A man who has no eyes cannot know color. There is the farther truth that man has the capacity of discovering relations between himself and other things, and between one thing and another. Again, it is also true that he cannot know all things; he cannot know all about any one thing. But when it is said that we know relations only, and not things, it is replied that "it is inconceivable

that we should know relations between things unknown. Relations between things unknown can never yield knowledge. If the things were to cease, there would be no relation; and if the things were unknown, there would be no relations known. If the sun and earth were unknown to me, I could never know a relation between them. A relation is — a relation of things known so far known — known by reason of that relation. We know in what relation we stand to God, because we so far know God and know ourselves. The subtlest form of infidelity in our day proceeds on the principle that man knows nothing of the nature or reality of things, or that he can know nothing except relations between things unknown. It makes human reason proclaim that it cannot discover any truth beyond and above the phenomena of sentient experience. It does not deny directly that there is a God, but it declares that God, if there be a God, is and must be unknown. In meeting this fundamental skepticism, we, need to maintain the veracity of the human faculties, and to show that the same powers which guide correctly in the business of life and in the pursuits of science are legitimately fitted to conduct to a reasonable belief in One presiding over the works of Nature and providentially guiding our lot.”

See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 1:76 sq., 205 sq.; Porter, *The Human Intellect*; McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*; also *Christianity and Positivism*; Blackie, *Four Phases of Morals*, p. 296 sq.

**II.** In its second form nihilism is a certain theory of the incarnation. In this sense it is also called *nihilianism*. The name was applied to the views of Peter Lombard, contained in' his *Sententiarum libri quatuor* (lib. iii, distinc. 5-7). **SEE LOMBARDUS**. The conception of Lombard is an outgrowth of the fundamental ideas of the Antiochian school, and of the theories of John of Damascus and Abelard. It stands in contrast with the theory of adoption. **SEE ADOPTIANISTS**. Abelard especially made prominent the idea which underlies the Christology of Lombard, viz. that God is absolutely immutable, unchangeable. The proposition, which occasioned the charge of nihilism was: “Christus, secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid.” Christ, the Son of God, did not become anything by the assumption of human nature, because no change can take place in the divine nature; “Deus non factus est aliquid.” His language was not always clear and definite, and was by some falsely interpreted as affirming that Christ had become nothing. In his view, the divine nature did indeed assume the human—that is, it took the human form to itself, but did not bring it into union with itself, so that it became in any intimate and peculiar

sense its, own. He implies that in the incarnation no human being of body and soul was formed. There was not a production of one nature or of one person out of the different elements of body, soul, and divinity, but the Logos simply clothed itself with body and soul as with a garment (indumentum), in order to appear more fittingly to the eyes of mortals. Accordingly Christ took the human body and soul into union with himself, not in such a way that they, either separately or themselves in union, became one person- with the Logos, or themselves became the Logos, but they were only brought into a relation or connection with the Logos analogous to that of a garment or dress to the person putting it on. The person of the Logos by the assumption of human nature was in no way changed, but remained one and the same. According to this view God became man only by way of *occupying* a human body, or only in the form he assumed, “secundum habitum,” as his formula was, which implies that what was assumed was merely adventitious, so that without it the person of the Logos would be the same as with it. In the Son’s becoming man, his form or fashion (habitus) was found as that of a man, which he really was not in himself and to himself, but only to those human beings to whom he appeared in humanity. “Verum hominem suscipiendo,” as he says (*Dist. vii*), “habitus inventus est ut homo-id est, habendo hominem inventus est ut homo, non sibi sed eis quibus in homine apparuit.” He expressly admits that the Son was not conscious of himself as a man, but was a man only to men., This makes the incarnation only a sort: of prolonged theophany, and essentially disintegrates and breaks the bond of union of divinity and humanity. The conception of Peter Lombard is a continuation of the idea of the Antiochian school that the divine and the human are alike or comparable in nothing, and hence not in any intimate sense capable of union, but must remain exclusive the one of the other. The problem of the union is in reality avoided, and the mode given of the Word becoming flesh is a mere illusion. The proposition that God through the incarnation became nothing, is in fact nearly equivalent to the assertion that the incarnation attained nothing, established nothing-that is, was in reality only a theophany. This nihilism, yet should be noted, is not an absolute denial of existence, as that Christ, or the Logos, was nothing, or became nothing, but is only a denial of existence in a certain individual form. These views of Lombard aroused much opposition. The phrase, “Dens’ non factus est aliquid,” was rejected by the Council of Tours in 1163. His pupil, John of Cornwall, opposed his view in his *Eulogium* (ad. Alex. III, published 1175). *SEE JOHN OF CORNWALL*. The Lateran Council of 1179

condemned it, and later Walter of St. Victor especially made it appear that the language of Lombard contained the heresy of nihilism or that “Deus est nihil secundum quod homo.” This so-called nihilism, that the incarnation was no new existence of God, was not God becoming man, but was only a new manifestation to men, with nothing new in God, appears also in the writings of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.

See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* vol. i, § 171; vol. ii, § 179.; *Gieseler, Dogmengeschichte*; Dorner, *Geschichte d. Lehre von d. Person Christi*; Augusti, *Dogmengesch.* p. 300 sq.; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chret.* 1:279 sq.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii.

**III.** The term nihilism is also used to denote the views of a party that has assumed considerable importance in Russia within the last half century, and who call themselves *Nihilists*. Their nihilism includes a peculiar philosophical theory in connection with socialistic tendencies. It consists of three original elements: the “cosmopolitical” conception, the “political and social” principles, and the “moral” ideas in individual and collective spheres. Their theory of nature and the universe is based upon the two principles of the eternity of matter and the unity of the natural forces. Along with these two, they adhere to a third fundamental principle, that an objective method of investigation is the only way to the attainment of knowledge and truth. Materialism forms the chief philosophical element of this movement. The leaders have borrowed their philosophical doctrines from German materialists, such as Vogt, Moleschott, Buchner, and others, whose writings have had a pre-eminent influence in their doctrines. The most influential promoter of these principles was Alexander Herzen, who in 1834, while a student at the University of Moscow, was arrested, with some of his’ associates, on account of their socialistic tendencies. He left Russia in 1847, and established a publishing-house in London for printing Russian translations of the writings of Louis Blanc, Mazzini, and kindred authors. Although not strictly the leader of the Nihilists, yet it was unquestionably he who gave the chief impulse to political and social radicalism in Russia. The leaders of this school or party were very greatly influenced also by the writings of the French Socialists, Saint-Simon, Pierre Leroux, Proudhon, Louis Blanc, and especially by those of Fourier and our own Robert Dale Owen.

These Nihilists believe that in human progress it is not only possible but absolutely necessary to begin at once with the present complicated social



phenomena, in the way of a sudden and complete social reform, or with a revolution. They believe that this has precedence over all other agencies of progress. In regard to political questions, they regard the idea of federalism with favor, but are very decided in their antagonism against the extreme patriotic pretensions of the Panslavists, and against the principle of nationality as a special political theory. During the demonstration by the students of St. Petersburg in February and March, 1869, the radical political platform of the Nihilists was published in revolutionary proclamations, following each other in great numbers, with very nearly the same form and contents. Socialistic and revolutionary circulars greatly excited the more educated Russian youth, and finally aroused the government to persecutions, which began with the arrest of the chief instigator of the St. Petersburg disturbances, Sergius Netschajew. the instructor in religion at the Sergiewski church-school in the city. About the same time young men made journeys into the interior, in order to study the "real wants" of the people, and to influence them by their advice and sympathy. In the cities they joined the "Sunday-school movement," and officiated in organizing schools, and in teaching and in giving lectures and exhibitions for their benefit, until they were closed by the government. In St. Petersburg, in Moscow, and in the larger provincial towns, the nihilist associations protested against the action of the government and of the nobility in the matter of the emancipation of the serfs. In consequence of this the government at various times undertook persecutions against the Nihilists. In August, 1871, after an extraordinary trial, Netschajew and many of his associates were convicted, and the political activity of the party nearly suppressed. Yet towards the close of that year traces of nihilist conspiracies were thought to have been discovered, and numerous arrests were made.

## Nihilists

is the name given to a sect of German mystics who flourished in the 14th century, and, according to Ruysbroek, held that neither God nor themselves, heaven nor hell, action nor rest, good nor evil, have any real existence. They denied God and the work of Christ, Scripture, sacraments—everything. God was nothing; they were nothing; the universe was nothing. "Some hold doctrines such as these in secret," adds Ruysbroek, "and conform outwardly for fear. Others make them the pretext for every kind of vice and insolent insubordination." *SEE NIHILISM*. Sometimes the term *Nihilists* is used to denote *Annihilationists* (q.v.).

## Nihus, Barthold

a learned German theologian, a convert to Romanism, was born in 1589 at Wolpe (duchy of Brunswick), of poor parentage, and after having finished his preparatory studies entered the service of Corn. Martin, professor of theology at Helmstadt, who obtained for him a pension which enabled Nihus to pursue his studies at the university. The violent disputes of the Protestant theologians inspired in him an aversion to Lutheranism, which was to him Protestantism. In 1616 he accompanied two young gentlemen to the university of Jena, and some time after was made preceptor through the favor of the duke Bernhard of SaxeWeimar. In 1622 Nihus went to Cologne, there embraced Romanism, and entered into orders. After having for some time directed the college of the proselytes of that city, he was in 1629 nominated abbot of Ilfeld. At the approach of the Swedish army he retired to Holland; later he became bishop of Myre and suffragan of the archbishop of Mayence. He died in Erfurt, March 10, 1657. We have of his works, *Disputationes logicoe* (Helmstatdt, 1612, 4to): — *De rerum publicarum formis* (ibid. 1616, 4to): — *Epistolaphilologica excutiens narrationern Pomp. Melce de navigatione* (Hanau, 1622, 4to): *Ars Nova, dicto Scripturce unico lucrandi e pontificis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum, defecta non nihil et suggesta theologis Helmstetensibus* (Hildesheim, 1633); a work which drew the author into a violent polemic with George Calixtus: — *Epigrammata* (Cologne, 1642, 12mo): — *Anticriticus de fabrica crucis dominicce* (ibid. 1644, 8vo): — *De cruce epistola ad Bartholinum* (ibid. 1647, 8vo):. — *Hypodichma quo diluuntur nonnulla contra Catholicos disputata in Corn. Martini tractatu de analysi logica* (ibid. 1648, 8vo): — *Tractatus chorographicus de nonnullis Asiceprovinciis ad Tqrigm, Euphratem, et Mediterraneum et Rubrum maria* (ibid. 1658, 8vo). Nihus, who published several other works of controversy against Wedel, Hornejus, etc., also edited several articles of Leon Allace, to which he joined dissertations of his own, such as *Adnotationes de communione Orientalium sub unica specie*, etc. See Bayle, *Hist. Diet. s.v.*; Rotermond, *Supplement to Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon*, S. v.

## Nikiphor

a Russian prelate of note, flourished after the opening of the 12th century. He was a Greek by birth, and came to Russia in 1106. He rapidly rose to the highest ecclesiastical distinction, and finally became metropolitan of Kief and all Russia. He died in April, 1121. He is spoken of by

contemporaries as a learned but modest man, who wielded a powerful influence among Russian ecclesiastics. Of Nikiphor's works the following remain: *Official Letters to the Grand Prince Waldimir Wsewolodowitsch Monomach, upon the Separation of the Eastern and Western Churches: — Upon Fasting and Continnence*. The first is to be found in MS. in the synodal library of Moscow, and the second is printed in the first volume of the *Menzorabilia*, which were published by the Moscow Historical and Antiquarian Society. See Cox's Otto, *History of Russian Life* (Oxford, 1839, 8vo), p. 304.' (J. H. W.)

### Nikkelen, J. Van,

a Dutch painter of interiors who flourished about 1660. He was a good artist in perspective, and painted interiors of churches in the style of Van Vleit, which possess considerable merit. They are signed J. van Nikkelen.

### Nikodim

a Russian monastic, greatly distinguished as a Church writer, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was a Dane by birth and a Lutheran by descent, and before his union with the Greek Church was called *Adam Burchard Sellj*. He was educated at the German universities, where he pursued studies in medicine and belles-lettres, as well as in philosophy and theology. In 1722 he made a journey to St. Petersburg; became a teacher at several clerical schools; served some time as secretary to the count Lestocq; adopted, in the year 1744, the Greek faith, on which occasion he received the name of *Nestor*, and one year later became a monk, when the additional name of *Nikodim* was given him. He died in 1746, and was buried in the monastery of Alexander Newskj. Ever after his first coming to Russia he had occupied himself upon the Russian language, and directed his attention towards Russian history. He collected in MS. and books all that had ever been written about Russia, labored himself uninterruptedly in copying and translating his different materials, and occupied himself in this way with some important works. In 1736 the following work was printed by him at Revel in the Latin language, *Schediasma Literarium de Scriptoribus qui Historiam -Politico - Ecclesiasticam Rossice scriptis illustrarunt*, where he gave, in alphabetical order, an accurate catalogue of almost all the works which have made any mention of Russia. The Russian translation of this small but useful book appeared at Moscow in 1815, and it may still be consulted with profit, notwithstanding the recent and more

complete works of this kind by Meiners, Adelung, and the learned director of the imperial library at St. Petersburg, baron Modeste de Korff. — Another little work of his, *A Historical Mirror of Russian Monarchs, from Rurik to the Empress Elizabeth Petrowana*, was written in Latin verse; the original has been lost, but the Russian translation is printed in the first part of the “Ancient Russian Library.” The third and most important of his works, *De Rossorum Hierarchia*, in five books, contains some very important and interesting information respecting Russian Church history, with a sketch of its earliest origin. The original manuscript is preserved in the archives of the office for foreign affairs, and a translation of it appears in the first part of the *History of the Russian Hierarchy*. The works that he has left besides, unfinished or unpublished, cause deep regret that he did not live as long as the monk Nestor, the father of Russian history, whom he had taken for a model. Among his unfinished works, the archives of Moscow possess a *Dictionary of all the Pictures of the Virgin Mary*, and several *Historical Notices on Russian Monasteries*; and the library of St. Alexandre-Nevski a treatise upon medicine, some *Souvenirs* of his travels, written half in Latin, half in German and Danish, and a *Recueil*, forming fifteen volumes, of different pieces, mostly relative to the history of the Russian Church, several of which are perhaps unique. See *Dict. Hist. des crivains de l’Eglise Greco-russe*; Gretch, *Essai (d)histoire de la Litterature Russe*; Sopikof, *Essai de Bibliographie Russe*; Cox’s Otto, *History of Russian Literature* (Oxford, 1839), p. 306, 307.

### Nikomedeo, Aaron Ben-Elija

(also called  $\hat{w}rj\ ah$ , *the Second*), a noted Jewish savant of the Karaite sect, was born about the year 1300 at Cairo, the center of Karaite learning in Egypt. When thirty years of age he went to Nicomedia, whence he received the surname of *Nicomedian* ( $\hat{a}ydmqyn$ ). He wrote,  $\mu\Upsilon\Upsilon\beta\iota$  /  $[e$  “The Tree of Life,” a system of religious philosophy according to the doctrines of the Karaites (q.v.), in 114 chapters. It was first published by professor F. Delitzsch, of Leipsic, in 1841, under the title *Ahron b. — Elias aus Nikonmedien, des Karaers, System der Relig-iofnsphilosophic, etc.*:  $hr/T\ae\tau K$ , “The Crown of the Law,” a commentary on the Pentateuch, of which some portions, with a Latin version and learned notes, have been published by Prof. Rosegarten, of Jena, *Libri Coronce legis; id est Commentarii in Pentateuchum Karaitici ab A harone ben Elihu conscripti, etc.* (Jense, 1824). The whole commentary has been

published by A. Firkowitsch (Eupatoria, 1866-67, 4 vols.):  $\hat{d}[\epsilon\grave{g}i8\text{seor } t\omega\lambda\mu\beta i8\text{se}$  "The Book of Precepts," giving in twentyfive treatises all the prayers and rites of the Karaites. Portions of this work have been published by S. Schupart, *Secta Karceorum dissertationibus aliquot historico-philologicis'adunbrata* (Jena, 1701), as well as by Trigland, Danz, and Lanzhausen. This work was also published by A. Firkowitsch (Eupatoria, 1866): —  $\gamma\eta\delta\alpha\epsilon\omega\upsilon\gamma\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon$  rules for the slaughtering of animals, in twenty-six chapters, portions of which Delitzsch published in the *L. B. d. Or.* 1840, No. 16 sq. Nikomedeo died in 1369. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:22 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 247 sq. (Germ. transl.); Basnage, *History of the Jews*, p. 685 (Taylor's translation); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden.* (Leips. 1873), 7:253 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Sekten*, 2:300, 329, 362; First, *Gesch. d. Karaerthums*, 2:261 sq.; Rule, *History of the Karaite Jews*, p. 200 sq.; Zeiger, *Jidische Zeitschrift*, 1869, p. 199 sq.; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (New York, 1872), 1:428; Delitzsch, *L. B. d. Or.* 1840, Nos. 13, 32, 34, 39, 40, 48, 52; but above all his prolegomena to the  $\mu\gamma\Upsilon\beta\grave{\alpha} / \epsilon$  (B. P.)

## Nikon

ST., surnamed METANOITE (from his frequent introduction of the word  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ , *repent*, in his sermons), an Eastern ascetic, flourished in the 10th century. He had lived in a monastery on the borders of Pontus and Paphlagonia, and in 961 went as a missionary into Armenia. He went also as a missionary to Crete. He afterwards labored in Lacedemon and Corinth. He died in 998. His life, which was written by a Lacedemonian abbot, father Sirmond translated into Latin, and Baronius has freely made use of it in the tenth volume of his *Annals*, under the years 961-998. To Nikon is attributed a curious and interesting little treatise in the Greek language, *On the impious Religion of the most wicked Armenians*, which will be found of use in illustrating the state of manners, as well as the ecclesiastical history of that country. It is inserted in Latin in the 25th volume of the *Bibl. Patr.*, and is also given in Cotelerius, *Patr. Apostol.* vol. ii, in a note to *Const. Apostol.* (lib. ii, cap. 24, p. 235, 236). See also NICON.

## Nikon Of Russia,

a prelate noted in ecclesiastical history as a most extraordinary character, and frequently denominated the Luther (though perhaps more accurately the Wolsey, or better still the Chrysostom) of the Russo-Greek Church,

was born in May, 1605, in a village near Nishnei Novgorod, of parents in humble life, and received his education from a pious monk in 'the monastery of St. Macarius. He afterwards became a priest at Moscow; but the taste which he had acquired while in the convent of St. Macarius for monastic life and discipline was so strong that, although he was now married, having taken that step at the urgent solicitations of his friends, he determined to separate from his wife, who had proved a faithful companion for nearly ten years, and, persuading her to enter the convent of St. Alexis at Moscow, he himself set out for the hermitage of Anserche, on the island of Solowetz, in the White Sea, and was, in 1643, made hegumen of the Nischeoserschian hermitage. The desolation of the place and the severity of the discipline served rather to increase than to abate the ardor of the new recluse; but the zeal of the brethren led to dissensions, and Nikon was embroiled in bitter strife. Being desirous of replacing their wooden church by a stone edifice, Nikon and Elizar, the founder and head of the community, were dispatched to Moscow to collect contributions for the purpose; but on their return Elizar took the money into his own keeping, and manifested no intention of applying it to the intended -purpose., This led to remonstrances and altercations, and to such persecution on the part of Elizar that Nikon pushed off from the island in a small boat; and, after incurring great danger, was driven to the island Kj, at the mouth of the Onega, where he set up a wooden cross. At the same time he made a vow to erect a monastery on that spot, in fulfillment of which may now be seen the magnificent cloister of the Holy Cross. Associating himself with a community called the Kosheoser hermits, he so distinguished himself by his superior sanctity and severity of life that on the death of their abbot or principal he was elected in his place, about 1644. Having occasion some two years afterwards to take a journey to Moscow, to arrange some affairs of this community, he was there brought to the notice of the czar Alexis Mikailovich, who was so struck with the greatness of Nikon's intellectual strength, his rare ability in many other directions, his eloquence and understanding, and his strict and virtuous life, that he caused him to be appointed archimandrite of the Novospasky convent- at Moscow. A new career was thus suddenly opened to him: his influence with the sovereign increased daily, and he took advantage of it to become the intercessor for poor widows, orphans, and the persecuted and oppressed. In 1648 he acquired the dignity of metropolitan of Novgorod, and he attached the people of that city to him no less strongly than he had at Moscow. Thus in 1650 he appeased a violent popular insurrection at very imminent peril to

his own person; and when he had successfully broken the uprising, he secured permission from the czar to go into the prisons, and to set at liberty not only those persons who had been unjustly confined, but also real criminals whom he found sincere in their repentance. Nikon was also a liberal distributor of alms to the poor; he gave them provisions during the time of the famine which took place, and ordered the erection of many almshouses. On feast-days he always preached, and his sermons were attended by crowds of people from distant parts, who were often moved to tears by his eloquence. It was about this time, too, that Nikon, perceiving the necessity of reformatory measures in the Church of Russia, opened his movement to that end with a revision of the liturgy. He introduced into the churches the psalmody of the Greek service and of Kief, and gave a more costly fashion to the holy utensils and other furniture of the churches. He was anxious to increase the respectability of the clerical profession, and caused divine service to be performed with more devotion. In 1652, after the death of the patriarch Joseph, Nikon's services received further recognition from the government by his elevation to the vacant patriarchate. He was thus enabled to carry on his philanthropical and reformatory works upon a still larger scale. He now took measures for the improvement of the Church 'books, and for making them more exact and faithful copies of the Greek originals. He called on that account the general assembly of the Church in 1654. and 1655. By this council the old Slavonic versions, some of which were over five centuries old, were compared with the Septuagint. The council declared the original Slavonic version correct, and that the differences observed in the copies then in general use resulted 'from the carelessness of the copyists. A new edition was made at Moscow, and signed by Nikon, so as to conform to the original. This, however, gave rise to a division in the Church; those who adhered to the old customs received the name of *Raskolniki*, and these schismatics remain to this day. *SEE RASKOLNIKI; SEE RUSSIA*. Nor were these the only measures. He set himself with stern severity and indomitable courage to root out all abuses of the Russian hierarchy, and even labored for the adoption of temperance principles. In his own person, as we have already seen, Nikon exhibited the doctrines he preached. He was noted for unbounded munificence, self-denial, and abstemious habits. In the furtherance of his object it is but natural to suppose that he broke through many practices of Church and State, to which long custom had probably given an almost religious consecration. Thus through his intervention the Oriental seclusion of the female sex was first infringed; at

his injunction — still, it is true, feliced about by many precautions — the empress, who had before never entered a church except under cover of night, now appeared publicly by day. Sacred pictures to which, in his judgment, idolatrous veneration was paid, were taken away. The baptisms of the Western Church, of which the validity is to this day denied by the Church of Constantinople, were by his sanction first recognized in the Church of Russia. The advances in education, too, which were first introduced under Ivan the Terrible, and then interrupted by the wars of the pretenders, Nikon started anew with fresh vigor. The printing-press was again set to work. Greek and Latin were now first taught in the schools. In the Church service, however, his changes were most marked and far reaching. The “gross and harsh intonations of the Muscovites.” as they are called by Syrian travelers, now gave way to the sweet chants of the Cossack choristers, brought partly from Poland, partly from Greece, and constitute the first beginnings of that vocal music which has since been “the glory of the Russian worship” (Stanley). But chief of all ecclesiastical changes was the revival of preaching. From his lips was first heard, after many centuries, the sound of a living, practical sermon. Nikon was guilty, too, of many missteps, consequent perhaps on his zeal and anxiety for reform. Thus he spent much time and effort foolishly on unimportant questions of discipline and ritual. As one has said, “He was constantly asking questions from Oriental Christian strangers to set his own ceremonial straight” (Macarius, 2:173). “Benedictions with three fingers instead of two, a white altar-cloth instead of an embroidered one, pictures kissed only twice a year, the cross signed the wrong way, wrong inflections in pronouncing the creed — these were the points to which he devoted his gigantic energy, and on which, as we shall see, he encountered the most frantic opposition” (Stanley, *East. Ch.* p. 467). But though the Church was greatly agitated by Nikon’s changes, the czar himself remained unchanged in his devotion to the patriarch, and honored him not only with a most agreeable and friendly correspondence, but evinced his confidence more clearly when he went to join the army in a campaign by entrusting to Nikon the care of the whole royal family; for whom the patriarch displayed the greatest attention and anxiety in the time of the plague which desolated Moscow in 1653 and 1654. In 1658, however, some of Nikon’s enemies contrived to inspire into the mind of the czar a feeling of jealousy or dislike towards him. Nikon, who remarked this, was incensed at it, and retired to the monastery of the Resurrection of Christ, which he had himself built about forty versts from Moscow. The misunderstanding between the czar



aid the patriarch increased continually. Nikon persisted in refusing to return to Moscow. In 1667 a council was therefore convened to deliberate on his case, under the presidency of the Eastern patriarch; and on December 12 of the same year Nikon was deprived of the patriarchal dignity, and banished as a common monk to the Bielvozersky Therapontic monastery. (For full details of this trial in an English version, see Stanley, p. 482 sq.) According to Kulczynski, the real cause of Nikon's disgrace was that he clandestinely embraced Romanism, but the evidence for this assertion has been generally questioned. The czar Feodor Alexievich allowed him to remove into the monastery of the Resurrection of Christ; but on his journey thither he died at Yaroslav, Aug. 17, 1681. His body was buried in the last-mentioned monastery in the presence of the monarch, and there, the deceased was again honored with the title of patriarch. His absolution was next obtained from the Eastern patriarch, and he was then properly enrolled among the list of Russian patriarchs. "Nikon," says Stanley, "rests all but canonized, in spite of his many faults, and in spite of his solemn condemnation and degradation by the nearest approach to a general council which the Eastern Church has witnessed since the second Council of Niceea. He rests far enough removed from the ideal of a saintly character, but yet having left behind him to his own Church the example, which it still so much needs, of a resolute, active, onward leader; to the world at large the example, never without a touching lesson, of a sincere reformer recognized and honored when honor and recognition are too late" (*East. Ch. p.* 490). Mr. Palmer, who has recently brought out two bulky volumes (Trubner & Co. London, 1873) containing documents illustrative of the history of Nikon (the first containing extracts from the travels of Macarius, the patriarch of Antioch, who attended Nikon's trial, and the second Paisius Ligurides's *History of the Deposition of NAikon*, from manuscripts in the synodal library- at Moscow), pays more glowing tributes to Nikon than any other writer had previously bestowed on him. Mr. Palmer makes out that the Russian state during Nikon's rule was erastian, its courtiers tyrannical, Greek patriarchs venal, and that Nikon had not a fair trial, and was in the right in the special points in dispute. Those who judge Nikon more critically question whether the patriarch should not have accepted the situation in which he found himself, and saved the Russian Church from a schism which has continued to this day, and that he lacked that wisdom and policy which men need in high places of trust, both in civil and ecclesiastic stations.

Nikon's most important literary labor was the improvement of the Slavonic Church books, and setting them in accordance with the original Greek. In 1664 he dispatched the hieromonach, Arsmj Suchanoff, into the East, and purchased through him more than five hundred manuscripts of Greek books dating from the 11th to the 17th century. He also made provision for the translation of a number of historical and geographical works from foreign languages into the Russian. Some of these signed by his own hand are still preserved in the synodal library. He also drew up a collation of the Russian chronicles, the Stufen books, and the Greek chronologists, which reaches to the year 1630, and is well known by the name of *The Chronicle of Nikon*. Of this codex the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg published a fine edition in eight volumes, 1767-1792. He also wrote several dogmatical and theological pieces, which were printed in his lifetime. Among them we notice a *Table (Skrijal) of Dogmatic Studies* (Moscow, 1656, 4to): — *Sermons* (ibid. no date [1654]; reprinted in Novikoff in the "Ancient Russian Library," 2d ed. .vol. vi): — *The Intellectual Paradise*, which contains a description of the monasteries of Mount Athos and of Valdai (Valdai. 4to): — *A Canon*, or book of prayers to attract the Raskolniks to the Church (no name of place, no date, 4to). See Ivan Choucherin, *Vie du tres-saint patriarche Nikon* (St. Petersb. 1817); Backmeister, *Beitrdge z. Lebensgesch. d. Patriarchen Nikon* (Riga. 1788); 'Strahl, *Beitrage z. russ. Kirchengesch.* (Halle, 1827), p. 287; Apollos, *Vie du Patriarche Nikon* (1839); Palmer, *The Patriarch and the Tsar* (Lond. 1873), vols. ii and iii; Cox's Otto, *Bist. Russian Lit.* p. 308 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. East. Ch.* p. 457, 459-471, 489; Eckardt, *Mfodern Russia* (Lond. 1870, 8vo), p. 254 sq.; *London Review*, 1862, April, art. vii; *Christ. Remembrancer*, July, 1853, .p. 95 sq.

## Nile

the one great river of Egypt; constituting, in fact, that country by its alluvial banks. In treating of it we give the ancient as well as the modern accounts, and especially the Scriptural relations. *SEE EGYPT*.

**I.** *Names of the Nile in Scripture.* — This word, the *Νεῖλος*, *Nilus*, of the Greeks and Romans, which is supposed to be of Iranian origin, signifying "dark blue," does not occur in the authorized version of the English Bible, but the river is repeatedly referred to under different names and titles. The Hebrew names of the Nile, excepting one that is of ancient Egyptian origin, all distinguish it from other rivers. With the Hebrews the Euphrates, as the

great stream of their primitive home, was always “the river,” and even the long sojourn in Egypt could not put the Nile in its place. Most of their geographical terms and ideas are, however, evidently traceable to Canaan, the country of the Hebrew language. Thus the sea, as lying on the west, gave its name to the west quarter. It was only in such an exceptional case as that of the Euphrates, which had no rival in Palestine, that the Hebrews seem to have retained the ideas of their older country. These circumstances lend no-support to the idea that the Shemites and their language came originally from Egypt.

With the ancient Egyptians the river was sacred, and had, besides its ordinary name, a sacred name, under which it was worshipped, HAPI, or HAPI-MU, “the abyss,” or “the abyss of waters,” or “the hidden.” Corresponding to the two regions of Egypt, the Upper Country and the Lower, the Nile was called HAPE-RES “the Southern Nile,” and HAPI-MEHIT, “the Northern Nile,” the former name applying to the river in Nubia as well as in Upper Egypt. The god Nilus was one of the lesser divinities. He is represented as a stout man having woman’s breasts, and is sometimes painted red to denote the river during its rise and inundation, or High Nile, and sometimes blue, to denote it during the rest of the year, or Low Nile. Two figures of HAPI are frequently represented on each side of the throne of a royal statue, or in the same place in a bass-relief, binding it with water-plants, as if the prosperity of the kingdom depended upon the produce of the river. The name HAPI, perhaps in these cases HEPI, was also applied to one of the four children of Osiris, called by Egyptologists the genii of AMENT or Hades, and to the bull Apis, the most revered of all the sacred animals. The genius does not seem to have any connection with the river, excepting indeed that Apis was sacred to Osiris. Apis was worshipped with a reference to the inundation, perhaps because the myth of Osiris, the conflict of good and evil, was supposed to be represented by the struggle of the fertilizing river or inundation with the desert and the sea, the first threatening the whole valley, and the second wasting it along the northern coast. (See § iii, below.)

It will be instructive to mention the present names of the Nile in Arabic, as they may serve to illustrate the Scripture terms. By the Arabs it is called *Bahr en-Nil*, “the River Nile” — the two upper streams being respectively termed *Bahr el-A biad*, or White Nile, and *Bahr el-Azrek*, or Blue Nile — the word *Bahr* being applied alike to seas and the largest rivers. The

Egyptians call it *El-Bahr*, or “the river,” alone; and term the annual overflow *En-Nil*, or “The Nile.”

**1.** *Shichor*, *r/j yvæwþvæj væ* “black.” The idea of darkness conveyed by this word has, as we should expect in Hebrew, a wide sense, applying not only to the color of the hair (<sup><183></sup>Leviticus 13:31, 37), but also to that of a face tanned by the sun (<sup><200></sup>Song of Solomon 1:5, 6), and that of a skin black through disease (<sup><380></sup>Job 30:30). It seems, however, to be indicative of a very dark color;- for it is said in the Lamentations, as to the famished Nazarites in the besieged city, “Their visage is darker than blackness” (4:8). That the Nile is meant by Shihor is evident from its mention as equivalent to *Yeor*, “the river,” and as a great river, where Isaiah says of Tyre, “And by great waters, the sowing of Shihor, the harvest of the river (*ray*) [is] her revenue” (23:3); from its being put as the western boundary of the Promised Land (<sup><630></sup>Joshua 13:3; <sup><330></sup>1 Chronicles 13:5), instead of “the river of Egypt” (<sup><150></sup>Genesis 15:18); and from its being spoken of as the great stream of Egypt, just as the Euphrates was of Assyria (<sup><210></sup>Jeremiah 2:18).

If, but this is by no means certain, the name Nile, *Neîλος*, be really indicative of the color of the river, it must be compared with the Sanskrit *Nilah*. “blue” especially, probably “dark blue,” also even “black,” and must be considered to be the Indo-European equivalent of Shihor. The signification “blue” is noteworthy, especially as a great confluent, which most nearly corresponds to the Nile in Egypt, is called the Blue River, or, by Europeans, the Blue Nile. *SEE SHIHOR*.

**2.** *Yeor*, *rway ray* is the same as the ancient Egyptian ATUR, AUR, and the Coptic *Eiero* or *laro*. It is important to notice that the second form of the ancient Egyptian name alone is preserved in the later language, the second radical of the first having been lost, as in the Hebrew form; so that, on this double evidence, it is probable that this commoner form was in use among the people from early times. *Year*, in the singular, is used of the Nile alone, excepting in a passage in <sup><270></sup>Daniel 12:5, 6, 7, where another river, perhaps the Tigris (comp. 10:4), is intended by it. In the plural, *μyray* this name is applied to the branches and canals of the Nile (<sup><1700></sup>Psalms 78:44; Ezekiel 29. 3sq.; 30:12), and perhaps the tributaries also, with, in some places, the addition of the names of the country, Mitsraim, Matsor, *j yæxihæ yray* (<sup><270></sup>Isaiah 7:18, A. V. “rivers of Egypt”), *r/xm:yray* (19:6, “brooks of defense;” 37:25, “rivers of the besieged places”); but it is also

used of streams or channels, in a general sense when no particular ones are indicated (see <sup><2332></sup>Isaiah 33:21; <sup><1830></sup>Job 28:10). It is thus evident that this name specially designates the Nile; and although properly meaning a river, and even used with that signification, it is probably to be regarded as a proper name when applied to the Egyptian river. The latter inference may perhaps be drawn from the constant mention of the Euphrates as “the river;” but it is to be observed that Shihor, or “the river of Egypt,” is used when the Nile and the Euphrates are spoken of together, as if *Yeor* could not be well employed for the former, with the ordinary term for river, *nahdr*, for the latter. **SEE STREAM.**

3. “The river of Egypt,” **μῦακῖνᾱῆνι** is mentioned with the Euphrates in the promise of the extent of the land to be given to Abraham’s posterity, the two limits of which were to be “the river of Egypt” and “the great river, the river Euphrates” (<sup><0158></sup>Genesis 15:18). **SEE EGYPT, RIVER OF.**

4. “The Nachal of Egypt, **μῦακῖνᾱῆνι** has generally been understood to mean “the torrent” or “brook of Egypt,” and to designate a desert stream at Rhinocorura, now El-’Arish, on the eastern border. Certainly **ἰνι** usually signifies a stream or torrent, not a river; and when a river, one of small size, and dependent upon mountain-rain or snow; but as it is also used for a valley, corresponding to the Arabic *wddy*, which is in like manner employed in both senses, it may apply like it, in the case of the Guadalquivir, etc., to great rivers. This name has been held by some to signify the Nile, for it occurs in cases parallel with those where Shihor is employed (<sup><0345></sup>Numbers 34:5; <sup><0150></sup>Joshua 15:4,47; <sup><1085></sup>1 Kings 8:65; <sup><0247></sup>2 Kings 24:7; <sup><2272></sup>Isaiah 27:12), both designating the easternmost or Pelusiac branch of the river as the border of the Philistine territory, where the Egyptians likewise put the border of their country towards Kanaan or Kanana (Canaan). It remains for us to decide whether the name signify the “brook of Egypt,” or whether Nachal be a Hebrew form of Nile. On the one side, may be urged the improbability that the middle radical should not be found in the Indo-European equivalents, although it is not one of the most permanent letters; in the other, that it is improbable that *nahar*, “river,” and *nachal*, “brook,” would be used for the same stream. If the latter be here a proper name, **Νεῖλος** must be supposed to be the same word; and the meaning of the Greek as well as the Hebrew name would remain doubtful, for we could not then positively decide on an Indo-European signification. The Hebrew word *nachal* might have been adopted

as very similar in sound to an original proper name; and this idea is supported by the forms of various Egyptian words in the Bible, which are susceptible of Hebrew etymologies in consequence of a slight change. It must, however, be remembered that there are traces of a Shemitic language, apparently distinct from Hebrew, in geographical names in the east of Lower Egypt, probably dating from the Shepherd period; and therefore we must not, if we take *nachal* to be here Shemitic, restrict its meaning to that which it bears or could bear in Hebrew. *SEE BROOK; SEE RIVER.*

5. “The rivers of Cush,”  $\text{v\ddot{w}k yrj \ddot{h}i}$  are only mentioned in the extremely difficult prophecy contained in Isaiah 18. From the use of the plural, a single stream cannot be meant, and we must suppose “the rivers of Ethiopia” to be the confluents or tributaries of the Nile. Gesenius, (*Lex.* s.v.  $\text{yh\ddot{h}}$ ) makes them the Nile and the Astaboras. Without attempting to explain this prophecy, it is interesting to remark that the expression, “Whose land the rivers have spoiled” (ver. 2, 7), if it apply to any Ethiopian nation, may refer to the ruin of great part of Ethiopia, for a long distance above the First Cataract in consequence of the fall of the level of the river. This change has been effected through the breaking down of a barrier at that cataract, or at Silsilis, by which the valley has been placed above the reach of the fertilizing annual deposit. But the verb  $\text{Waz}^* \text{B}$  should rather be rendered “have cut up,” and refers to the intersection of the alluvial country by the channels of the river. *SEE CUSH.*

6. The Nile is sometimes poetically called *a sea*,  $\mu\text{y}$ ; ( $\text{238D}$  Isaiah 18:2;  $\text{38B}$  Nahum 3:8;  $\text{38B}$  Job 41:31; but we cannot agree with Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v., that it is intended in  $\text{238D}$  Isaiah 19:5): this, however, can scarcely be considered to be one of its names. *SEE SEA.*

7. By some the *Gihon*,  $\text{^/j y\ddot{g}\ddot{a}e}$  one of the rivers of Eden, is thought to have been the Nile; but the boundaries of that locality were far away from Egypt. *SEE GIHON.*

## Picture for Nile 1

### II. Course, General Description, and Characteristics of the Nile. —

1. This great river, or rather its principal branch the White Nile (for its upper streams consist of several branches), according to one of the latest discoveries, has its origin in the northern end of the lake *Victoria Nyanza*, a

point which is about 150 miles south of the equator. The southern end of the lake is situated close on the  $3^{\circ}$  south latitude, which gives to the Nile a length, in direct measurement, of above 2300 miles, or more than one eleventh of the circumference of our globe. The lake is known to have only one feeder of importance on its eastern side, viz. the Kidette River, and none on the western. It is about  $3^{\circ}$  east of the Mountains of the Moon, and' the issue of the Nile from Victoria Nyanza presents the appearance of a small cascade, which was named by the late captain Speke "Ripon Falls," — after the nobleman who presided over the Royal Geographical Society when his expedition was planned. According to Sir Thomas Baker, however, who visited that region in 1864, the real source of the White Nile is another lake called the *Albert Nyanza*, about 100 miles north-west of the Victoria Nyanza. Mr. Stanley, the exploring correspondent of the *N. Y. Herald*, claims to have determined that the true source of the Nile is the Chambesi, while according to others it is lake Tanganyika, still farther south. It thus appears that the ancient problem as to the origin of the Nile is not yet fully determined. The Hindûs call the source of the Nile *Amara*, the name of a district north-east of the Nyanza, which leads us to suppose that the ancient Hindûs must have had some communication with both its northern and southern ends (Speke's *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile*, p. 466, 467, etc.). Great, however, as is the body of water of this the longer of the two chief confluent, it is the shorter, the Bahr el-Azrek, or Blue River, the Astapus of the ancients, which brings down the alluvial soil that makes the Nile the great fertilizer of Egypt and Nubia. The Bahr el-Azrek rises in the mountains of Abyssinia, and carries down from them a great quantity of decayed vegetable matter and alluvium. The two streams form a junction at Khartum, now the seat of government of Sudan or the Black Country under Egyptian rule. The Banrel-Azrek is here a narrow river, with high, steep mud banks like those of the Nile in Egypt, and with water of the same color; and the Bahr elAbiad is broad and shallow, with low banks and clear water. Farther to the north another great river, the Atbara, rising, like the Bahr el-Azrek, in Abyssinia, falls into the main stream, which for the remainder of its course does not receive any other tributary. Throughout the rest of the valley the Nile does not greatly vary, excepting that in Lower Nubia, through the fall of its level by the giving way of a barrier in ancient times, it does not inundate the valley on either hand. From time to time its course is impeded by cataracts or rapids, sometimes extending many miles, until at the First Cataract, the boundary of Egypt, it surmounts the last obstacle. Below

Syene it continues its course for 500 miles, until a little below Cairo the river divides itself into two branches, one flowing to Rosetta, the other to Damietta, containing between them the present Delta, at the apex of which was “the land of Goshen,” where Jacob and his family had their settlement. Above the Delta its average breadth may be put at from half a mile to three quarters, excepting where large islands .increase the distance. In the Delta the branches are .usually narrower. Ancient authors speak of five, seven, and occasionally of innumerable mouths of the Nile; but the “septem ostia Nili,” mentioned by Virgil (*Aeneid*, 6:800) and other Roman writers, seven centuries after Isaiah (11:15) had prophesied respecting “the seven streams of the river,” show that it was commonly recognized as having seven mouths at its exit to the Mediterranean Sea. The names of these are as follows:

- (1) The Canopic;
- (2) Bolbitine, at Rosetta;
- (3) Sebenitic;
- (4) Mendesiah;
- (5) Saitic;
- (6) Phanitic, at Damietta;
- (7) the Pelusiatic, which is the most eastern mouth of the seven.

As regards the geological formation of the river’s bed, for several hundred miles, from the inner boundaries of the Delta to within a short distance of the First Cataract, the silt and sand rest on what is known as the “marine” or nummulitic limestone. Over this there is a later formation of the tertiary, which contains marine deposits and forests of dicotyledonous. trees. Underneath, the limestone rests on a sandstone of permian or triassic age; the sandstone rests, in turn, on the famous breccia de verde of Egypt; and the breccia on a group of azoic rocks, consisting’ of gneisses, quartzes, mica-schists, and clay-slates, which surround the red granite of Syene (Hugh Miller’s. — *Test. of the Rocks*, p. 412, 413). The bed of the Nile is cut through these layers of rock, which in some places confine it on both sides, and even obstruct its course, causing the formation of rapids and cataracts. For scarcely have the waters of the White Nile, which come from the very heart of Africa to the westward, become confluent with those of the Blue Nile, which flows down from the mountains of Abyssinia to the eastward, when their united torrent is opposed by the sands and rocks of the great Sahara desert, and from that point the Nile flows along a devious course of 2300 miles until it reaches the Mediterranean Sea, without



receiving a single tributary. Thus it diffuses fertility and life over vast districts, always expanding its waters, and never receiving any accession to them from the heaven above or the earth beneath; so that when it reaches Cairo the bulk and volume of its tide is scarcely one half of that which foams amid the rocks and cataracts of Syene (Osburn's *Mon. Hist. of Egypt*, 1:3).

In Upper Egypt the Nile is a very broad stream, flowing rapidly between high, steep mud banks, that are scarped by the constant rush of the water, which from time to time washes portions away, and stratified by the regular deposit. On either side rise the bare yellow mountains, usually a few hundred feet high, rarely a thousand, looking from the river like cliffs, and often honeycombed with the entrances of the tombs which make Egypt one great city of the dead, so that we can understand the meaning of that murmur of the Israelites to Moses, "Because [there were] no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" (<sup>4241</sup>Exodus 14:11). Frequently the mountain on either side  $\beta$  approaches the river in a rounded promontory, against whose base the restless stream washes, and then retreats and leaves a broad bay-like valley, bounded by a rocky curve. Rarely both mountains confine the river in a narrow bed, rising steeply on either side from a deep rock-cut channel through which the water pours with a rapid current. Perhaps there is a remote allusion to the rocky channels of the Nile, and especially to its primeval bed wholly of bare rock, in that passage of Job where the plural of Yeor is used. "He cutteth out rivers ( $\mu\gamma\alpha\alpha\beta$ ) among the rocks, and his eye seeth every precious thing. He bindeth the floods from overflowing" (<sup>4230</sup>Exodus 28:10, 11). It must be recollected that there are allusions to Egypt, and especially to its animals and products, in this book, so that the Nile may well be here referred to, if the passage do not distinctly mention it. In Lower Egypt the chief differences are that the view is spread out in one rich plain, only bounded on the east and west by the desert, of which the edge is low and sandy, unlike the mountains above, though essentially the same, and that the two branches of the river are narrower than the undivided stream. On either bank, during Low Nile, extend fields of corn and barley, and near the river-side stretch long groves of palm-trees. The villages rise from the level plain, standing upon mounds, often ancient sites; and surrounded by palm-groves, and yet higher dark-brown mounds mark where of old stood towns, with which often "their memorial is perished" (<sup>4906</sup>Psalms 9:6). The villages are connected by dikes, along which pass the chief roads. During

the inundation the whole valley and plain are covered with sheets of water, above which rise the villages like islands, only to be reached along the half-ruined dikes. The aspect of the country is as if it were overflowed by a destructive flood, while between its banks, here and there broken through and constantly giving way, rushes a vast turbid stream, against which no boat could make its way, excepting by tacking, were it not for the north wind that blows ceaselessly during the season of the inundation, making the river seem more powerful as it beats it into waves. The prophets more than once allude to this striking condition of the Nile. Jeremiah says of Pharaoh-Necho's army, "Who [is] this [that?] cometh up as the Nile [Yeor], whose waters are moved as the rivers? Egypt riseth up like the Nile, and [his] waters are moved like the rivers; and he saith, I will go up, [and] will cover the land; I will destroy the city and the inhabitants thereof" (Exodus 46:7, 8). Again, the prophecy "against the Philistines, before that Pharaoh smote Gaza," commences, "Thus saith the Lord; Behold, waters rise up out of the north, and shall be as an overflowing stream (*nachal*), and shall overflow the land, and all that is therein; the city, and them that dwell therein" (Exodus 47:1, 2). Amos, also, a prophet who especially refers to Egypt, uses the inundation of the Nile as a type of the utter desolation of his country. "The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein? and it shall rise up wholly as the Nile (*raab*); and it shall be cast out and drowned, as [by] the Nile (*pyraixinaewayka*) of Egypt" (~~Exodus~~ Exodus 8:7,8; see 9:5).

Of old the great river must have shown a more fair and busy scene than now. Boats of many kinds were ever passing along it, by the painted walls of temples, and the gardens, that extended around the light summer pavilions, from the pleasure-galley, with one great square sail, white or with variegated pattern, and many oars, to the little papyrus skiff, dancing on the water, and carrying the seekers of pleasure where they could shoot with arrows, or knock down with the throw-stick the wild-fowl that abounded among' the reeds, or engage in the dangerous chase of the hippopotamus or the crocodile. In the Bible the papyrus-boats are mentioned; and they are shown to have been used for their swiftness to carry tidings to Ethiopia (~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 18:2).

**2.** The most remarkable and distinctive peculiarity of the Nile is its annual overflow, which is the great: source of Egypt's fertility, and the failure of which necessarily causes famine: for Egypt may be truly termed "a land

without rain,” as was noted by Zechariah (~~3847~~ Zechariah 14:17,18), though occasional showers are known to fall in Lower Egypt.’ The country is therefore devoid of the constant changes which make the husbandmen of other lands look always for the providential care of God. “For the land, whither thou goest in to possess it, [is] not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst [it] with thy foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land, whither e go to possess it, [in] a land of hills and valleys; [and] drinketh water of the rain of heaven; a land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God [are] always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year” (~~6510~~ Deuteronomy 11:10-12). The cause of the inundation was the occasion of great perplexity to the ancients; but it is now ascertained beyond all dispute to be the periodical rain of the tropics, the same cause which produces the inundations of the Indus and the Ganges. According to Herodotus (2:19), the Nile begins to increase about the summer solstice, and continues to rise for a hundred days, and then decreases for the same time; and continues low all the winter until the return of the summer solstice. This is confirmed by the reports of modern travelers. According to Pococke, the Nile began to rise at Cairo, A.D. 1714, June 30; A.D. 1715, July 1; A.D. 1738, June 20. “So precisely is the stupendous operation of its inundation ‘calculated,” says Bruce, “that on the 25th of September, only three days after the autumnal equinox, the Nile is generally found at Cairo to be at its highest, and begins to diminish every day after.” At the Cataracts, however, the first rise is perceived somewhat earlier, about the end of May or the beginning of June, which led Seneca to say that “the first increase of the Nile was observable about the islands of Philae.” In proportion as we get farther south, we find the inundation commences earlier, so that at Khartum, according to some, it is said to begin “early in April.” In the beginning of the inundation the waters of the Nile acquire a green, slimy appearance, occasioned by the vast lakes of stagnant water left by the annual overflow on the broad sand-flats of Nubia. These, having stagnated in the tropical sun for more than six months, are carried forward by the new inundation, and once more forced into the river. The continuance of this state seldom exceeds three or four days. The sufferings of those who are compelled to drink the water in this stage are very severe. Ten or twelve days elapse before the development of the last and most extraordinary change in the waters of the Nile, when it assumes the perfect appearance of a river of blood, which the Arabs call the *Red Nile*. It is not, however, like the green mixture, at all deleterious, as the Nile water

is never more wholesome or refreshing than during this period of the inundation. "Perhaps," says a modern traveler, from whom we have already quoted, "there is not in nature a more exhilarating sight, or one more strongly exciting to confidence in God, than the rise of the Nile. Day by day and night by night its turbid tide sweeps onward majestically over the parched sands of the waste, howling wilderness. There are few impressions I ever received, upon the remembrance of which I dwell with more pleasure, than that of seeing the first burst of the Nile into one of the great channels of its annual overflow. All nature shouts for joy. The men, the children, the buffaloes, gambol in its refreshing waters, the broad waves sparkle with shoals of fish, and fowl of every wing flutter over them in clouds. Nor is this jubilee of nature confined to the higher orders of creation. The moment the sand becomes moistened by the approach of the fertilizing waters, it is literally alive with insects innumerable. It is impossible to stand by the side of one of these noble streams, to see it every moment sweeping away some obstruction to its majestic course, and widening as it flows, without feeling the heart expand with love, joy, and confidence in the great Author of this miracle of mercy."

## Picture for Nile 2

As all the wealth of the country may be said to depend on the inundation of the river, which Herodotus has condensed in this terse definition, "Egypt is the gift of the Nile," it is of the utmost importance to the inhabitants to register the periodical rise and fall of the overflow. This has been done for ages by means of an instrument termed a "Nilometer," or "Niloscope." Several Arabian authors mention that this was originally set up by Joseph during his regency in Egypt. The measure of this instrument was sixteen cubits, that being the height of the increase of the Nile necessary to the fruitfulness of the country. Herodotus mentions a column in a point of the Delta, which served in his time as a nilometer, and there is still one of the same kind in a mosque at the same place. In the Bibliotheque Imperiale at Paris there is an Arabic treatise on nilometers, entitled *Neil fi alnal al Nil*, in which all the inundations of the Nile are described, from the first year of the Hegira to the 875th (A.D. 620-1495). "On the point of the island of Rhoda," observes Mr. Bruce, "between Ghizeh and Cairo, near the middle of the river, is a round tower enclosing a neat well or cistern lined with marble. The bottom of this well is on the same level with the bottom of the Nile, which has free access to it through a large opening like an embrasure. In the middle of the well rises a thin column of eight faces of blue and

white marble, of which the foot is on the same plane with the bottom of the river. This pillar is divided into twenty peeks of twenty-two inches each. Of these peeks the two lowermost are left without any division, to stand for the quantity of sludge which the water deposits there. Two peeks are then divided, on the right hand, into twenty-four digits each; then on the left, four peeks are divided into twenty-four digits; then on the right four, and on the left another four; again four on the right, which completes the number of eighteen peeks from the first division marked on the pillar, each peek being twenty-two inches. Thus the whole, marked and unmarked, amounts to something: more than thirty-six feet English." As soon as the inhabitants at Cairo perceive the mixture of the rain-water from the tropics with the Nile at that city, they begin to announce the rise of the river, having then five peeks of water marked on the nilometer. When the whole eighteen peeks are filled, all the land of Egypt is fit for cultivation. Several canals are then opened, which convey the water to the desert, and hinder any further stagnation in the fields. Prof. Lepsius has discovered some inscriptions in a temple at Semne, near the Second Cataract, which record the mode by which the ancient Egyptians were accustomed to register the annual overflow. Writing to Ehrenberg and Bockh of Berlin from Philse, he observes: "The highest rise of the Nile in each year at Semne was registered by a mark, indicating the year of the king's reign, cut in the granite, either on one of the blocks forming the foundation of the temple, or on the cliff, and particularly on the east or right bank, as best adapted for the purpose. Of these markings eighteen still remain, thirteen of them having been made in the reign of Moeris [a Pharaoh of the twelfth dynasty, according to Lepsius, who lived between the times of Abraham and Joseph], and five in the time of his next two successors. . . The record is almost always in the same terms, short and simple: *Ra en Hapi em rempe*, signifying mouth or gate of the Nile in the year' . . . And then follows the year of the reign, and the name of the king. It is written in a horizontal row of hieroglyphics, included within two lines, the upper line indicating the particular height of the water, as is often specially stated. The earliest date preserved is that of the sixth year of the king's reign, and he reigned forty-two years and some months. The next following dates are the years 9; 14, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 30, 32, 37, 40, 41, and 43. Of the remaining dates, that only of his two successors is available; all the others which are on the left bank of the river have been moved from their original place by the-rapid floods which have overthrown and carried forward vast masses of rock. The mean rise of the river recorded by the marks on the east bank during

the reign of Mteris is sixty-two feet six inches (English) above the lowest level of the water in the present day, which, according to the statements of the most experienced boatmen, does not change from year to year, and therefore represents the actual level of the Nile, independently of its increase by the falls of rain in the mountains in which its sources are situated. The mean rise above the lowest level at the present time is thirty-eight feet eight inches; and therefore in the time of Moeris (nearly 2000 years B.C.) the mean height of the river at the cataract of Semne, during the inundation of the Nile, was twenty-three feet ten inches above the mean level in the present day” (*Verhandlungen der Konigl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1844). The inundations of the Nile are very various, and when deficient or excessive by even a few feet cause great damage and distress. The rise of the river during a good inundation is about forty feet at the First Cataract, about thirty-six at Thebes, gradually decreasing until at the several mouths it does not reach above four feet. If the river at Cairo attain to no greater height than eighteen or twenty feet, the rise is scanty; if only to two or four more, insufficient; if to twenty-four feet or more, up to twenty-seven, good; if to a greater height, it causes a flood. Sometimes the inundation has failed altogether, as was, doubtless the case in the seven years’ famine during the viceroyalty of Joseph. A hieroglyphic record of a famine in Egypt prior to the descent of the Israelites has been discovered on a tomb at Thebes, and deciphered by Dr. Birch of the British Museum. The person entombed states that he was governor of a district in Upper Egypt, and is represented as saying, “When in the time of Sesertesen I *the great famine* prevailed in all the other districts of Egypt, there was corn in mine.” Bunsen supposes that this is a record of the “seven years’ famine;” but, independent of the reign of Sesertesen I not agreeing with the time of Joseph’s viceroyalty according to Biblical chronology, the fact of there being corn in Upper Egypt during “the great famine” sufficiently disproves its identity with that memorable “dearth” recorded in Scripture, which: was in all lands, and over all the face of the earth, while in all the land of Egypt there was bread.” There is mention in the Chinese annals of a famine which “lasted seven years,” during the reign of the emperor Ching-tang, who was on the throne at the time of the descent of the Israelites to Egypt, and which very probably refers to the “seven years’” famine mentioned in Scripture (*History of China*, by Martinus, Couplet, and Du Halde). There is a record also of a “seven years’” famine in Egypt during Saracenic times, in the reign of the Khalifeh El-Mustansir billah, when the rise of the Nile was not sufficient to produce the crops of the country. It was probably to

the inundations of the river that the Egyptian priest referred in his conversation with Solon when he told him that “there had been many inundations before” the one special deluge of which Solon had made mention (Plato, *Timenus*, ch. v).

As the river Nile, especially during the inundation, is always impregnated with alluvium, which it deposits on the soil at the rate of nearly five inches in a century. an attempt has been made by some of the skeptical school to show that man has been a denizen of this earth for many thousand years prior to the time which Scripture allows. Some excavations having been made at the suggestion of Mr. Leonard Horner — who does not appear to have assisted in person, or even to have been in the country — at the foot of the colossal statue of Rameses II in the area of Memphis, he concluded, from the rate at which such deposits are annually formed, that some specimens of pottery brought up from a depth of thirty-nine feet proved the existence of men upon earth long anterior to the time of Adam, observing, “If there be no fallacy in ray reckoning, this fragment of pottery, found at a depth of thirty-nine feet, must be held to be a record of the existence of man 13,371 years before A.D. 1854, In the boring at Bessousse fragments of *burned brick* and pottery were brought up from a depth of fifty-nine feet.” The late baron Bunsen considered that this discovery “established the fact of Egypt having been inhabited by men who made use of pottery about 11,000 years before the Christian aera” (*Egypt’s Place in Univ. Bist.* vol. ii, p. xii). The most distinguished writers have, however, decided against this conclusion. Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes that “as there is no possibility of ascertaining how far the statue stood above the reach of the inundation when first put up, we have *no base for any calculation.*” Champollion, the father of Egyptology, wrote, “I have demonstrated that no Egyptian monument is really older than the year 2200 before our sera.” Sir Charles Lyell, in his recent work on *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*, tells us that if such borings were made where an arm of the river had been silted up, the fragments of pottery and brick might be *very modern*; and he considers that “in every case where we find monuments buried to a certain depth in mud, as at Memphis and Heliopolis, it represents the eera when’ the city fell into such decay that the ancient embankments were neglected, and the river allowed to inundate the site of the temple, obelisk, or statue.” “An old indigo planter” relates his experience in a letter to the *Athenaeum* (No. 1509) respecting the deposit of pottery in the bed of the Ganges: “Having lived many years on its banks, I have seen the stream

encroach on a village, undermining the bank where it stood, and deposit, as a natural result, bricks, pottery, etc., in the bottom of the stream. On one occasion I am certain that the depth of the stream where the bank was breaking was above forty feet; yet *in three years* the current of the river drifted so much that a fresh deposit of soil took place over the *debris* of the village, *and the earth was raised to a level with the old bank.*” What took place on the Ganges might have equally occurred on the Nile. The fact also that the Grecian honeysuckle was unexpectedly discovered on some of these supposed pre-Adamite fragments together with the supposition *that burned brick* is a certain indication of Roman times, completely sets aside the arguments which infidelity would fain draw from any discovery supposed to be hostile to the supremacy of God’s Word.

With reference to the qualities of the water from the Nile, all antiquity acknowledges its excellence; and the Egyptians drink it without ever being injured by the quantity, except during the brief season at the commencement of the overflow to which we have already referred. Plutarch is unable to explain why it should be the most pleasant and nutritive water in the world, though he confesses that it was so; and he tells us that the priests refrained from giving it to the sacred bull Apis on account of its fattening properties. It has also been held that the Nile gave fecundity, not only to the soil which was watered by it, but to all living things which partook of it; whence it happened, as some suppose, that the Egyptian women very frequently bore twins and’ even more. Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* 7:4) says, “they give birth to three or four children at a time, nor is this of rare occurrence.” And Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 7:3) observes, “that’ three born at a birth is undoubted; though to bear above that number is considered as an extraordinary phenomenon *except in Egypt.*” The peculiar sweetness of the water is due to the purifying influence of the mud with which it is at all times charged; but which readily settles or is removed by filtration. So valuable are the properties of the Nile water esteemed by the inhabitants that they frequently preserve it in sealed vases, and drink it when it is old with the same pleasure that we do old wine. There is an anecdote of Pescennius Niger, who, when his soldiers in Egypt complained of wanting wine, exclaimed, “What! do you long for wine, when you have the water of the Nile to drink?” It is recorded of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, B.C. 285-247, when he married his daughter Berenice to Antiochus, king of Syria, that he used to send her water from the Nile, which alone she was able to drink.



**III.** *Divine Honors paid to the Nile.* — Considering the immense importance of the Nile in every point of view, it was not unnatural for the ancient Egyptians to regard the river in very much the same light as that in which the Ganges is viewed by the Hindûs. Heliodorus (*Ethiop.* lib. ix) tells us that the Egyptians paid divine honors to the river, and revered it as the first of their gods; for he adds, “They declared him to be the *rival* of heaven, since he watered the earth without the aid of clouds or rain.” The god of the Nile, according to Osburn, was an impersonation of Nu or Noah. His name was written in the hieroglyphics *hp-mu.* and on the most ancient monuments *hp-ro-mu,* signifying “the waters whose source is hidden.” This name often occurs in monuments of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, where he is represented as a fat man of different colors, with a cluster of water-plants on his head, and holding in his hands stalks and flowers, or water jars, indicative of the inundation. In a representation at Phile he is termed “the father of the fathers of the gods.” He was often represented with the Nile issuing from his mouth. On the tomb of Pharaoh Rameses III there is a device in which the river in its three different stages is represented. Three figures, one of larger size than the other two, are painted in colors—blue, green, and red—with the river flowing from the mouth of the chief one into the mouths of the others, and thence on to the ground, showing that this god underwent three different impersonations at the three states of the Nile, which were colored accordingly, so that the deity was worshipped in a different image at each change of the river. The principal festival of the Nile was at the summer solstice, when the inundation was considered to have commenced; at which season, in the dog days, by a cruel and idolatrous custom, the Egyptians sacrificed red-haired persons, principally foreigners, to Typhon, the peculiar god of the dog-star, who was worshipped chiefly at Heroopolis, Busiris, etc., by burning them alive, and scattering their ashes in the air for the good of the people (Plutarch, *His et Osir.* 1:383). Hence Bryant sagely conjectures that these victims may have been chosen from among the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt! *SEE NILUS.*

**IV.** *Scriptural Prophecies respecting the Nile.* — In addition to the numerous incidental allusions noticed above, various incidents in the history of Israel of an ominous character are mentioned in Scripture as having happened in connection with the Nile. The seven well-favored and ill-favored kine of which Pharaoh dreamed, in the dream which Joseph interpreted, are said to have come up out of the river (<sup>(140)</sup>Genesis 41:1-3).

Pharaoh's dream is a most lively figure, representing things exactly conformable to the state of the country, enriched as it was by the inundation of the Nile; and without this the beasts would have had no grass to feed them, much less to fatten them. The banks of the river are enlivened by the women who come down to draw water, and, like Pharaoh's daughter, to bathe, and by the herds of kine and buffaloes which are driven down to drink and wash, or to graze on the grass of the swamps. It was into this river that the male children of the Israelites were cast by command of the cruel king who had recently ascended the throne, and who "knew not Joseph" (<sup><B172></sup>Exodus 1:22). The mother of Mosethid her child in an ark of bulrushes, which she laid in the flags by the river's brink, beside which Pharaoh's daughter came to bathe, when her maidens are represented as walking along the bank, and thus the child was preserved. Two of the plagues which God inflicted upon the Egyptians were intimately connected with the waters of the Nile which they esteemed so precious (<sup><B177></sup>Exodus 7:17, 18; 8:1-3). Nearly a thousand years later in Israel's history Isaiah was inspired to foretell judgments upon Egypt and the Nile: "The Egyptians will I give over into the hand of a cruel lord,... and the river shall be wasted and dried up, . the paper reeds by the brooks shall wither and be no more. The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish" (<sup><B194></sup>Isaiah 19:4-8). Though history shows how truly the prophecy respecting the Egyptians being given over into the hands of cruel lords (the word is in the plural number, *lords*, though the adjective rendered *crutel* is singular) was accomplished in the twelve petty tyrants who ruled in Egypt, according to Herodotus, about a century after the time of Isaiah, the expression may also be understood to denote the decay of Egypt's strength by metaphors taken from the decrease of the river Nile, upon the overflowing of which the plenty and prosperity of the country depended. Thus the king of Egypt is described (<sup><B198></sup>Ezekiel 29:3) as "a dragon lying in the midst of many waters," and boasting of his strength, as his predecessor did in the days of Moses, "My river is my own," etc.; which was fulfilled in the person of Pharaoh-hophra (mentioned in <sup><B243></sup>Jeremiah 46:38), or Apries (as he was called by the Greeks), who profanely boasted, as Herodotus (2:169) tells us, that "there was no God who could cast him down from his eminence." In the Thebaid crocodiles are found, and during Low Nile they may be seen basking in the sun upon the sand-banks. "The paper reeds" are said in the prophecy to grow by the "mouth of the brooks," i.e. by the side of the brooks; expressed elsewhere

(<sup><0403></sup>Genesis 41:3; <sup><0003></sup>Exodus 2:3) by “the brink of the river,” when referring to the Nile. Paper was an invention of the Egyptians, and was first made of a reed that, grew upon the banks of the Nile, as Ovid (*Metamorph.* i) describes it

*“—Papyriferi septemflua flsmina Nili.”*

The monuments of the early dynasties represent the Nile as a stream bordered by flags and papyrus-reeds, the covert of innumerable wild fowl, and bearing on its waters the flowers of the various-colored lotus. At the present time there are scarcely any reeds or water-plants to be seen in Egypt—the papyrus having become extinct, and the lotus being now unknown—as the prophet distinctly foretold they should be “no more.” When it is recollected that the water-plants of Egypt in Isaiah’s time and much later were so abundant as to be a great source of revenue to the country, the exact fulfillment of his predictions is a valuable evidence of the truth in reference to “the sure word of prophecy.” We have seen likewise how Isaiah foretold the failure of the fisheries; and although this was doubtless a natural result of the wasting of the river, its cause could not have been anticipated by human wisdom. “The Nile,” says Diodorus Sicullus (lib. i), “abounds with incredible numbers of all sorts of fish,” which once formed a main source of “revenue” (<sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 23:3), as well as sustenance to the inhabitants of the country. The Israelites in the desert looked back with regret to the fish they had left behind them. “We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, but now our soul is dried away, and there is nothing at all beside this mamna before our eyes” (<sup><0403></sup>Numbers 11:4, 5). The fisheries of Egypt have long ceased to be of the productive nature they once were, in accordance with the prophetic announcement that “the fishers should mourn and all the anglers should lament” for their lost trade.

There is one more prophecy in Isaiah respecting the Nile, the fulfillment of which is still in the future: “When Jehovah shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from the islands of the sea, he will utterly destroy the tongue (or bay, <sup><0603></sup>Joshua 15:2, 5) of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dryshod” (<sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 11:11-15). Notwithstanding that R. Kimchi and others have understood this of the Euphrates, it is clear from the context, as well as from a comparison of

the parallel passages (<sup>23915</sup>Isaiah 19:5; 23:3), that none other than the river Nile can be intended. As by “the tongue of the Egyptian sea” must be meant the bay of the Mediterranean Sea into which the Nile, and not the Euphrates, empties itself, so a prophecy specifying a river with “seven streams” must necessarily point to that famous river, which in ancient and modern times alike has been recognized as the “sevenmouthed Nile.” Now, as for a long period past, there are no navigable and unobstructed branches but the two that Herodotus distinguishes as in origin works of man. This change was prophesied by Isaiah: “And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and dried up” (<sup>23915</sup>Isaiah 19:5).

The prophets not only tell us of the future of the Nile; they speak of it as it was in their days. Ezekiel likens Pharaoh to a crocodile, fearing no one in the midst of his river, yet dragged forth with the fish of his rivers, and left to perish in the wilderness (<sup>23201</sup>Ezekiel 29:1-5; comp. 32:1-6). Nahum thus speaks of the Nile, when he warns Nineveh by the ruin of Thebes: “Art thou better than No-Amon, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall [was] from the sea?” (<sup>3488</sup>Nahum 3:8). Here the river is spoken of as the rampart, and perhaps as the support of the capital, and the situation, most remarkable in Egypt, of the city on the two, banks is indicated. **SEE NO-AMMON.** But still more striking than this description is the use, which we have already noticed of the inundation, as a figure of the Egyptian armies, and also of the coming of utter destruction probably by an invading force.

In the New Testament there is no mention of the Nile. Tradition says that when our Lord was brought into Egypt his mother came to Heliopolis. See Ox. If so, he may have dwelt in his childhood by the side of the ancient river which witnessed so many events of sacred history, perhaps the coming of Abraham, certainly the rule of Joseph, and the long oppression and deliverance of Israel their posterity.

See in addition to the works named above, Oedmann, *Saml.* 1:113 sq.; Lenz, *De Nilo* (in the *Comment. philol.* ed. Ruperti et Schlichthorst, Brem. 1794); Hartmann, *Geogr. van Africa*, 1:75 sq.; Ukert, *Geogr. von Africa*, 1:97 sq.; Le Pere, *id.* xviii, i, p. 555 sq.; Beke, *Sources of the Nile* (Lond. 1860); Werne, *Source of the White Nile* (ibid. 1849); Baker, *Basin of the Nile* (ibid. 1866); McCulloch, *Gazetteer*, s.v.; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; Appleton's *New Amer. Cyclopaedia*, and the recent works there cited.

## Niles, Nathaniel

a Congregational minister, was born April 3, 1741, at South Kingston, R.I. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1776; studied theology under Dr. Bellamy; entered the ministry, but never settled in any place as pastor. Residing for some time in Norwich, Conn., he was several times sent to the state legislature. After the Revolution he settled in Orange County, Vt., then a wilderness, and there spent his life, filling many important public stations, being a judge in the supreme court; speaker in the House of Representatives, 1784; member of the United States Congress, 1791 to 1795; and six times presidential elector. He preached in his own house and in school-houses around the country, seldom receiving any compensation for his labors, which were continued until his strength failed. His death occurred Oct. 31, 1828. Mr. Niles published *Four Discourses on Secret Prayer* (1773): — *Two Discourses on Confession of Sin and Forgiveness* (1773): — Two sermons entitled *The Perfection of God the Fountain of Good* (1777): — *A Sermon* on vain amusements; and a *Letter* to a friend concerning the doctrine that impenitent sinners have the natural power to make to themselves new hearts (1809); besides numerous articles for newspapers and the *Theological Magazine*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:716.

## Niles, Samuel (1),

a Congregational minister of colonial days, was born at Block Island, Mass., May 1; 1674; was educated at Harvard University, class of 1699; and after thoroughly preparing himself for ministerial labors became pastor of a church at Kingston, R. I., in 1702, and there remained until 1710. In 1711 he was installed pastor of the Second Church at Braintree, Mass. He died at his native place May 1, 1762. He published, *A brief and sorrowful Account of the present Churches in New England* (1745).: — *Vindication of divers Important Doctrines* (1752, 8vo): — *Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* (1757, 8vo): — *God's Wonder-working Providence for New England in the Reduction of Louisburg* (1747): — *History of the French and Indian Wars*, in "Hist. Collections," 3d series, vol. vi.

## Niles, Samuel (2),

a Congregational minister, son of the preceding, was born Dec. 14, 1743, at Braintree, Mass., where his father was then pastor. Niles, Jun., graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1769; studied under Dr.

Bellamy; entered the ministry Nov. 7, 1770, and was ordained, Sept. 25, 1771, pastor in Abington, Mass., where he remained until his death, Jan. 16, 1814. He published two occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:713.

### Niles, William Watson

son of judge Nathaniel Niles, of Vermont, was born at West Fairlee Nov. 29, 1796; graduated at Dartmouth College, studied at Andover Theological Seminary, entered the ministry of the Congregational Church, and subsequently took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. He died at La Porte, Ind., in 1854. He was a zealous advocate of the cause of temperance.