

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Q - Red Heifer

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

Q.

Quadragesima

(*fortieth* day) is a name sometimes applied to the Lenten season, or more properly to the first Sunday of Lent (q.v.). It is so called by analogy with the three Sundays which precede Lent, and which are called respectively Septuagesima, seventieth; Sexagesima, sixtieth; and Quinquagesima, fiftieth. The whole period of Quadragesima is in the Roman Catholic Church accounted as *tempus clausum*.

Quadrangle

is an architectural term used to describe a square or court surrounded by buildings. The buildings of monasteries were generally arranged in quadrangles. *SEE QUADRATUM*.

Quadrans

SEE FARTHING.

Quadratum

(*squared*), a name which was given to the nave of a church because of its square form. *SEE CHURCH; SEE NAVE; SEE QUADRANGLE*.

Quadratus

bishop of Athens, flourished under the government of Antoninus Pius. Quadratus is reputed to have been a disciple of the apostles and a native of Athens. Under emperor Adrian, while Publius was bishop of Athens, the Christians were persecuted and the congregation scattered. When Quadratus later succeeded to the episcopate of Athens, he wrote, for the purpose of ending the persecution of his co-religionists, an *Apology for the Christian Faith*, and presented it to the emperor. This *Apology*, which had the desired effect, was extant in Eusebius's time, who tells us that it showed the genius of the man and the true doctrine of the apostles; but we have only a small fragment. preserved by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, wherein the author declares that "none could doubt the truth of the

miracles of Jesus Christ. because the persons healed and raised from the dead by him had been seen, not only when he wrought his miracles. or while he was upon earth, but even a very great while after his death; so that there were many,” says he, “who were yet living in our time.” Valesius, and others upon his authority, make of this Quadratus a different person from Quadratus the bishop of Athens; but this assertion is generally rejected. Jerome affirms that the Quadratus of Athens and the one reputed to have lived at Magnesia were the same. Nothing certain can be collected concerning the death of Quadratus; but it is supposed that he was banished from Athens, and then put to a variety of torments, under the reign of Adrian. See Eusebius, *Hist.* ^{204B} *Ecclesiastes* 4:3; Cave, *Hist. Lit.*; Donaldson, *Literature of the Early Centuries*; Lardner, *Works*; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 8:173; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Quadrio, Francesco Saverio

a learned Italian Jesuit, was born in Valtellina, Dec. 1, 1695. He was of an infirm and susceptible temper, which involved him in sundry broils and disappointments, in consequence of which he sought and obtained leave to quit the Order of the Jesuits and assume the garb of a secular priest or abbe. He died at Milan, Nov. 21, 1756. He is noted principally as a secular writer. His historical and descriptive work on his own country, which he dedicated to pope Benedict XIV- *Dissertazioni Critico-storiche intorno allal Rezio, di qgua dalle Alpi oggi detta. Valtellina* (Milan, 1755, 3 vols. 4to) — is the best account extant of that secluded region. But the principal work of Quadrio is his general history of poetry in all ages and countries; *Storia e Ragione d' oquui i' oesiea* (Bologna and Milan, 1741-52, 7 vols. 4to), a laborious work, containing a vast deal of information not found collected in any other compilation; and, notwithstanding several mistakes and imperfections, is a very useful library book. Its composition occupied the author a considerable part of his life. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Quadripartite

is the technical term for the divisions of a vault into four triangular spaces.

Quadrisacramentarians

is a controversial name for some German reformers in Wittenberg and vicinity who maintained that there *are four* sacraments necessary to

salvation, viz., baptism, the Lord's supper, absolution, and holy orders. See Melancthon, *Loci Comm.* **SEE SACRAMENTARIANS.**

Quadrivium

(*quatuor*, four, and *via*, a road), the name given, in the language of the schools of the West, to the higher course of the medieval studies. From its consisting of four branches, as the lower course, for an analogous reason, was called *Trivium*, or "Three Roads." The quadrivium consisted of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. It would carry us beyond our limits to detail the nature and extent of each of these branches as pursued in the medieval schools. The reader *will* find much curious and new matter on all questions of this nature in the volumes of the works of Roger Bacon, lately edited in the series issued under authority of the Master of the Rolls, as also in the Introduction prefixed to the volumes.

Quail

Picture for Quail (1)

(**wl c**][*Keri*, **wyl c**].*selv*; Sept. ὀρτυγομήτρα; Vulg. *coturnix*) occurs in ^{<0243>}Exodus 14:13; ^{<0413>}Numbers 11:31, 32; ^{<0450>}Psalms 105:40, where it is mentioned as food of the Israelites while they were in the desert. According to Schultens (*Orig. Heb.* i, 231), the Hebrew **wl c**]is derived from an Arabic root "to be fat." The round, plump form of the quail is eminently suitable to this etymology; indeed, its fatness is proverbial. Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 1, 5), too, expressly names the bird referred to here *ortyx*, ὄρτυξ. In fact, the Hebrew word **wyl c**]is unquestionably identical with the Arabic *salwa*, a "quail." Nevertheless, various opinions have been held as to the nature of the food denoted by the Hebrew *selv*, which on two distinct occasions was supplied to the Israelites in the wilderness (see ^{<0243>}Exodus 16:13, on which occasion the people were between Sin and Sinai; and ^{<0413>}Numbers 11:31, 32, when at the station named, in consequence of the judgment which befell them, Kibroth-hattaavah). Ludolf, for instance, an author of high repute, has endeavored to show that the *selav* were locusts (see *hi is Disse-tatio de Locustis, cum Diatribau*, etc. [Franc. ad Moen. 1694]). His opinion has been fully advocated and adopted by Patrick (*Comment.* on ^{<0413>}Numbers 11:31, 32). The Jews in Arabia also, as we learn from Niebuhr (*Beschreib. von Amab.* p. 172), "are convinced that the birds which the Israelites ate in such numbers were only

clouds of locusts, and they laugh at those translators who suppose that they found quails where quails were never seen.” Rudbeck (*Ichthyol. Bibl. Spec.* i) has argued in favor of the *selav* meaning “flying-fish,” some species of the genus *Exocetus*. Michaelis at one time held the same opinion, but afterwards properly abandoned it (see Rosenmuller. *Not. ad* Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 649). A later writer, Ehrenberg (*Geograph. Zeitschr.* 9:85), from having observed a number of “flying-fish” (gurnards, of the genus *Trigla* of Oken, *Dactylopterus* of modern ichthyologists) lying dead on the shore near Elim, believed that *this* was the food of the Israelites in the wilderness, and named the fish *Triglac Israelitarum*. Hermann von der Hardt supposed that the locust bird (*Patstor roseus*) was intended by *seladv*; and recently Mr. Forster (*Voice of Israel*, p. 98) has advanced an opinion that “red geese” of the genus *Casalrca* are to be understood by the Hebrew term. A similar explanation has been suggested by Stanley (*S. and P.* p. 82) and adopted by Tennent (*Ceylon*, i, 487, note): this is apparently an old conceit, for Patrick (on ^{<0413>}Numbers 11:31) alludes to such an explanation. Some writers, while they hold that the original word denotes “quails,” are of opinion that a species of sand-grouse (*Pterncles alchata*), frequent in the Bible lands, is also included under the term (see Rosenmuller [*Not. ad -Hieroz.* ii, 649], Faber [in *Harmar*, ii, 442], and Gesenius [*Thesaur.* s.v. **wl c**]). It is usual to refer to Hasselquist as the authority for believing that the *Kata* (sand-grouse) is denoted: this traveller, however, was rather inclined to believe, with some of the writers named above, that “locusts,” and not birds, are to be understood (p. 443); and it is difficult to make out what he means by *Tetrao Israelitarum*. Linnaeus supposed he intended by it the common “quail.” In one paragraph he states that the Arabians call a bird “of a grayish color and less than our partridge” by the name of *Kattta*. He adds “An Selaw?” This cannot be the *Pterocles alchata*. The view taken by Ludolf may be dismissed with a very few words. The expression in ^{<1982>}Psalms 78:27, of “feathered fowl” (**ānk āw**), which is used in reference to the *selav*, clearly denotes some bird, and Ludolf quite fails to prove that it may include winged insects. Again, there is not a shadow of evidence to support the opinion that *selav* can ever signify any “locust,” this term being used in the Arabic and the cognate languages to denote a “quail.” As to any species of “flying-fish,” whether belonging to the genus *Dactylopterus* or to that of *Exocetus*, being intended, it will be enough to state that “flying-fish” are quite unable to sustain their flight above a few hundred yards at the most, and never could

have been taken in the Red Sea in numbers sufficient to supply the Israelitish host. The interpretation of *selav* by “wild geese” or “wild cranes,” or any wild fowl,” is a gratuitous assumption without a particle of evidence in its favor. The *Casorca*, with which Mr. Forster identifies the *selav*, is the *C. rutila*, a bird of about the size of a mallard, which can by no means answer the supposed requisite of standing three feet high from the ground. “The large red-legged cranes” of which Prof. Stanley speaks are evidently white storks (*Ciconia alba*), and would fulfil the condition as to height; but the flesh is so nauseous that no Israelite could ever have done more than have tasted it. With respect to the *Pterocles calchata*, neither it, nor indeed any other species of the genus, agrees with the Scriptural account of the *seldav*. The sand-grouse is a bird of strong wing and of unwearied flight, and never could have been captured in any numbers by the Israelitish multitudes. It is at all times a tenant of the wilderness far from water, and, strictly taken, is perhaps not a clean bird, all the species subsisting, for the most part, on larvae, beetles, and insects. We much question, moreover, whether the people would have eaten to excess — for so much the expression translated “fully satisfied” (~~1989~~ Psalm 78:29) implies — of the flesh of this bird, for, according to the testimony of travellers, from Dr. Russell (*History of Aleppo* [2d ed.], ii, 194) down to observers of to-day, the flesh of the sand-grouse is hard and tasteless. The **ὄρτυγομήτρα**, or “quail-mother,” of the Sept. should not be passed over without a brief notice. It is not easy to determine what bird is intended by this term as used by Aristotle and Pliny (*ortygometra*). According to the account given of this bird by the Greek and Latin writers on natural history just mentioned, the *ortygometra* precedes the quail in its migrations, and acts as a sort of leader to the flight. Some ornithologists, as Belon and Fleming (*Brit. Anim.* p. 98) have assigned this term to the “land-rail” (*Crex pratensis*), the Roi des Cailles of the French, Re di Quaglie of the Italians, and the Wachtelkonig of the Germans, but with what reason we are unable to say. Probably the Sept. uses the term as a synonym of **ὄρτυξ**, or to express the good condition in which the birds were, for Hesychius explains **ὄρτυγομήτρα** by **ὄρτυξ ὑπερμεγέθης**, i.e. “a quail of large size.” **SEE PARTRIDGE.**

Picture for Quail (2)

The objections which have been urged by Patrick and others against “quails” being intended are very easily refuted. The expression “as it were two cubits [high] upon the face of the earth” (~~0413~~ Numbers 11:31) is

explained by the Sept., by the Vulg., and by Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 1, 5) to refer to the height at which the quails flew above the ground, in their exhausted condition from their long flight. As to the enormous quantities which the least successful Israelite is said to have taken (viz. “ten homers”) in the space of a night and two days, there is every reason for believing that the “homers” here spoken of do not denote strictly the measure of that name, but simply “a heap;” this is the explanation given by Onkelos and the Arabic versions of Saadiah and Erpenius in ^{<HEB>}Numbers 11:31. Indeed, the inspired historian has himself shown that a complete covering of the ground with a compact mass is out of the question. For he has informed us that the people “spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp.” This was in order to dry them in the sun for keeping, and it would require to be performed before decomposition had begun to set in; therefore the ground about the camp was free and clean for the drying process, which could not have been if it had been covered a yard deep with birds, twenty bushels to the square yard. As it was, however, the store they collected in thirty-six hours lasted them for a whole month. The bodies, after having been split and cleansed, may have been simply dried in the sun without any antiseptic; for desiccation having once taken place, which a few hours of sunshine would be sufficient to accomplish, the stock would be preserved in the arid climate of the desert for an indefinite period. Thus the flesh of animals taken in hunting is simply sun-dried in South Africa, and thus the stock-fish of the Norwegians is prepared from the cod, without salt. It is possible that a portion of the preserved meat may have been salted. The Egyptians used a large quantity of salt provisions, particularly fish and fowl; and the processes of splitting and salting geese are well depicted in the paintings of the tombs. The Hebrews would thus be sufficiently familiar with the art; and we know, from the ordinances concerning sacrifice (^{<HEB>}Leviticus 2:13), that they carried salt with them. But that they had, or could on the spur of the occasion procure, salt enough for the curing of a hundred millions of bushels of quails (allowing twenty millions to have been consumed in the fresh state), is altogether improbable. A comparatively small quantity may have been so preserved, but the bulk was doubtless simply sun-dried. The Egyptians similarly prepared these birds (see Herodotus [ii, 77], and Maillet [*Lettres sur L’Egypte*, 9:21; 4:130]). **SEE EXODE.**

Quails form a subdivision of the *Tetraonidae*, or grouse family, being distinguished from partridges by their smaller size, finer bill, shorter tail,

and the want of a red naked eyebrow and of spurs on the legs. There are several species, whereof the common, now distinguished by the name of *Coturnix dactylisonans*, is abundant in all the temperate regions of Europe and Western Asia, migrating to and from Africa in the proper season. Thus it crosses the Mediterranean and Black seas twice a year in vast multitudes; but being by nature a bird of heavy flight, the passage is partially conducted by way of intermediate islands or through Spain, and in the East, in still greater numbers, along the Syrian desert into Arabia, forming, especially at the spring season, innumerable flocks. This quail, the only species of the genus known to migrate, has, in fact, a very wide geographical range, being found in China, India, the Cape of Good Hope, and England, and, according to Temminck, in Japan (see Col. Sykes's paper on *The Quails and Hempodii of India* [*Trans. of Zool. Soc.* vol. ii]). Enormous flights of this bird, after crossing (an immense surface of sea, are annually observed at the spring and fall to take a brief repose in the islands of Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Crete, in the kingdom of Naples, and about Constantinople, where on those occasions there is a general shooting-match, which lasts two or three days. This always occurs in the autumn. The birds, starting from the Crimea about seven at night, and with a northerly wind, before dawn accomplish a passage of above sixty leagues in breadth, and alight on the southern shore to feed and repose. In the vernal season the direction of the flight is reversed, and they arrive in similar condition on the Russian coast. The same phenomena occur at Malta, etc.; and as gregarious birds of passage are known to guide their course by given landmarks, which they distinguish with unerring precision, and which, unless they have been driven out of their usual direction by storms of wind, they invariably arrive at or over before they take a new flight, so also quails congregate in Arabia in numbers proportionate to the surface of Western Asia, whither they are proceeding. The providential nature of their arrival within and around the camp of the Israelites, in order that they might furnish meat to a murmuring people, appears from the fact of its taking place where it was not to be expected; the localities, we presume, being out of the direction of the ordinary passage; for, had this not been the case, the dwellers in that region, and the Israelites themselves, accustomed to tend their flocks at no great distance from the spot, would have regarded the phenomenon as a well-known periodical occurrence. Aristotle (*Anima*. 8:14) mentions the habit; and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 10:23) states that they sometimes alight on vessels in the Mediterranean and sink them! Belon found quails alight in autumn on a vessel bound from Rhodes to Alexandria; they were passing

from the north to the south, and had wheat in their craws. In the preceding spring, sailing from Zante to the Morea, he saw flights of quails going from south northwards. Buffon relates that M. le Commandant Godelun saw quails constantly passing Malta during certain winds in May, and repassing in September; and that they flew by night. Tornefort (*Voyage*, i, 329) says that all the islands of the Archipelago at certain seasons of the year are covered with these birds. Col. Syles states that such quantities were once caught in Capri, near Naples, as to have afforded the bishop no small share of his revenue, and that in consequence he has been called Bishop of Quails. The same writer mentions also (*Trans. Zool. Soc.* 1. ii) that 160,000 quails have been netted in one season on this little island. M. Temminck says that in spring such prodigious numbers of quails alight on the western shores of the kingdom of Naples, about Nettuno. that one hundred thousand are taken in a day (Yarrell, *Brit. Birds* [2d ed.], ii, 404). It is interesting to note the time specified: "it was at even" that they began to arrive; and they, no doubt continued to come all the night. Many observers have recorded that the quail migrates by night, though this is denied by Col. Montagu (*Ornithol. Dict.* s.v.). "On two successive years I observed enormous flights of quails on the north coast of Algeria, which arrived from the south *in the night*, and were at daybreak in such numbers through the plains that scores of sportsmen had only to shoot as fast as they could reload" (H. B. Tristram). When the numbers, however, are very great, and the distance to be achieved remote, we can well imagine that both day and night would be spent on the wing, as on the second occasion recorded in the sacred text. The expression "quails from the sea" (^{Q113}Numbers 11:31) must not be restricted to denote that the birds came from the sea as their starting-point, but it must be taken to show the direction from which they were coming. The quails were, at the time of the event narrated in the sacred writings, on their spring journey of migration northwards, an interesting proof, as Col. Sykes has remarked, of the perpetuation of all instinct through some 3300 years; the flight which fed the multitudes at Kibrothhattaavah might have started from Southern Egypt and crossed the Red Sea near Ras Mohammed, and so up the gulf of Akabah into Arabia Petra. The Israelites would have had little difficulty in capturing large quantities of these birds, as they are known to arrive at places sometimes so completely exhausted by their flight as to be readily taken, not in nets only, but by the hand. See Diod. Sic. (i, 82 [ed. Dindorf]), Prosper Alpinus (*Rerum Egypt.* 4:1), and Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 5). Sykes (*l.c.*) says "they arrive in spring on the shores of Provence so fatigued that for the first few

days they allow themselves to be taken by the hand.” Diodorus tells us (i, 60) that the inhabitants of Rhinocolura, a town on the border of Palestine and Egypt, placed long nets made of split reeds along the shore a length of many furlongs, in which the quails were arrested that had crossed the sea in flocks; and that they then preserved them for future subsistence. In the northern parts of Persia and Armenia, according to Morier, quails are taken in great abundance, and with great ease, with the simplest possible machinery. The men stick two poles in their girdles, on which poles they so stretch a coat or a pair of trousers that the sleeves or the legs shall project like the horns of a beast. Thus disguised, they prowl about the fields with a hand-net, and the quails, simply supposing the strange object to be a horned beast, and therefore harmless to them, allow him to approach, till he throws the net over them. Rude as such a contrivance seems, the Persians catch quails thus with astonishing rapidity (*Second Journey*, p. 343). The flesh of the quail, though of an agreeable quality, is said by some writers to be heating, and it has been supposed by some that the deaths that occurred from eating the food in the wilderness resulted partly from these birds feeding on hellebore (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 10:23) and other poisonous plants; but this is exceedingly improbable, although the immoderate gratification of the appetite for the space of a whole month (^(-OHIO) Numbers 11:20) on such food, in a hot climate, and in the case of a people who at the time of the wanderings rarely tasted flesh, might have induced dangerous symptoms. “The plague” seems to have been directly sent upon the people by God as a punishment for their murmurings, and perhaps is not even in a subordinate sense to be attributed to natural causes. See, in general, Bochart, *lieroz.* ii, 648 sq.; Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 40; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 229; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 430 sq.; *Bible Educator*; i, 157, 250; iii, 88.

Quaini, Luigi

an Italian painter, the son of Francesco, was born at Bologna in 1643. After having acquired the rudiments of the art and a knowledge of perspective from his father, he became a disciple first of Guercino, and afterwards of his relation Carlo Cignani, in whose school he was contemporary with Marc Antonio Franceschini. His improvement was so great that in a few years he was employed, as well as Franceschini, to assist Cignani in the execution of some of his great works. Their method of handling and coloring was so similar that it was difficult to determine what part of any work was executed by either of them. In Cignani's principal

works, however, it seems that Quaini painted the landscape, the architecture, and other ornaments, and Franceschini the figures. After Cignani's death the two artists continued to work together. They were employed at Bologna, Modena, Piacenza, Genoa, and Rome, where they painted the cartoons for a cupola in St. Peter's, which has since been executed in mosaic. Quaini also painted many historical subjects from his own compositions, which were entirely finished by himself. In the church of St. Joseph at Bologna there is a picture of the *Visitacion*; in La Carith, the dead *Christ Supported by the Virgin*; and in the church of St. Nicholas the principal altar-piece is by Quaini — it represents *St. Nicholas in Prison Visited by the Virgin and an Angel*, and is favorably spoken of by Lanzi. Quaini died in 1717.

Quakers

SEE FRIENDS.

Quam despectus

QUAM DEJECTUS, is the beginning of a passion-hymn, written by the *doctor seraphicus*, St. Bonaventura (q.v.), of which the first stanza runs thus:

*“Quam despectus, quam dejectus,
Rex coelorum est effectus,
Ut salvaret saeculum;
Esquivit et sitivit,
Pauper et egenus ivit
Usque ad patibulum.”*

This beautiful hymn has been translated into English by P. S. Worsley, and from the *Lyra Messianica*, p. 277, we subjoin the first stanza:

*“Oh, what shame and desolation,
Working out the world's salvation,
Deigned the King of Heaven to bear!
See him bowed with sorrows endless,
Hungry, thirsty, poor, and friendless,
Even to the cross repair.”*

For the original, see Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Lond. 1864), p. 143 sq. (B. P.)

Quam dilecta Tabernacula

is the beginning of a prose of Adam of St. Victor (d. about 1192) for the dedication of a church. "This hymn," says Mr. Trench, "of which the theme is, the dignities and glories of the Church, as prefigured in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New, is the very extravagance of typical application, and were it only as a study in mediaeval typology, would be worthy of insertion; but it has other and higher merits, even though it must be owned rather that the poet's learned stuff masters him, than that he is able effectually to master it. Its title indicates that it was composed for the occasion of a church's dedication, the services of which time were ever laid out for the carrying of men's thoughts from the temple made with hands to that spiritual temple, on earth or in heaven, 'whose builder and maker is God.'" We subjoin the first verse:

*"Quam dilecta tabernacula
Domini virtutum et atria!
Quam electi architecti,
Tuta aedificia,
Quae non movent, immo fovent,
Venius, flumen, pluvia!"*

There are two English translations of this prose, one by W. B. Flower, in *Lyra Mystica* (, p. 211 sq. — "How loved thy halls and dwelling-place" — and the other by Neale, in his *Mediaeval Hymns*, p. 146 sq., with explanatory notes. A third translation, but only of the last stanzas, is given by Mr. Bonar in the *Sunday at Home* (Jan. 1878), which, for their beauty, we subjoin:

*"Future things in figure shadowed
This our day of grace displays!
on the couch with our beloved
here we rest, and sing, and praise,
Now the bridal day has come!*

*"Days of which the silver trumpets
Of the ancient feasts first told;
Day of days, whose promised glory
Israel's holy psalms unfold,
Giving voice to solemn sound.*

*“Thousand, thousand are the praises
To the Bridegroom which they raise;
With one voice in triumph singing
Through the everlasting days,
Hallelujah, without end.”*

See Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 227 sq.; Mone, *Hymni Latini*, i, 316; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, i, 109. (B. P.)

Quandt, Johann Jacob

a Lutheran theologian, doctor and professor of theology, was born March 27, 1686, at Koniigsberg, in Prussia, where he also died Jan. 17, 1772, as church-counsellor and general superintendent. Of his writings we mention, *Jude'nprediyt* (Konigsberg, 1710): — *De Atramento Hebrorum, ex Pandectis Talmudicis* (ibid. 1713): — *De Cultris Circumcisorii et Secespitis Hebraeorum* (ibid. 1713): — *De Cornibus Al taris Exterioris* (ibid. 1713): — *De Cinere in Sacris Hebrceorum* (ibid. 1713): — *Dissertatio de Sagtan* (WNS) *sire Pontifics Maximi Suffrasqaneo* (Lips. 1708). reprinted in Ugolino, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacru'm*, etc. 12:No. 16: — *De Christo Veio Ecclesice 1F; damento in Nomine Sethi typice adumbrato* ^{QOES} *Genesis 4:25* (Kinigsberg, 1726). See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124; Winer, *landbuch der theolog. Literatur*, i, 637; ii, 718 (Leips. 1838). (B. P.)

Quanian Version

The Quines, a wandering people, for whom this version is made, inhabit that most northerly portion of Lapland which is called Finmark or Norwegian Lapland. This dreary region, having for its northern boundary the Arctic or Frozen Ocean, is the habitation of about 6000 people, called the QuAines, who till within the last half century were left without any version of the Scriptures in their vernacular dialect. The Bible Society of Finland sent to them copies of the Finnish Testament, but this version was unintelligible to them, and even so the Lappish Testament, although they speak a dialect of Laplandish. In 1822 the British and Foreign Bible Society voted £200 to promote a version in Quinian, and it was not till the year 1828 that arrangements for the immediate translation of the New Testament were made by the Norwegian Society. The execution of the translation was committed to Mr. Stockfleth, a missionary of eminent devotedness, who in 1828 was laboring as a pastor among the uncivilized

tribes of Laplanders under the seventy-first degree of north latitude, where, during two months of the year, the sun never rises. In 1840 the translation of the New Testament was completed, and an edition was published at Christiania, under the superintendence of the Norwegian Bible Society. See *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 324. (B. P.)

Quanwon

is, in Japanese mythology, an embodiment of the goddess Amida. She is represented with a multitude of hands, each holding a different object, probably things useful to men, whom she has undertaken to make happy. Her temples are splendid, of extraordinary dimensions, and filled with idols: 33,333 are said to be contained in the temple of Miako; hence its name, *San mun San Tsin*, which signifies the temple of the 33,333 images. A large number of children are represented around her in her pictures: they are the gods themselves looking up to her with love and veneration.

Quarantana

In the mountainous wilderness between Jerusalem and Jericho, in which, according to tradition, our Lord's temptation took place, there is a very high mountain, one of the highest in Judaea, called *Quarantana* (by the Arabs *Kuruntul*), in allusion to the forty days' fasting of Jesus, and which is supposed to be the mount alluded to in ^{<408>}Matthew 4:8 (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 450; Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 2, 12); but by some it is identified with the Rock of Rimmon, where the defeated Benjamites took refuge (^{<474>}Judges 20:47). "The mountain rises precipitously, an almost perpendicular wall of rock, twelve or fifteen hundred feet above the plain, crowned with a chapel on its highest point. The eastern front is full of grotts and caverns, where hermits are said once to have dwelt in great numbers. At the present day, some three or four Abyssinians are said to come hither annually to pass the time of Lent upon the mountain, living only upon herbs. There is nothing else remarkable about this naked cliff to distinguish it from the other similar ones along the Ghor and the Dead Sea farther south. The tradition which regards the mountain as the place of our Lord's temptation, as well as the name Quarantana, appears not to be older than the age of the Crusades" (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 303).

Quare impedit

(i.e. *why he hinders*) is the title of an English action whereby a person who has purchased an advowson, or right of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, sues any one who disturbs or hinders him in the exercise of his legal right.

Quare incumbavit

(*why he has cumbered or taken possession*). During a plea between two persons for the possession of an advowson [*SEE QUARE IMPEDIT*], if the bishop admits the presentee of one of them within six months, the other can have a writ of this form against the bishop.

Quare non admisit

(*why he has not admitted*). When one has recovered an advowson, and the bishop refuses to admit his presentee, such a writ may be employed.

Quarrel

(Fr. *carre*, square) is a technical term employed in architecture to describe a diamond-shaped pane of glass, or a square one placed diagonally. It is also the name of a small piercing in the tracery of a window. A wax taper (q.v.) used in churches is also called “quarrel.”

Quarry

Picture for Quarry

(*l ysbæ pesil*, but only in the plur.; Sept. *γλυπτά*, Vullg. *idoll*). In the account of the exploit of Ehud in ^{<0789>}Judges 3:19, 26, for the “quarries that were by Gilgal” of our version, or, as the Syriac and the Chal dee read, stone-pits or quarries, the primary signification of *images* of false gods may be intended, as in ^{<0725>}Deuteronomy 7:25; ^{<2408>}Isaiah 42:8; ^{<2489>}Jeremiah 8:19; 51:52; ^{<28112>}Hosea 11:12. etc.; and it is so understood by the Sept. and the Vullg. in the above text. We have no knowledge of any quarries at Gilgal, in the plain of Jericho; and Boothroyd conjectures that idols might have been erected at Gilgal by Eglon, and that the sight of them there inspired Ehad with new ardor to execute his purpose. Rosenmuller, after Rashi, adheres to the above interpretation of quarries, and in this Furst and Keil agree. The last-named interpreter remarks that the Gilgal intended cannot

be the one near the Jordan, but that in the hills of Ephraim. *SEE GILGAL*. Gesenius regards *Pesilim* as the name of a place. Cassel, in *Lange's Commentary*, understands by it *boundary-stones*, i.e. "termini," of an idolatrous form. That the ancient Canaanites had extensive quarries is evinced by the cyclopean blocks at the foundation of the temple at Baalbek (q.v.).

Quarterly Fast

SEE FASTING.

Quarterly Meeting

SEE MEETING, QUARTERLY.

Quartodecimani

a name in ecclesiastical history for those Christians of Asia Minor who, in the first ages of the Church, annually commemorated the death of Christ at the 14th of Nisan, the time when the Jews celebrated the Passover, *SEE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY*, and three days after the resurrection of Jesus, totally ignoring the regard for the day of the week usually taken as the one on which this event is believed to have occurred. This difference it was determined to adjust at the Council of Nice in A.D. 325, when it was decreed that the practice of observing Friday as the day of crucifixion (q.v.), and the following Sunday as the day of ascension (q.v.), should prevail. Those who refused to accept this decision of the council were denominated *Quartodecimani*, because of their contending for the fourteenth day of the first Hebrew month as the proper time for observing Easter, *quartadecima lunae*, on the fourteenth day of the moon. They are sometimes called *Paschites*. The Audaean, Montanists, Novatians, and other sects were *Quartodecimani*. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*; Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi.

Quar'tus

(Graecized *Κούαρτος*, for the Latin *quartus*, fourth), a Christian resident at Corinth, and, from his name, apparently a Roman, whose salutations Paul communicated to the Church of Rome in his epistle thereto (⁴⁶³Romans 16:23). A.D. cir. 50. There is the usual tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples; and it is also said that he ultimately became bishop of Berytus (Tillemont, 1, 334).

Quas Laudes

TIBI NOS, PATER, CANEMUS, is the beginning of one of the hymns written by the “preceptor Germanise,” Philip Melancthon (q.v.). It was composed in the year 1527, and is based on ~~PSALM~~ Psalm 111. It is found with his other poems, of which he composed altogether about 400, in Bretschneider’s *Corpus Reformatorum* (Hal. Sax. 1842), vol. 10. A selection of about fifty-one, together with a German metrical translation, was published by Oberhey, *Melancthon’s Gedichte, Musgewihlt und ubersetzt* (Halle, bei Muhlmann, 1862). See Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, i, 259. (B. P.)

Quaser

The Scandinavian *Edda* tells us that the divine families of the Asas and Vanas, having warred against each other for many years, felt tired at last of these never-ceasing disputes, and determined to create a being on whose wisdom they might safely rely, and whom they would take for their umpire. The Asas and Vanas spat into a common vessel, and formed Quaser. He was so wise that no one could ask him a question which he was not able to answer. Therefore, having pronounced his sentence in the quarrel of the gods, he travelled about in the world to impart his wisdom to men. But two gnomes, Fialar and Galar, killed him, mingled his blood with honey, and thus prepared a delicious mead, which made poets of all those who tasted it. The gods having shown some anxiety as to what had become of the great sage, the gnomes managed to spread the rumor that Quaser had been choked by his own wisdom (a phrase which has become proverbial in the north), as nobody could relieve him of it by his questions. Shortly afterwards the same dwarfs killed the giant Gilling and his wife by crushing them with a mill-stone while sleeping. The giant Suttung, Gilling’s son, avenged his father by exposing the murderers on a deserted island, to die there of starvation. In this extremity they offered him, to ransom their lives, their poetical mead. Suttung listened to their proposition, set them free, and had the precious liquid carefully guarded by his beautiful daughter Gunloda in the interior of a mountain. Odin, by a stratagem, penetrated into the mountain, gained the favor of the yotung giantess, and drank the mead to the last drop.

Quasimodogeniti

is a term sometimes used to denote the first Sunday after Easter. It is of comparatively late origin, and is derived from the Latin version of ~~1~~1 Peter 2:2: *Quasi modo geniti infantes*, etc. — “As new-born babes,” etc. *SEE EASTER.*

Quatember

are fasts observed in the Church of Rome, and by other ecclesiastical bodies, among them the Church of England. According to Jewish custom, the four seasons of the year were observed as occasions for fasting. These were the four fast-weeks: one after Ash-Wednesday, Pentecost, the Crucifixion (Sept. 14), and after Lucia (Dec. 13). The fast-days were Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. Wednesday was the day on which the quarterly offerings were brought, and it was principally called Quatember-day. In the German Protestant Church these fasts were for a long time observed also.

Quater'nion

(τετράδιον, *a body of fl. bur*). “A quaternion of soldiers” (~~4~~Acts 12:4) was a detachment of four men, which was the usual number of a Roman night-watch (Veget. *De Re de Milit.* iii, 8; Philo, *2 In Flacc.* p. 98; Polyb. 6:33, 37). *SEE SOLDIER.* Peter, therefore, was guarded by four soldiers, two within the prison, probably attached to his person, and two outside the doors; and, as the watch was usually changed every three hours, it was necessary that the “four quaternions” mentioned in the text should be appointed for the purpose. *SEE PRISON.* Or one set of sentinels may have been posted at the door of the cell (which was probably thought to be so secure as not to require a guard within), and another at the outer or street gate (Walch, *De Vinclis Petri*, in his *Dissert.* ad loc.). *SEE PETER.*

Quatremere, Etienne Marie

a celebrated French Orientalist, was born at Paris, July 12, 1782. He began his studies at a very early age, and as a youth was noted for his remarkable attainments. In 1807 he was employed in the Imperial Library. and in 1809 was called to the professor's chair at Rouen. In 1815 he was appointed to the Academy of Inscriptions, and in 1819 instructor of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac at the College of France. In 1827 he became professor of

Persian. He was now known as one of the greatest Orientalists in the world, and was especially noted as an Egyptologist, and how well he deserved this distinction appears from his publications in this line of study. In his religious proclivities he was Gallican and Jansenist. He used his pen freely against the innovations of the papists and against their assumptions. We have not room here to mention his severe satires against the Ultramontanes, but refer the reader who desires to study them to Renan's *Essays*. Quatremire died Sept. 18, 1857.

Quaw, James E.

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. He graduated at the New Brunswici Theological Seminary in 1828, and was engaged during his ministerial life chiefly in missionary work among feeble churches in New York and Michigan. He was the author of two remarkable books — *The Cold Water Man*, a powerful plea for total abstinence, and *Bible Baptism, or the Immerser Instructed from Various Sources*. The latter has passed through a number of editions. and is a real thesaurus of information, and of learned, acute, and valuable discussion of the mode of baptism. The object is to place before its readers the *results* of learned investigation, and to prove that immersion is not the only scriptural mode of baptism; that sprinkling is scriptural, and that infants are proper subjects of that ordinance. The individuality of the author's character, life, and ministry, and his independence of thought and treatment of his subject, may be gathered from his prefatory statement: "Many of the materials for the following work were collected while the author was travelling in primitive apostolic style in different parts of the great American valley. In these, his ministerial journeyings, he usually preached six or eight times a week, while he often travelled on foot without purse or scrip or two coats, sometimes with scarcely one, often for day's without bread and occasionally without water. But the mighty God of Jacob was always with him... This book was written in a Western log-cabin, in a room which at one and the same time answered for a study, a parlor, a sitting-room, a dining-hall, bedroom, and kitchen. The hours which for six or eight months the author could spare from the discharge of the duties of a New-Testament bishop, he has, in this rather romantic study, devoted to this work." Mr. Quaw was lost on Lake Erie in the dreadful wreck of the steamer Erie in 1845. He was a godly and self-denying man, peculiar in appearance and manner, a faithful missionary to the needy, and an able writer. (W. J. R. T.)

Quedara Wardon

is a Hindu festival in honor of the goddess Parwati (q.v.). It imposes on him who has once celebrated it the obligation of celebrating it every year. The participants in this solemnity are distinguished by a yellow string, which they carry around their arm. They fast the whole day of the feast.

Quedil

is a Hindu feast in honor of the goddess Mariatale. The performances are the same as those of the goddess Mariyammai. Mariatale is probably identical with the latter.

Quedlinburg, Synods Of.

Several ecclesiastical councils were held in this German city in mediæval times. The first took place in 1085. The bishops who sided with pope Gregory VII assembled it immediately after Easter, and it was presided over by the papal legate Otto di Ostia. Among those who attended were archbishops Gebhard of Salzburg and Hartwick of Magdeburg; the bishops Adalbere of Wtirzburg, Altmann of Passau, Bernard of Merseburg, Gunther of Zeiz, St. Benno of Meissen, Albert of Worms. Burchard of Halberstadt, Herrmann of Metz, Reginhard of Minden, Wigold of Augsburg, Gebhard of Constance, Heinrich of Bamberg. The council recognised, first, the primacy of the pope, whose decisions it was allowed to no one to alter or to criticise. In conformity with the decrees of former popes, the consecration of the bishops unlawfully established by Henry IV, Wenzel of Mentz, Siegfried of Augsburg, Norbert of Chur, etc., was declared null, and likewise all other ordinations and consecrations of the same kind. The synod rejected the erroneous assertions of Wenzel of Mentz in regard to excommunication. Excommunications are only valuable when they are pronounced according to the forms adopted by the Church. The six following resolutions are of a general kind: The sixth canon recommends to the priests, deacons, and subdeacons perpetual continence; the seventh canon prohibits the lays from touching the altar-palls and holy vessels; according to the eighth canon, the lays shall not take hold of the dimes without having the consent of the legitimate owners; the ninth canon directs that the spring fast of Quatember shall be held in the first week of Lent, the summer fast in the week of Pentecost; the tenth canon decrees no one shall eat eggs or cheese during the forty days of Lent; the eleventh canon declares that the choice made by the legate Otto of Gebhard as

bishop of Constance, and everything done by the legate in that city, is approved by the council. At the close of the council the anathema was pronounced, with burning tapers, against the anti-pope Wibert (pseudo-Clemens III), the heresiarch; against the apostate Hugo of Albano, who had presided at the Council of Worms in 1076; against Johannes (Petrus), archbishop of Parto, and against Petrus, late chancellor of the pope; against archbishop Liemar of Bremen, Udo of Hildesheim, Otto of Constance, Burchard of Basle, Huzmann of Spire, deposed bishops; finally, against the usurping bishops aWenzel, archbishop of Mentz; Siegfried, bishop of Augsburg; Norbert, bishop of Chur, and all their followers. See Labbe, *Concil.* x; Hardouin, *Concil.* vi; Hartzheim, *Cone. Germ.*; Binterim, *Deutsche Conc.* vol. iii; Flotho, *Konig Heinrich IV* (Stuttg. 1855). Two other synods were held at Quedlinburg — one in 1105, for the reformation of manners; a third in 1121, about the situation of the empire and the investitures. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

Quedu

was, in Hindu mythology, the son of Kassiaba and Siugfriede. He and his brother Rahu were redoubtable giants and wicked daemmnns. They tried to prevent the gods from preparing the beverage of immortality, the *amrita*. The gods having succeeded in their enterprise, by causing the Mandar Mountain to rotate in the middle of the milk sea, the two giants robbed the vessel which contained the amrita. The sun and moon had been witnesses to the robbery: they denounced it to Vishnu, who cut off the heads of the giants at the very moment when they carried the immortalizing liquid to their lips. A drop of the amrita had already made the two heads immortal; they flew towards the sky, and there became planets. They are only visible at the time of eclipses. They are fierce enemies of the sun and moon, which they pursue and try to swallow.

Queen

The Hebrews had no word properly answering to our term *queen* in the sense of a female sovereign, neither had they the dignity which that word denotes. Of the three Hebrew terms used as the equivalents of “queen” in the A. V. (**הַמַּלְכָּה** **הַשְּׂהֵגָל** **הַגְּבִירָה**), the first (*malkah*) alone is applied to a queen *reynnant*; the first and second (*shegal*) equally to a queen *consort*; without, however, implying the dignity which in European nations attaches to that position; and the third (*gebirah*) to the queen *mother*, to whom that

dignity is transferred in Oriental courts. The etymological force of the words accords with their application. *Malkah* is the feminine of *mlek*, “king;” it is applied in its first sense to the queen of Sheba (^{<1100>}1 Kings 10:1), and in its second to the chief wife, as distinguished from all other females in a royal harem (^{<700>}Esther 1:9 sq.; 7:1 sq.; Cant. 6:8): the term “princesses” is similarly used in ^{<1100>}1 Kings 11:3. *Shegal* simply means “wife,” i.e. of the first rank, as distinguished from mere concubines; it is applied to Solomon’s bride or perhaps mother (^{<950>}Psalm 45:9), and to the wives of the first rank in the harems of the Chaldee and Persian monarchs (^{<270>}Daniel 5:2, 3; ^{<1016>}Nehemiah 2:6). *Gebirdh*, on the other hand, is expressive of authority; it means “powerful” or “mistress,” being the feminine of *ryb67* *gebir*, “master,” or “lord.” The feminine is to be understood by its relation to the masculine, which is not applied to kingly power or to kings, but to general authority and dominion. It is, in fact, the word which occurs twice with reference to Isaac’s blessing of Jacob: “Be lord over thy brethren;” and “I have made him thy load” (^{<073>}Genesis 27:29, 37). It would therefore be applied to the female who exercised the highest authority, and this, in an Oriental household, is not the wife, but the mother, of the master. Strange as such an arrangement at first sight appears, it is one of the inevitable results of polygamy: the number of the wives, their social position previous to marriage, and the precariousness of their hold on the affections of their lord combine to annihilate their influence, which is transferred to the mother, as being the only female who occupies a fixed and dignified position. Hence the application of the term *gebirah* to the queen *mother*, the extent of whose influence is well illustrated by the narrative of the interview of Solomon and Bathsheba, as given in ^{<1129>}1 Kings 2:19 sq. The term is applied to Maachah, Asa’s mother, who was deposed from her dignity in consequence of her idolatry (^{<1153>}1 Kings 15:13; ^{<4516>}2 Chronicles 15:16); to Jezebel as contrasted with Joram (^{<203>}2 Kings 10:13, “the children of the king and the children of the queen”); and to the mother of Jehoiachin or Jeconiah (^{<2438>}Jeremiah 13:18; comp. ^{<1242>}2 Kings 24:12; ^{<250>}Jeremiah 29:2). In ^{<1119>}1 Kings 11:19, the text perhaps requires emendation, the reading followed in the Sept., *j l wdGhi* “the elder,” according better with the context. The limited use which is made even of the restricted term *gebirah* is somewhat remarkable. It is only employed twice with reference to *the wife* of a king: in one of these two cases it is applied to the wife of the king of Egypt, where the condition of the royal consort was more *queenly* than in Palestine (^{<1119>}1 Kings 11:19; comp. Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. ii, 59; iii, 64; v, 28); and in the other to

Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, who, as the daughter of a powerful king, appears to have enjoyed peculiar privileges in her matrimonial state (^{<12013>}2 Kings 10:13). In two other places it is not clear whether the king's wife or mother is intended (^{<241318>}Jeremiah 13:18; 29:2); and in the remaining passages it is pointedly referred to the king's mother in such terms as clearly show that the state which *she* held was one of positive dignity and rank (^{<11153>}1 Kings 15:13; ^{<41516>}2 Chronicles 15:16). **SEE WIFE.**

Picture for Queen (1)

The result of all inquiry into the subject seems to show that among the Jewish kings the usages bearing on this point were not different from those which are still exhibited in Western Asiatic courts. Where woman never becomes the head of the State, there can be no queen regnant; and where polygamy is allowed or practiced, there can be no queen consort. There will, however, be a chief wife in the harem; and this is no doubt the rank indicated in the Bible by the words which we render "queen." This rank may be variously acquired. The *first* wife of the king, or the first whom he took *after his accession*, usually obtained it; and if she is both of high birth and becomes the mother of the first son, her position is tolerably secure; but if she possesses neither of these advantages, she may be superseded in her position as head of the harem by a wife of higher birth and connections subsequently espoused, or by one who becomes the mother of the heir apparent. The king, however, will sometimes act according to his own pleasure in this matter, promote any favorite lady to this dignity, and also remove her from it at his pleasure; but more generally he finds it convenient to follow the established routine. The daughter of the king of Egypt was, doubtless, from her high rank, the chief wife of Solomon; as was Jezebel, for the same reason, the chief wife of Ahab. In like manner the high-born mother of Absalom was probably the chief wife of David, although it is possible that the mother of the eldest son, Amnon, at first enjoyed that distinction, which, we may safely presume, eventually devolved on Bathsheba, after her son Solomon had been recognised as the heir. In one of Mr. Morier's amusing books (*Hajji Baba in England*) there is a passage which strikingly illustrates this matter. The court of Persia is there represented as being perplexed how to answer a letter which, in ignorance of Eastern customs, had been addressed by the queen consort of England "to the queen of Persia." The cause of the dilemma thus created was that — "Although the shah's principal wife is called the banou harem, or head of the seraglio, yet her situation in the State bears as little affinity

to that of the queen of England as one may say the she buffalo kept in the enclosure for food and milk has to the cow fed and worshipped by the Hindu as his god. Our shah can kill and create banous at pleasure, whereas the queen of England maintains her post till the hand of fate lays her in the grave” (comp. Chardin, *Voyages* [ed. Langles], vol. 6 ch. xii; Thornton’s *Turkey*, ii, 264-286). Very different was, and is to this day, in Western Asia, the position of the king’s mother, whose state is much the nearest to that of a European queen of any with which the East is acquainted. It is founded on that essential principle of Oriental manners which in all cases considers the mother of the husband as a far superior person to his wife, and as entitled to more respect and attention. This principle should be clearly understood; for it extends throughout the Bible, and is yet entirely different from our own social arrangements under which the mother, as soon as she becomes widowed, abandons her place as head of the family to the daughter-in-law. Mr. Urquhart has admirably illustrated and developed this principle in his *Spirit of the East* (ii, 387 sq.); and his remarks, although primarily illustrative of Turkish manners, are, with some unessential limitations, applicable to the ancient and modern East. In p. 389 there is an anecdote of the late Ibrahim Pasha, who is represented as staying a whole week in the harem of his mother, waiting to find a favorable opportunity of pressing a request upon her; and when admitted, kissing her feet, refusing to be seated, and standing an hour and a half before her with his arms crossed, without, after all, succeeding in the suit which he — the conqueror of Syria and the victor of Konieh — preferred to an aged woman. The arrangement in the seraglios of the more magnificent Hebrew monarchs was probably similar to that of Turkey, with this difference, that the chief women in the harems of the Jewish sovereigns entered it as wives, and not as slaves. The grand signior, from an indeterminate number of female slaves, selects his favorites, who are distinguished by the title of *cadun*, which, as it means “lady of the house,” seems nearly equivalent to the Hebrew *gebirah*. The number of these is said to be limited to seven, and their rank seems to correspond to that of the “wives” of the Hebrew seraglio, whose number was unlimited. The mother of a boy is called *hasseky*, unless the boy die, in which case she descends to her former rank. The caduns, or wives, of a deceased or deposed sultan are all removed from the imperial harem to a separate palace, with the single exception of the *valide sultan*, the mother of the reigning sultan, who has her liberty, a palace, and revenues to support a suitable establishment. But the hassekies, or those who have a son living,

are treated with marked respect, as in the natural course of events they may become *valide*. The title of *sultan* (for the Turkish has no distinction of gender), though from courtesy it may be given to the hassekies, is, strictly speaking, appropriate only to the sovereign's mother, and to the sons and daughters of the imperial family (Thornton, 2, 276; Urquhart, 2, 433). This statement, especially the last point of it, strikingly illustrates the view we have taken as to the more *queenly* position of the king's mother than of his wife in the Jewish and other Asiatic courts. It must be clearly understood that this position is by no means peculiar to the modern East, or to the Jews among the ancient Orientals. Heeren, indeed, thinks that the power of "the queen mother" was even more considerable among the ancient Persians than among the modern Turks (*Hist. Researches*, i, 400); and the narratives of Herodotus and Ctesias respecting the tyrannical influence exercised by Parysatis, Amestris, and others bear ample testimony to this fact. The careful reader of Scripture will easily be able to trace the same ideas respecting the position of the king's mother among the Israelites. In how marked a manner does the mother of Solomon come forward at the end of her husband's and the beginning of her son's reign! She takes an active part in securing her son's succession; it is in the conviction of her commanding influence that Adonijah engages her to promote his suit, alleging "he will not say thee nay;" and then, when Bathsheba appears before her son, the monarch rises from his place, advances to meet her, bows himself before her, and seats her on the right hand of his throne (^{<1100>}1 Kings 1:2). That the king's mother possessed high dignity is further evinced by the fact that Asa found it necessary to remove his mother, Maachah, "from being queen," on account of her abuse of the power which that character conferred (^{<1153>}1 Kings 15:13). Jezebel was, as already stated, very powerful in the lifetime of her husband; but it is only under her son that she is called "the queen" (*gebiraih*); and the whole history of his reign evinces the important part which she took in public affairs (^{<1102>}2 Kings 9:22, 30, 37; 10:13). Still more marked was the influence which her daughter Athaliah exercised in Judah during the reign of her son Ahaziah, which was, indeed, such as enabled her at his death to set the crown on her own head, and to present the anomaly in Jewish history of a regnant queen (2 Kings 11). *SEE WOMAN*.

Picture for Queen (2)

Queen Of Heaven.

In ²⁴⁷⁸Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17, 18,19, 25, the Heb. מַלְאכֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם *meleketh hash-shamayim*, is thus rendered in the A. V. In the margin is given “frame or workmanship of heaven,” for in twenty of Kennicott’s MSS. the reading is מַלְאכֵת of which this is the translation, and the same is the case in fourteen MSS. of ²⁴⁴⁸Jeremiah 44:18, and in thirteen of ²⁴⁴⁹Jeremiah 44:19. The latter reading is followed by the Sept. and Peshito Syriac in ²⁴⁷⁸Jeremiah 7:18, but in all the other passages the received text is adopted, as by the Vulg. in every instance. Kimchi says *a* is wanting, and it is as if מַלְאכֵת — ‘workmanship of heaven,’ i.e. the stars; and some interpret ‘the queen of heaven,’ i.e. a great star which is in the heavens.” Rashi is in favor of the latter; and the Targum renders throughout “the star of heaven.” Kircher was in favor of some constellation, the Pleiades or Hyades. It is generally believed that the “queen of heaven” is the moon (comp. “siderum regina,” Horace, *Carm. Sec.* 35, and “regina coeli,” Apul. *Met.* 11:657), worshipped as Ashtaroth or Astarte, to whom the Hebrew women offered cakes in the streets of Jerusalem. Hitzig (*Der Proph. Jeremia*, p. 64) says the Hebrews gave this title to the Egyptian Neith, whose name in the form Ta-nith, with the Egyptian article, appears with that of Baai Hamman, on four Carthaginian inscriptions. It is little to the purpose to inquire by what other names this goddess was known among the Phoenician colonists; the Hebrews, in the time of Jeremiah, appear not to have given her any special title. The Babylonian Venus. according to Harpocraton (quoted by Selden, *De Dis Syris* [ed. 1617], synt. 2, cap. 6, p. 220), was also styled “the queen of heaven.” Mr. Layard identifies Hera, “the second deity mentioned by Diodorus, with Astarte, Mylitta, or Venus,” and with the “queen of heaven,” frequently mentioned in the sacred volumes... The planet which bore her name was sacred to her, and in the Assyrian sculptures a star is placed upon her head. She was called Beltis, because she was the female form of the great divinity, or Baal; the two, there is reason to conjecture, having been originally but one, and androgyne. Her worship penetrated from Assria into Asia Minor, where its Assyrian origin was recognised. In the rock tablets of Pterium she is represented; as in those of Assyria, standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess. This may have been a modification of the high cap of the Assyrian

bas-reliefs. A figure of Astarte found in Etruria represents her as winged (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 404). To the Shemites she was known under the names of Astarte, Ashtaroth, Mylitta, and Alitta, according to the various dialects of the nations among which her worship prevailed” (*Nineveh*, ii, 454, 456, 457). It is so difficult to separate the worship of the moon-goddess from that of the planet Venus in the Assyrian mythology when introduced among the Western nations that the two are frequently confused. Movers believes that Ashtoreth was originally the moon-goddess, while according to Rawlinson (*Herod.* i, 521) *Ishtar* is the Babylonian Venus, one of whose titles in the Sardanapalus inscriptions is “the mistress of heaven and earth” (see Onias, De $\mu\gamma\mu\chi\ \tau\kappa\iota\ m$ [Alt. 1666]). **SEE ASHTORETH.**

With the cakes ($\mu\gamma\mu\chi\iota$ *carvvanmi*; Sept. $\chi\alpha\upsilon\omega\acute{\nu}\epsilon\varsigma$ which were offered in her honor, with incense and libations, Selden compares the $\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha$ (A. V. bran”) of Ep. of Jeremiah 43, which were burned by the women who sat by the wayside near the idolatrous temples for the purposes of prostitution. These $\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha$ were offered in sacrifice to Hecate while invoking her aid for success in love (*Theocr.* ii, 33). The Targum gives $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\tau\epsilon\kappa\iota$ *kanrdutin*, which elsewhere appears to be the Greek $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\delta\omega\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, a sleeved tunic. Rashi says the cakes had the image of the god stamped upon them, and Theodoret that they contained pine-cones and raisins. **SEE CAKE.**

Queen Of The South.

SEE SHEBA.

Queen Anne’s Bounty

is the name given in England to a fund appropriated to increase the income of the poorer clergy. It was created out of the firstfruits and tenths which before the Reformation were exacted by the pope from the clergy. These were funded by a statute in queen Anne’s time; hence the name. See *Chambers’s Encyclop.* s.v. **SEE ANNATES.**

Queensferry Declaration

After the defeat at Bothwell Bridge, the stricter and more violent portion of the Covenanters drew off from the main body, and adhered exclusively to the ministers Cameron and Cargill. An outline of their opinion had been composed, and the document was found in possession of Hall of

Haughhead on his apprehension at Queensferry on June 3, 1680. Hall was mortally wounded as he was defending himself, and Cargill, his companion, escaped. This document, unsigned and unfinished, and named after the place where it was seized, after affirming adherence to the Scriptures and the covenanted work of reformation. goes on, however, to say: "We do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the Word of God; that we shall no more commit the government of ourselves, and the making of laws for us, to any one single person, this kind of government being most liable to inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny." This bold avowal of revolution was soon charged against the entire Presbyterian body, and increased persecutions was the result. *SEE COVENANTERS; SEE RUTHERGLEN DECLARATION; SEE SANQUHAR DELCLARATION.*

Queiss, Eberhard Von,

a German prelate of the Reformation period, flourished near the opening of the 16th century. In 1523 he was made bishop of Pomerania, but in the following year he felt constrained to announce his abandonment of the old faith and became Protestant. In 1527 he resigned his worldly power (the episcopates of Germany then holding secular as well as ecclesiastical sway) into the hands of the duke of Pomerania. He also abandoned the celibate, and in every way he identified himself with the Protestant cause. He was overshadowed by the greatness of his predecessor in the see, George von Polentz (q.v.), and little is known of Queiss after 1527. Probably his decease only two years later was the reason for this obscured page in his life's history.

Quelen, Hyacinthe Louis De

a French Roman Catholic prelate of note, was born at Paris, Oct. 8, 1778, and was educated at the seminary in St. Sulpice. In 1807 he was ordained to the priesthood, and made shortly after secretary of cardinal Fesch. When this noted dignitary fell out with Napoleon, Quelen accompanied his eminence to Lyons. Under the Restoration he became general vicar of Talleyrand, took an active part in the establishment of the concordat, and was rewarded for his valuable services by the bishopric *in partibus* of Samosata in 1819. When Talleyrand was elevated to the archbishopric of Paris, Quelen was made his coadjutor *cum spe succedendi*, and on Oct. 20,

1821, succeeded Talleyrand in the primacy of France. He made many journeys and busied himself greatly with *relique* controversies (Francis de Sales, Vincent de Paul); but his stout advocacy of Ultramontanism and the Jesuits, whose expulsion from France in 1828 he *vainly* endeavored to prevent, made him very unpopular, and he was subjected to repeated attacks in his palace by the mobs of Paris in 1830 and 1831. He lived on, however, until 1839, when sudden death ended the ignominious life of this great ecclesiastic. See Henrion, *Vie et Travaux Apostoliques de oM. de Quelen*; D'Exauvillez, *Vie Abrgee*; Clavel, *Hist. Chret. des Dioceses de France*, s.v.

Quenstedt, Johan Andreas

a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg in 1617, studied at Helmstbidt under Calixtus and Hornejus, and in Wittenberg under Leyser. Won to the theology of the latter highschool, he became in 1646 theological adjunct, in 1649 extraordinary, and in 1660 ordinary professor of theology at Wittenberg, and always distinguished himself as a most ardent Lutheran. He died in 1688. His most celebrated work, *Theologia Didactico-polemica, s. Systema Theologicum* (Wittenb. 1685), is a most elaborate treatise of Lutheran scholasticism, and constitutes one of the best polemics of its distinguishing dogmas. Other works of his of note are, *De Sepultura Veterum* (ibid. 1648, 8vo, and later): — *Dialogus de Patriis Illustrium Doctrina et Scriptis Viroruem* (ibid. 1654, 4to): — *Disputationes Exegeticce in Epistolm ad Colossenses* (ibid. 1664, 4to): — *Ethica Pastoralis* (ibid. 1678, 8vo, and later): — *Antiquitates Biblicce et Ecclesiasticce* (ibid. 1688, 4to, and later). Personally Quenstedt was a mild, unpretentious character, and even his polemics is nothing less than zealous. He appeared on the stage when the period of dissolution had touched Lutheranism and rejuvenated the old orthodox spirit, and gave it new and attractive form. His power was not only with his pen, but in the university. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index); Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrten Lexikon*, s.v.; Tholuck, *Wittenberger Theologen*, p, 214 sq.; Gass, *Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik*, i, 357 sq. (J. H.W.)

Quental, Bartholomieu Do

a Portuguese theologian, was born of noble parentage, Aug. 22, 1626, in the isle of St. Michael, Azores. In 1643 he was sent to Portugal to study at Evora and other Portuguese highschools, and after taking holy orders

became one of the confessors of the king. He greatly served papal interests, and was distinguished by pope Clement XI with the title of “the venerable.” Quental introduced the “Congregation of the Oratory,” and in other ways strengthened Romanism. He died at Lisbon, Dec. 20, 1698. His principal works are, *Meditaciones* (Lisb. 166695, 6 vols. 8vo): — *Sermoes* (ibid. 1692, 4to). See Kiceron, *Memoires*, vol. xlii. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, xli, 300.

Queras, Mathurin

a French controversialist, was born at Sens, Aug. 1, 1614, studied theology at Paris, where he obtained the doctorate, and was attached to the Sorbonne. He was a Jansenist in proclivity, and in 1656 refused to abandon the Port-Royalists even on the threat of being ousted from his professorship. He was rewarded for his consistency by the archbishop of Sens, who made Queras one of his grand vicars and placed him at the head of his theological seminary. In 1674, upon the death of his protector, Queras was obliged to retire to Troyes, and became prior of St. Quentin. He spent the remainder of his life, like the Port-Royalists, in retirement and penitence. He died April 9, 1695. His most important works is *Eclaircissement de cette Celebre et importante Question*, referring to the decisions of the Council of Trent on the dogmas of justification and grace (Paris, 1683, 8vo), in which he takes ground against the council. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Quercus, Synod Of.

In the year 403 a council was held at a place in the neighborhood of Chalcedon. The spot is designated ἐπὶ δρῶν (to the oak), and the council is therefore known as the *Concilium cad Quercum*. It was presided over by Paul, bishop of Heraclea. Theophilus of Alexandria here succeeded in effecting the deposition of his archenemy St. John Chrysostom, which was decreed by the thirty-six bishops present, among whom were Acacius of Berea, Severianus of Gabala. in Syria, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Cyprian of Chaicedon. St. Chrysostom was cited. but refused to appear, unless Theoplilhis, Acacius. Antiochns, and others of his declared foes withdrew. The emperor Arcadius, yielding to the wish of his wife Eudoxia, who had determined thie ruin of Chrysostom, confirmed the judgment of the council, and banished him to Bithynia However, an earthquake, which occurred on the very day of his departure, terrified the empress to such a

degree that he was instantly brought back, and re-entered Constantinople in triumph. *SEE CHRYSOSTOM.*

Querini, Angelo Maria,

an illustrious Italian prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Venice. of noble parentage, in 1680. He first studied under the Jesuits, and at the age of seventeen entered the Benedictine order. Having become well acquainted with the Greek, Hebrew, and Biblical learning, he was made instructor of the novices, for whom he wrote a dissertation, *De Mosaicoe Historia Praefantia*. He afterwards travelled four years in France, England, Holland, and Germany, and enjoyed the society of some of the most distinguished men of those countries. In his *Commentarii de Rebus ad se Pertinentibus*, he gives some account of what he saw and the conversations he had with many learned men. On his return to Italy he published several works on liturgic antiquities: *Vetus Officium Quadragesimale Graecice Orthodoxae: — Diatribae ad Priores Partem Veteris Officii: — De Ecclesiasticorum Officiorum apud Graecos Antiquitate: — De Hymnis Quadragesimalibus Graecorum: — De Alis Cantibus Quadragesimalibus*. In 1721 Querini was made archbishop of Corfu, and he wrote on the antiquities and history of that island. In 1728 he was transferred to the see of Brescia, and soon after he was made a cardinal and librarian of the Vatican. It was after his promotion to the see of Brescia that he wrote his literary history of Brescia. He also published the *Lives* of Paul II (q.v.) and Paul III (q.v.), in the former of which he endeavored to clear the memory of that pope from the charges of Platina and other historians; and he edited a collection of the epistles of cardinal Reginald Pole. His other works consist of dissertations upon literary subjects, both sacred and profane, and of numerous epistles, chiefly in Latin. Cardinal Querini was in every respect one of the most distinguished prelates of the Roman Church in the 18th century. Spotless in his morals, modest and simple in his habits, generous, meek, and charitable, he conciliated the esteem of men of all countries and opinions. Frederick the Great wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Voltaire dedicated to him his tragedy of *Semiramis* and other works. Querini labored particularly to improve the town of Brescia, of which he was bishop. He completed the structure of its handsome cathedral, founded a clerical college, a house for female instruction in the Val Camonica, and, lastly, he established the public library of Brescia. He died in 1755.

Quesnel, Pasquier,

a celebrated French priest or the Oratory, was born of Scottish descent, at Paris, in 1634. He studied at the Sorbonne, and in 1657 entered the Congregation, to which his two brothers belonged also. Those were times that tried men's souls. All France was agitated by the controversy which threatened the exodus of Holland from the domain of Romanism. The heresy of Jansen had found warm advocates in France also, and Quesnel was himself one of the most ardent of these. In 1671 he brought out his *Abrege de la Morale de l'Evangile*, which constitutes only the opening of the now celebrated work of his, *Le Nouveau Testament en Francais, avec des Reflexions Morales* (first complete ed. Paris, 1687, and often since). This work most unequivocally condemned much in the papacy, and advocated pretty boldly many features of Jansenism. Voltaire says that thirty pages of this book, properly qualified and softened, would have prevented much of the disturbance which Jansenism created in France. In 1675, Quesnel made the breach wider by his publication of the works of Leo I and of St. Hilary of Aries, greatly enriched by marginal notes, in the interest and defence of the rights of the Gallican Church. Of course, the book was placed on the *Index*, and its author proscribed at Rome. The superior of the Oratorians, pere Abel de Sainte-Marthe, was himself an enthusiastic Jansenist, and positively endorsed Quesnel. But when the archbishop of Paris, De Harlay, exiled Sainte-Marthe, Quesnel found France a very undesirable home, and he determined to go beyond its borders. In 1681 he was not even left to make his choice, for he was in that year driven from Paris. At first he went to Orleans. His persistent refusal to abandon Jansenism made him uncomfortable here also. In 1684, finally, his order promulgated an anti-Jansenistic formula and demanded the signature of all its members. Quesnel refused to comply, and, feeling insecure, retired to Brussels, where he found the great Arnauld living, also in exile, on account of his Jansenistic proclivities. The two theologians became intimate companions and wrought much together, until the death of Arnauld, in 1694, terminated their relations. One of the most telling labors in defence of Jansenism brought out at Brussels by Quesnel was his *Reflexions Morales*. Notwithstanding its favorable treatment of Jansenism, the work, by its spirit of devotion and fervor, attracted many readers and warm admirers. Its beauties made even the moderate Ultramontanes forget the Jansenistic proclivities of the pen that wrote it, and all bestowed high encomiums on it. Several bishops were loud in its praises. Even the ultra-

Jesuits would read it to catch its holy influences; and Voltaire (*Siecle de Louis XIV*, vol. ii) asserts that it was freely read at Rome. He tells the story that the abbd Renaudot, one of the most learned men in France, being at Rome the first year of Clement XI's pontificate, went one day to wait upon this pope, who loved men of letters, and was himself a man of learning, and found him reading Quesnel's book. "This," said his holiness, "is an excellent performance; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in this manner. I wish I could have the author near me." Yet this very pope in 1708 published a decree against it, and afterwards, in 1713, issued the famous bull *Unigenitus*, in which were condemned a hundred and one propositions extracted from it. We must not, however, look upon this condemnation of Clement XI as a contradiction to the encomium he had before given; it proceeded entirely from reasons of state. The warmest advocate of the *Reflexions* was cardinal de Noailles (q.v.). While still bishop of Chalons he had defended Quesnel's works. Later, in the archiepiscopal see of Paris, he again espoused the cause of the PortRoyalists, and, of course, of Quesnel. In 1696 he even brought out an edition of the *Reflexions* at Paris. But the Jesuits were at work, and they finally succeeded in securing the pope's disapproval of the work, and in blackening the character of its author. They accused him of plotting against the authorities and as a dangerous and seditious person. In 1703 Quesnel was arrested by order of king Philip V, at the instigation of the archbishop of Malines, and put in prison. He was rescued, however, by Jansenistic friends, and made good his escape to Amsterdam, where he spent the remainder of his days building up Jansenism in Holland and strengthening it in France and Belgium also. He died in 1719. The titles of all his writings fill in Moreri several columns. We have room here to mention only, *L'Idee du Sacerdoce et du Sacrifice de Jesus-Christ* (Par. 1688, 12mo): — *Causa Arnaldina* (ibid. 1697, 8vo): — *La Paix de Clement IX, ou Demonstration des deux Faussetes Capitales avancees dans l'Histoire de cinq Propositions contre la Foi des Disciples de Saint-Augustin*, etc. (ibid. 1701, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Consultation sur le Famneux Cas de Conscience* (ibid. 1704, 12mo): — *La Discipline de 'Eglise* (ibid. 1698, 2 vols. 4to): — *Tradition de l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination des Saints et sur la Grace Efficace* (ibid. 1687. 4 vols. 12mo). See Guettei, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*, vols. x and xi; Ceillier, *Dict. Hist. des Aut. Ecclesiastes*; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France* (see Index); Reuchlin, *Gesch. v. Port-Royal*, vol. ii; Neander, *Christian Dogmas*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of*

Rationalism, p. 381; *Princeton Review*, 1856, p. 132; Moreri, *Dict. Historique*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Question, Modern,

is, in Scotland, “Whether it be the duty of all to whom the Gospel is preached to repent and believe in Christ?” and it is called modern because it is supposed never to have been agitated before the early part of the last century. It originated in Northamptonshire, in the churches in which Mr. Davis of Rothwell preached, though it does not appear that he took an active part in it. The question thus started was pursued by a variety of inferior writers down to the time of Andrew Fuller, who very ably supported the positive side of the question, namely, that faith is the duty of all men, although, through the depravity of human nature, men will not believe till regenerated by the Holy Spirit. On the other side it was contended “that faith was not a duty, but a grace,” the exercise of which was not required till it was bestowed. On this subject Mr. Fuller published *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation; or, The Duty of All Men to Believe in Jesus Christ*. Thereupon Fuller was attacked by Mr. Hutton, a Supralapsarian, on the one hand, and by Mr. Daniel Taylor, an Arminian, on the other, to whom he replied by *A Defence* of his former tract.

Questmen

are parish officers whose duty it is to assist church-wardens.

Quetif, Jacques,

a French Dominican, was born in Paris Aug. 6, 1618. At a very early age he entered the order, and in 1635 was sent to Bordeaux to study theology. In 1642 he was ordained to the priesthood at Paris. After filling several positions of trust in houses of his order in provincial towns, he was recalled to Paris, in 1652, and placed in charge of the library of the Jacobin convent. Thereafter, he became noted for his bibliographical attainments and his intimate knowledge of the canon law. He died March 2, 1698. We have from him: *Hieronymi de Medicis Formalis Explicatio Summae Theol. D. Thomae Aquinatis* (Paris, 1657, fol.): — *Concilii Trid. Canones* (ibid. 1666, 12mo): — *Vita Hier. Savonarolce* (ibid. 1674, 3 vols. 12mo): — *Petri Morini Opuscula et Epistolce* (ibid. 1675, 12mo): — *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Recensiti* (ibid. 1719 sq. 2 vols. fol.), left incomplete and continued by Echard. See *Scriptores Ordinis*

Praedicatorum, ii, 746; Niceron, *Memoires*, xxiv; Moreri, *Dict. Hist.* s.v. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Quetzalcoatl

a Mexican divinity, represented by the green-feathered serpent, is the god of the air. He was, while on earth, a high-priest in the city of Tuta, and was so immensely rich that his houses were built with nothing but gold and precious stones. He was, at the same time, a legislator of incredible wisdom; his commands were published from the top of a mountain by a herald whose voice could be heard at a distance of three hundred miles. It was to him that useful inventions were due; he was, besides, a favorite of the gods, who, for his sake, loaded the land with blessings of all kinds. In that time an ear of corn was of such a size that it was no light burden for a strong man. But as the country, through him, grew happy to excess, and as the gods were well aware that such unmixed felicity was not to the advantage of the people, they advised him to emigrate. He did so; went to Cholula, where the people chose him for their ruler. His reign was as prosperous as could be expected. After his death he was worshipped as god of the air. Almost all peoples, even those hostile to Cholula, recognised his divinity and built temples in his honor.

Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco Gomez De

a Spanish author of note, was born in Madrid, Sept. 26, 1580; was educated at the university at Alcala, and when only fifteen years of age took his degree in theology. He would probably have risen to great distinction in the Church had not his hot temper involved him in strife and controversy, which ended in a duel and exile. He removed to Italy and there also led a restless and eventful life. He died at Villanueva de los Infantes in 1645. Many of his writings were confiscated by the government, but among those that reached the public we are interested in the treatises *On the Providence of God*: — *God's Politics and Christ's Government*, in which he attempts a complete body of political philosophy based upon the example of the Saviour: — *On a Holy Life*: — *The Militant Life of a Christian*, etc. There is a complete edition of his works by Sancho (Madrid, 1790-94, 11 vols. 8vo), and a more recent one by Guerra y Orbe (*ibid.* 1852).

Quiatri

is, in the mythology of the Hindus, the conceiving force resting (therefore sterile, ineffectual) in Brahma. It is called his wife, and as such is opposed to the prolific goddess, Saraswati. The latter is the feminine element of Brahma in its exterior appearance; Quiatri is the same resting in himself.

Quiches, Kiches, Or Utlatecas

a semi-civilized nation of Guatemala, occupying, at the time of the conquest, the greater part of what is now called Los Altos, or the highlands, of Guatemala, including the districts of Quiche, Totonicapam, and Quesaltenango. their traditions indicate that they sprang from the Toltec stock. Their records, as written out by members of the royal house immediately after the conquest, give a long array of kings, and imply a high antiquity. It seems that the Kachiquels and Zutugils were once embraced in the Quiche kingdom, and that their separation was the act of the king Acxopil, who divided his power with his two sons, retaining to himself the capital and surrounding regions, which preserved the name of Quiche. These three divisions, subsequently becoming hostile, were easily conquered by the Spaniards. Alvarado encountered his most vigorous resistance in Quiche, where the king, Tecum-Umam, went out to meet him, according to the chroniclers, with 232,000 men. They fought with great bravery; but musketry and cannon, and, above all, the terror inspired by the Spanish horse, proved too powerful for the rude means of resistance at their command. The battle lasted six days, the Indians fighting desperately as they fell back. The king at last was slain by Alvarado, and the subjugation of the Quiches was completed. The ruins of the city of Quiche, described by Mr. Stephens, attest the grandeur and power of this people, and give a fair support to the early accounts of their numbers. The district which they occupied is the best-populated portion of Guatemala, and is almost purely Indian, the ancient language being still in general use. The people are described by Arthur Morelet as “an active, courageous race, whose heads never grow gray, persevering in their industry, skilful in almost every department of art, good workers in iron and the precious metals, generally well-dressed, neat in person, with a firm step and independent bearing, and altogether constituting a class of citizens who only require to be better educated to rise equal to the best.” Their language is regarded as a purer dialect than either the Kachiquel or Zutugil, with which it is compared by Fray Ildefonso Flores, in his *Arte de la Lengua*

Kachiquel (Guatemala, 1753). Much has recently been done for a better knowledge of this people by Brasseur de Bourbourg, especially in his *Grammaire de la Langue Quichee itise en Parallele avec ses Deux Dialectes Cakchiquel et Tzutuhil, avec un Vocabulaire, servant d'Introduction au Rabinal Achi, Drame Indigne* (Paris, 1862); and *Popul Voh, le Livre Sacrs et les Mythes de l'Antiquite Americaine, avec les Livres Heroiques et Historiques de Quiche* (1861). — *The Amer. Cyclop.* s.v.

Quichuas

the dominant people in the empire of Peru under the incas, who made their language the general one of their territory. The Quichuas extended from Lake Titicaca to Quito, and towards the coast to the territory of the Chinchas and Yuncas. The Aymaras, extending from Lake Titicaca to what is now the southern limit of Bolivia, were first reduced by the Quichuas under the incas. The Quichuas are gay, cheerful, energetic, and, under the wise sway of the incas, seem to have risen rapidly in many arts. They were assiduous cultivators of the soil; maize and other grains raised in Titicaca were sent to all parts of the empire as sacred presents, and the inca himself gave an example of the honor of agriculture. They wove and spun the wool of the llama, vicufia, and alpaca; they worked mines of gold, silver, and copper; built suspension-bridges; erected adobe houses with gables, niches, and arches, and temples of the same material or stone, cutting and fitting the blocks with an accuracy and finish that cannot be excelled; made sterile tracts productive by a wise and extended system of *azequias* and aqueducts, and also by excavating till moisture was reached. In astronomy they had not reached as high a degree as the Mexicans; and in literature, though preserving records mainly by *quipus*, or knotted cords, they cultivated poetry, and had dramas, as well as touching songs, that won the admiration of the Spaniards. The incas claimed to descend from the sun, and introduced the worship of that luminary. They reduced the Chancas and Huancas, apparently intrusive eastern tribes. and then attacked the Yuncas, the people of the coast, whose capital was at Chimu, near Trujillo, and who worshipped Pachacamac, creator of the world (of whom there were a famous idol and temple at the place that still bears the name), the god Rimac (who had a famous oracle near Lima), and other deities. After a long and bloody war, the inca Capac Yupanqui overthrew Chuqui Manca, king of Chimu, and reduced the Yuncas. They were compelled to accept the sun-worship; but the inca allowed the temple of Pachacamac to stand,

as its fame was spread through most of South America. There are remnants of the Yuncas still retaining their language at Moche, Eten, etc.; it is entirely different from the Quichua. The priests of the sun dressed in white, and practiced celibacy and fasts. Near each temple was also a convent of virgins of the sun. The men wore woollen tunics and leggins, the women long skirts and short cloaks, joined by gold, silver, or copper clasps. The incas were distinguished by the *llautu*, a fillet with a ball descending between the eyes. After the Spanish conquest, the Indians lost much of the arts they had gained, and retrograded generally. A desperate effort was made by the Quichuas in the last century to recover their freedom; but their leader, Tupac Amaru, a descendant of the incas, was taken and torn in pieces by horses in the plaza of Cuzco in 1780. There is a series of grammars of the Quichua, beginning with that of Fray Domingo de San Tomas (Valladolid, 1560), and coming down to Markham, *Contributions towards a Grammar and Dictionary of Quichua* (London, 1864). *Ollulttoy*, a Quichua drama, and several songs of the *haravecs*, or bards, have been published.

Quick, John

an English Presbyterian divine, was born at Plymouth in 1636. Having determined to enter the ministry, he was ordained in 1658. When the Nonconformity bill of 1662 was passed, he joined the conforming party, and was subjected to imprisonment. After his release, he went to London, and became the pastor of a Presbyterian congregation. He also interested himself in the French Protestants, and cared for those of the Huguenots who touched London on their way to a refuge from the intolerant measures of their own countrymen. He even wrote in their defence *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata* (Lond. 1692, 2 vols. fol.), being a history of the Reformed Church in France; and *Icones Sacrae Gallicanae*, a biography of fifty Reformed French preachers, interrupted, however, by the death of Quick, which occurred in 1706. He left in manuscript several sermons and treatises, which all evince a superior mind. See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 8:183.

Quicksands, The

(ἡ Σύρτις, Vulg. *Syrtis*), more properly, *The Syrtis* (Acts 27:17), the broad and deep bight on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrene. In the above passage it is stated that when the ship in which Paul

was embarked was driven past the isle of Clauda on the south, the mariners, as would now be said, struck the sails, and scudded under bare poles, lest they “should fall into the quicksands.” The original word *syrtis* denotes a *sand-bank*, or shoal, dangerous to navigation, *drawn*, or supposed to be *drawn* (from **σύρω**, “to draw”), together by the currents of the sea. According to others, the name is derived from *sert*, an Arabic word for “desert.” For two reasons this region was an object of peculiar dread to the ancient navigators of the Mediterranean — partly because of the drifting sands and the heat along the shore itself, but chiefly because of the shallows and the uncertain currents of water in the bay. Josephus, who was himself once wrecked in this part of the Mediterranean, makes Agrippa say (*War*, ii, 16,4), **φοβεραὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσι Σύρτις**. So notorious were these dangers that they became a commonplace with the poets (see Horace, *Odes*, i, 22, 5; Ovid, *Fast.* 4:499; Virgil, *AEn.* 1, 111; Tibul. 3, 4,91; Lucan, *Phars.* 9:431). It is most to our purpose here, however, to refer to Apollonius Rhodius, who was familiar with all the notions of the Alexandrian sailors. In the fourth book of his *Aronaut.* 1232-1237, he supplies illustrations of the passage before us in more respects than one — in the sudden violence (**ἀναρπάγδην**) of the terrible north wind (**ὀλοή Βορέαο θύελλα**), in its long duration (**ἐννέα πάσας Νύκτας ὁμῶς καὶ τόσσα φέρῃ ἡματα**), and in the terror which the sailors felt of being driven into the Svrtis (**Προπρὸ μάλ᾽ ἐνδοθι Σύρτιν, ὅθ, οὐκέτι νόστος ὀπίσσω Νη σι πέλει**). **SEE CLAUDA**; **SEE EUROCLYDON**. There were properly two Syrtes — the eastern, or larger, now called the *Gulf of Sidra*. and the western, or smaller, now the *Gulf of Cebes*. It is the former to which our attention is directed in this passage of the Acts. The ship was caught by a north-easterly gale on the south coast of Crete, near Mount Ida, and was driven to the island of Clauda. This line of drift, continued, would strike the greater Syrtis, whence the natural apprehension of the sailors. **SEE SHIP**. The danger was not so imaginary in this case, we apprehend, as Dr. Falconer (*Dissert. on St. Paul’s Voyage*, p. 13) conceives; for the apprehension does not appear to have been entertained till the ship had been driven *past* the isle of Clauda, which, as we take it, is mentioned merely as the last point of land which had been seen till the ship was wrecked on the isle of Melita. The position of that island must be regarded as indicating the course in which they were driven; and if that were Malta, it is clear that, had that course not been arrested by the intermediate shipwreck, they would, in all probability, have been driven upon the Syrtis Minor, which we may therefore conclude to have been the

subject of their apprehension. That apprehension only becomes “imaginary” when Meleda in the Adriatic is taken, as Dr. Falconer himself takes it, for the Melita of Scripture. It may, therefore, be added to the arguments in favor of Malta that its identification with Melita gives reality to the fear entertained by the mariners, which, under the other alternative, must be supposed to have been imaginary. *SEE MALTA*. The best modern account of this part of the African coast is that which is given by Admiral Smyth (in his *Memoir on the Mediterranean*, p. 87-91, 186-190), who was himself the first to survey this bay thoroughly, and to divest it of many of its terrors. *SEE SHIPWRECK*.

Quicunque vult

These are the initial words of the symbol known as the Athanasian Creed. The real composer of this ancient formulary being unknown, its origin is a mere matter of conjecture. A cursory notice of its history in ancient and modern times is all that can be here attempted. It probably had its origin in the Gallican Church. It was first used in that Church. Gallican councils and bishops have always treated it with especial deference. Churches which received the Gallican Psalter received with it this “*expositio fidei*.” The oldest known translation into the vernacular was Gallican, as prescribed by Hincmar of Rheims to his priests. The first writers who cite its words were Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Aries; the oldest commentator upon its text was Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers; and MSS. were nowhere so abundant or so ancient as in Gaul (Waterland).

This “Creed,” to use its scholastic title, first appeared in Latin, the Greek copies that exist being independent versions from that language. The age also of the oldest Latin MSS. exceeds that of the Greek exemplars by several centuries. The oldest Latin copy is referred by archbishop Usher to the beginning of the 7th century, and was in the Cottonian collection (*De Symb. Praef.* ii, 3). The Treves MS., acephalous, is of nearly equal antiquity. Five MSS. of the 8th century are known: the Ambrosian of Milan; the Cottonian in king Athelstan’s Psalter, referable with certainty to A.D. 703, and professing to be “*Fides St. Athanasii Alexandrini*,” the Colbertine, copied in Saxon character from the Treves MS. shortly after the middle of the century, and, like the original, imperfect at the beginning; the Paris MS. of equal date, also in Saxon character; and the copy written in letters of gold which was presented by Charlemagne, while only king of France, to Adrian I on his accession to the pontificate, A.D. 772. It is still

preserved at Vienna. The Greek copies are of much later date, and Montfaucon had never seen one that was more than three hundred years old (*Diatrise*, p. 727).

The earliest form in which this “*expositio fidei*” is found is the commentary of Venantius Fortunatus in the middle of the 6th century, showing that it was then of popular use. The fourth Council of Toledo also (A.D. 633) adopted many of its more striking expressions. Rome, distrustful of novelties, only admitted it after long delay, as Waterland says, about A.D. 930. Thus it was accepted by the churches of the West “as soon as, or sooner than, the Nicene Creed.”

This dogmatic composition has a direct bearing on the Apollinarian error, which was condemned by pope Damasus, A.D. 375. This heresy had much in common with the Eutychian error of the middle of the 5th century; but the latter had certain distinguishing features of which no notice is taken in the Creed, and for this reason the clauses that contravene both errors may be safely applied to Apollinarian notions: we need not look for its origin therefore so low as the Eutychian period (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*, p. 549-557), in which the dying embers of Apollinarianism kindled up again. Neither can its production range later than the Nestorian controversy, which commenced with the first year of the patriarchate of Nestorius (A.D. 428), and led to the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431); otherwise the crucial term **θεοτόκος** must as certainly have found its way into it as that the term **ὁμοούσιος** was made the “*lapis Lydius*” of orthodoxy by the Nicene fathers; hence this “*expositio fidei*” must have been written before the year A.D. 428 (Waterland, Harvey). But by how many years did it anticipate the council? There are undeniable points of resemblance between many of its expressions and the terms used by Augustine in his work *De Trinitate* (A.D. 416; Harvey, p. 562-564); which furnished the copy, the father or the Creed? Waterland affirms the former, but reasons quite as cogent point to the latter conclusion. Augustine says that the phrases used by him in defining the three Persons of the Godhead were adopted also by catholic writers his predecessors; and, in fact, the writer of the Creed may have borrowed the corresponding terms, in some few cases, from Tertullian, but abundantly from Ambrose. The Creed, then, so far as its phraseology is concerned, is quite as likely to have been written between A.D. 381, when Ambrose completed his work *De Spiritu Sancto*, and A.D. 416, when Augustine put forth his work *De Trinitate*, as after this latter date.

Further, the rudimental statements of the Creed are more fully developed in the work of Augustine. The Creed simply says, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." The most unbending Greek theologian would have allowed the statement to pass unchallenged. e.g. Cyril of Alexandria says of the Holy Spirit, "For he is termed the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is truth; and he proceeds (προχέῖται) from him, as in fact he does from God and the Father" (*Ep. Synod.*; comp. Harvey, *Vindex Cathol.* i, 188). Thus also Basil says "the Spirit proceeds from God, not by generation as the Son, but as the Spirit of his mouth;" where it is manifestly intended that as the Spirit proceeds from God the Father, so also he proceeds from God the Word. Ambrose makes the matter more plain: "Dei Spiritus et Spiritus Christi et in Patre est et in Filio, quia oris est Spiritus" (Ambrose, *De Spir. Sanct.* i, 11, 37, 114; iii, 6). There is an Augustinian definiteness also in those other words of Ambrose: "Et si Spiritum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo procedit Spiritus, et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti" (*ibid.*). The third Person was universally acknowledged to be of the Father and of the Son, and his origination was allowed to be by procession; that which was denied was his procession from the Son as well as the Father, instead of from the Father by the Son. But the work *De Trinitate* originated all the discussion that followed, and in fact led to that schism between the churches of the East and of the West which has never again been healed. Augustine expresses himself with his usual roundness and perspicuity upon a point that was a result of scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light (*De Trin.* 4:29; 15:47). The concluding chapters of his work are filled with statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these with the more shadowy lines of the Creed satisfies the judgment that Augustine was indebted to the Creed, and not the Creed to Augustine. Then again the Creed instances by way of illustration the union of a spiritual and a material nature in the individual man: "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ." The illustration is exactly to the point; but Augustine follows out the idea in a strain of subtle argumentation that runs through six books of his work; finding points of analogy between the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hac igitur tria, memoria intelligentia voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres mentes sed una mens; consequenter utique nec tres substantiae sunt sed una substantia" (*De Trin.* 10:18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue

from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter convince the mind that here again the Creed was the archetype. Diverging, therefore, at this point from Waterland, who dates the Creed A.D. 420, four years after the publication of the work *De Trinitate*, we may now see whether we can assign a prior date for its composition.

It should be borne in mind once more that the Apollinarian heresy is the latest form of error of which the Creed takes cognizance. But that heresy never took root in the churches of the West; therefore no newly appointed Gallican bishop would have gone out of his way to condemn it, as Waterland supposes Hilary to have done on his appointment to the see of Arles. "It is hardly in keeping with the mild 'credo' of a newly installed prelate. But in the year A.D. 401 we can point to a most popular and zealous bishop of Western Gaul, apostolical in his labors among the benighted population of the Nervii and Morini (Pas de Calais) as well as in his self-inflicted poverty (Paulin. Nol. *Ep.* 18 *ad Victric.*), who was accused publicly of teaching heresy, and that evidently of Apollinaris; who also gave account of his faith in a confession that, without any great degree of improbability, may be identified with this exposition of the catholic faith. This eminent son of the Church was Victricius, confessor and bishop of Rouen, who at the close of the 4th century was considerably advanced in years" (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*, p. 578). The terms of this confession are sketched out by Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 37 *ad Victric.* 3, 4), and they harmonize remarkably with those of the Creed (*ibid.* p. 5, 6). There are historical reasons for believing that this confession was presented at Rome between A.D. 399 and 402 when Anastasius was pope (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*). But the name of Victricius was in time expunged, and it then stood as the production of Anastasius. Hence, since one commentator terms it "Fides Anastasii," and a codex ascribes it to Anastasius, it is highly probable that this name was connected with the Creed at an earlier date than that of Athanasius, into which it easily passed. The name of Athanasius is first placed at the head in a copy of the 8th century, which leaves a wide margin of three hundred years for the change of title. The earliest MS. (Cottonian. now lost) assigned no name to the Creed, but simply styled it "Fides Catholica," as does also Venantius Fortunatus in his commentary. The reasons for assigning it to Victricius have been thus summed up:

“(1.) Its careful, well-considered terms are more consistent with the mature age of Victricius, who had attained the honor of confessor forty years before the date now assigned to the Creed, in 401, than with the youth of Hilary, who was only eight-and-twenty years of age when he is supposed by Waterland to have composed the hymn on his advancement to the episcopate.

(2.) Its style, though not that of an apology in vindication of the writer’s faith, agrees well with the supposition that he was accused of the errors that he anathematizes.

(3.) Its matter is exactly parallel with the subjects upon which Victricius, if we may judge from the expressions of Paulinus, was called to defend himself. With respect to both of these particulars, the supposition that Hilary should have been the author is singularly unsatisfactory to the judgment. His exposition of faith on entering upon his episcopal office would scarcely have been pointed with anathemas which the history of his time persuades us were not required. Indeed, the Creed can only be assigned to Hilary upon the supposition that Apollinarianism infested the Gallican Church at the date of his appointment to the see of Aries — a supposition wholly contrary to fact. But since we know that Pelagian tenets had then taken a firm root in the south of France, we know also the direction that any inaugural exposition by Hilary must have taken. (4.) Again, if Hilary had been the author of the Creed, his name must have commanded respect, and he would scarcely have met with such hard words from pope Leo I as may be found in his epistle to the French bishops, A.D. 445: e.g. “Non est hoc... salubritatem impendere diligentiae pastoralis, sed vim inferre latronis et firis ... Potest forsitan ad depravandos vestrae sanctitatis animos Hilarius pro suo more mentiri” (Leo, *Ep.* 10). On the other hand, the highly probable communication between Victricius and Anastasius, and the preparation of a confession of faith by the Gallican confessor, indicate the process whereby the name of Athanasius may have been placed at length, by assimilation, at the head of the Creed. For these reasons, therefore, it is considered that the authorship of the Creed may be referred to the confessor Victricius, bishop of Rouen; and that the date of the production may be assigned to the year 401” (Harvey, *On the Three Creeds*, p. 583). See Waterland, *On the Athanasian Creed*; Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of the Three Creeds*; Blunt, *Annotated Prayer-book*, which latter work should be consulted with reference to its liturgical use. **SEE CREED.**

Quiddity, Or Quidity

(*quidditas*, from *quid*, mwhat), a term employed in scholastic philosophy as equivalent to the τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι of Aristotle, and denotes what was subsequently called the *substantit form*. It is the answer to the question, What is it? — *quid est?* It is that which distinguishes a thing from other things, and makes it what it is, and not another. It is synonymous with essence, and comprehends both the substance and qualities; for qualities belong to substance, and by qualities substance manifests itself. It is the known essence of a thing, or the complement of all that makes us conceive of anything as we conceive of it as different from ally or every other thing. — Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s.v.

Quien, Le

SEE LE QUIEN.

Quiercy, Council Of

(*Concilium Carisiacense*). An ecclesiastical council was there held in 849 by Hincmar and thirteen other bishops, who condemned Gottschalk, a Predestinarian, and sentenced him to be flogged and imprisoned at Hautvilliers, where he wrote a profession of faith similar to that which he had presented at the Council of Mayence in 848. See Labbe, *Concil.* 8:55.

Another council was held at the same place in 858. From this body the bishops of the provinces of Rheims and Rouen wrote a long letter, full of reproaches, to Louis, king of Germany, blaming him for invading France upon the invitation of the disaffected nobles of Charles, and declaring that it had come to their ears that, in the course of his march through the various dioceses, cruelties and abominations had been committed surpassing those of the heathen themselves. See Labbi, *Concil.* 8. 654.

Quietism

is the doctrine that the highest character of virtue consists in the perpetual contemplation and love of supreme excellence. It recognises this excellence only in God, and maintains that perfect union with God must be effected, and that it is best attainable by a state of passive rest or quiet, more or less absolute. The quietude aimed at, beginning with an act of so-called resignation of self, is a state of mental inactivity, without thought, reflection, hope, or wish. In this state it is supposed that the soul is brought

so immediately into the divine presence as to be merged in it by an essential union. Quietism, accordingly, is not peculiar, for it requires no basis of Christology. It results from every philosophical system by an excess or perversion of contemplation, when the ethical tendency of the mind is too weak to preserve a just balance with the contemplative. Vaughan (*Hours with the Mystics*, vol. 1, ch. 2, p. 43) observes that “the same round of notions, occurring to minds of similar make under similar circumstances, is common to mystics in ancient India and in modern Christendom.” He gives a summary of Hindu mysticism, that it

- (1) lays claim to disinterested love, as opposed to a mercenary religion;
- (2) reacts against the ceremonial, prescriptive, and pedantic literalism of the Vedas;
- (3) identifies in its pantheism subject and object, worshipper and worshipped;
- (4) aims at ultimate absorption into the Infinite;
- (5) inculcates, as the way to this dissolution, absolute passivity, withdrawal into the inmost self, cessation of all the powers — giving recipes for procuring this beatific torpor or trance;
- (6) believes that eternity may thus be realized in time;
- (7) has its mythical, miraculous pretensions, i.e. its theurgic department;
- (8) and, finally, advises the learner in this kind of religion to submit himself implicitly to a spiritual guide — his *guru*.

Of these articles, the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth give quietism, properly so called; and it is a question whether the manifestation of this doctrine in Christianity adds anything essential to the definition of article five, so as to save Christian quietism from the pantheistic conclusions of articles three and four.

In the Christian Church this mystical theology is defined by its professors to be that doctrine which reveals to man the hidden essence of God’s Being. The way to this wisdom is in three stages, the purgative, the illuminative, the unitive; the first purging the will from low affections, the

second communicating to the intellect the knowledge of God, and the third leading the soul thus prepared to union and deification.

The table at head of page 846, and taken from Arnold's *Historia Theologiae Mysticae*, gives this theology in outline. Some parts of it need an initiated interpreter.

Picture for Quietism

It is evident that this scheme, if at all carried out to its legitimate consequences, leads directly to the error of those enthusiasts who supposed the kingdom of Christ to be an earlier and inferior dispensation, the reign of the Spirit the later and perfect dispensation. Men are taught by it, not the superiority of love to knowledge in St. Paul's sense, but that they may become more perfect by disregarding the knowledge of an earlier state, by becoming again children in understanding. To that earlier state are referred the power of Christ's resurrection and the sacrament of the holy eucharist. What the higher sacrament of unction is does not appear. In working out this scheme, Molinos taught as follows:

1. The perfection of men, even in this life, consists in an uninterrupted act of contemplation and love, which contains virtually all righteousness; that this act once effected lasts always, even during sleep, provided that it be not expressly recalled; whence it follows that the perfect have no need to repeat it.
2. In this state of perfection the soul ought not to reflect either on God or on itself, but its powers ought to be annihilated, in order to abandon itself wholly and passively to God.
3. Perfect prayer is this state of quietude, in which there should be absolutely no thought or wish or hope. Vocal prayer, confession, all external things, are but hindrances.
4. In prayer the first act of faith, the first intention of resignation, prevails to constitute the whole an act of worship. "One may persevere in prayer though the imagination be carried about with various and involuntary thoughts." These are not to be actively resisted, but merely neglected.
5. The violent and painful suggestions of impatience, pride, gluttony, luxury, rage, blasphemy, cursing, despair, and an infinite number of others,

are God's means for purifying those whom he calls. The soul ought not to be disquieted on account of them.

An example of pure quietism may be quoted in illustration of these principles: "Gregory Lopez having for the space of three years continued that ejaculation, Thy will be done in time and in eternity, repeating it as often as he breathed, God Almighty discovered to him that infinite treasure of the pure and continued act of faith and love, with silence and resignation; so that he came to say that, during the thirty-six years he lived afterwards, he always continued in his inward man that pure act of love, without ever uttering the least petition, ejaculation, or anything that was sensible or sprung from nature" (*Spiritual Guide* [transl. 1699], p. 75).

Molinos is charged by Romanist writers with teaching antinomianism. The charge does not appear to be well founded, but that his teaching regarding evil thoughts is most dangerous there can be no doubt. At the same time, the truth of which it is a perversion is very discernible.

Molinos proceeds to his doctrine of self-annihilation through what he calls infused contemplation. The means whereby the soul ascends to infused contemplation are two — the pleasure and the desire of it. The steps of it are three—satiety when the soul is filled with God; intoxication, an excess of mind and elevation of soul arising from satiety of divine love: security, when the soul is so drenched with love that it loses all fear, and would willingly go to hell if it knew such to be the will of God. Six other steps there are — fire, union, elevation, illumination, pleasure, and repose. But there are many other steps besides, as ecstasies, raptures, meltings, deliquiums, glee, kisses, embraces, exaltation, union, transformation, espousing, and matrimony; "which," Molinos says, "I omit to explain, to give no occasion to speculation." Madame Guyon, however, does explain: "The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul, and the soul is God" (*Explicat. du Cant. des Cant.*).

Molinos passes through annihilation to the same result of deification. The soul that would be perfect passes, with the divine aid, into the state of nothingness: from the spiritual death the true and perfect annihilation derives its original; insomuch that when the soul is once dead to its will and

understanding, it is properly said to have arrived at the perfect and happy state of annihilation, which is the last disposition for transformation and union. The soul no longer lives in itself, because God lives in it. The soul being in that manner the nothing, the Lord will be the whole in the soul.

Quietism aims at an entire abstraction from all externals, and seeks to put the spirit of man into direct and immediate union with the very nature of the Godhead. From this there inevitably results, instead of the Christian doctrine of the communion of saints, the doctrine of a pantheistic identification of the creature with the Creator, and an ultimate absorption of the soul into the substance of God. The Quietists call it indeed a vulgar error to say that in the prayer of rest the faculties operate not, and the soul is idle and inactive; but they assert at the same time that the soul operates neither by means of the memory nor by the intellect, nor by ratiocination, but by simple apprehension (Molinos, *Spiritual Guide*, 1, 12). What an active apprehension is when none of the powers of the mind are exerted is not explained. The Quietists think to attain that repose of the mind which is the result of exertion, and that quiet rest in God which follows from the earnestness of meditative prayer, by altogether surceasing from the exertion and superseding the earnestness. Consequently, the mind being reduced to inactivity, the body has sway; and the state of perfect quietude, supposed to be a waiting for the divine access, becomes that state (which may be produced by “mesmeric” process) in which the body suffers or simulates catalepsy, and the mind apes a divine trance. Quietism becomes mental sleep.

There is a remarkable similarity between the mysticism of the Quietists and of the Plotinian school of philosophy. The aim of Plotinus was to enter into the immediate vision of Deity. “Unconditioned Being, or the Godhead, cannot be grasped by thinking or science, only by intuition. In this pure intuition, the good, or the absolute being, gazes upon itself through the medium of our own spirits. To close the eye against all things transient and variable, to raise ourselves to this simple essence, to take refuge in the absolute, this must be regarded as the highest aim of all our spiritual efforts” (Prof. C. A. Brandis, in Smith’s *Biog. Dict.* art. Plotinus, p. 427). Plotinian contemplation may find a place in the system of John Smith and Henry More, but it may also pass as readily into the reveries of Molinos. It is to be considered whether the tendency of such contemplation is not to reduce the Father manifested in the Son to the cold abstraction of the Plotinian Deity.

In the Church there have been two kinds of mysticism, one a churchly mysticism, which allies itself with the ordinances and rites of the Gospel; the other subjective or inward, which gradually rejects more and more all that is external, and even at last passes beyond the contemplation of the humanity of our Lord, and the sacraments which make men partakers of his body, to “seek a resting-place beyond all that is created in the Logos as he existed prior to the incarnation and creation” (Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, II, i, 233). This unchristianizing of Christianity, this presentation of the great drama without its central figure, this removal of God Incarnate from the mystery of godliness, as the result of a perverted or depraved mysticism; is exhibited more than once in the history of the Church. The words quoted from Dorner on the subject were used regarding Maximus Confessor. We may resume and continue them. “True love and knowledge unite to seek a resting-point beyond all that is created, beyond even the humanity of Christ: their final goal is the pure and bare (γυμνός) Logos, as he existed prior to the incarnation and the creation. It is clear that in the last instance Christ is hereby reduced to the position of a mere theophany, and that the historical significance of his person is destroyed. The same thing appears also from his application to the professedly highest stage of the words. Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we him no longer. So far was Maximus Confessor from attributing eternal significance to the God-man that he regarded the humanity of Christ rather in the light of a hindrance to the full knowledge and love of the pure God — a hindrance which must be surmounted by those who aim to reach the highest stage” (Dorner, *l.c.*, and see note 48 there referred to). So in Italy, Marsilius Ficinus and John Pico of Mirandola turned Christianity in many respects into a Neo-Platonic theosophy.

In the article *Mysticism* (q.v.) this subject is more opened, and the schools of mysticism of the Greek and Latin churches classified. In the article *Hesychasts* (q.v.) is related the quietism of the Greek Church. The directions of the abbot Simon for producing the visions of quietism (supposed to have been written in the 11th century) are still in existence: “Alone in thy cell, shut thy door, and seat thyself in a corner; raise thy mind above all things vain and transitory; recline thy beard and chin on thy breast; turn thy eyes and thy thoughts towards the middle of thy belly, the region of the navel; and search the place of the heart, the seat of the soul. At first all will be dark and comfortless; but if you persevere day and night, you will feel an ineffable joy; and no sooner has the soul discovered the

place of the heart than it is involved in a mystic and ethereal light.” At present it is only necessary to point out that these Hesychasts had the same rule as the Hindlt Quietists, viz. that to produce the state of abstraction the eyes must be steadily fixed on some particular object. The Hindus presented the tip of the nose, the Hesychasts the navel.

In German mediaeval mysticism a quietistic element is met with. It, however, borders on pantheism, very much as the pantheism of Dionysius the Areopagite borders on quietism.

The real founder of quietism in the Church is thus reputed to be Molinos (q.v.), a Spanish priest, whose opinions, published at Rome towards the end of the 17th century, called forth violent opposition from the authorities of the Church, but met with many supporters in Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands. He seems to have held “that religion consists in the perfect tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centred in God, and in such a pure love of the Supreme Being as is independent of all prospect of interest or reward.” In more modern times Fenelon and Madame Guyon have taught quietism. They are, however, usually called Semi-Quietists. The two following propositions from Fenelon’s *Maxims of the Saints* were condemned by Innocent XII in 1699:

1. There is attainable in this life a state of perfection in which the expectation of reward and the fear of punishment have no place.
2. Souls may be so inflamed with love to God, and so resigned to his will, that if they believed that God had condemned them to eternal pain, they would absolutely sacrifice their salvation. Madame Guyon thought she had learned a method by which souls might be carried to such a state of perfection that a continual act of contemplation and love might be substituted for all other acts of religion. She came forward as one of the chief promoters of quietism in France, and hence arose a celebrated controversy between Bossuet and Fenelon — the former of whom attacked and the latter defended several of that pious lady’s opinions. See the dissertation by M. Bonnel, *De la Controverse dle Bossuet et Fenelon sur le Quietisme* (Nevers, 1850, 8vo); Dr. Burnet, *Tracts* (1689, 12mo), vol. i; *Recueil des Diverses Pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes* (1688); Weisman, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* § xvii.

Quinisextum, Concilium

(Σύνοδος πενδεκτή', as a complement of the fifth and sixth, so-called, ecumenical councils, A.D. 555 and 680), was held at Constantinople in 692, and intended to complete the disciplinary measures proposed, but not completed, at the previous councils. The meetings of this council were held in a hall in the imperial palace called Trullus, and hence it received, also, the name of the *Trullan Council*. It was composed chiefly of Oriental bishops, and its canons were publicly received in all the churches within the territories of the Greek emperors. Although the Roman legates subscribed to the acts of this council, it was never recognised by the Romish Church nor by its then ruling pope, Sergius I. This is due to the decisions of the council regarding the number of the apostolical canons, against enforced clerical celibacy, the rank of patriarchs, the fasting on Sabbath eves, the partaking of blood, etc. See Schaff, *Ch. History*; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*; Butler, *Ch. History*, i, 359; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. i; Lea, *Celibacy*.

Quinn, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born June 20, 1790. He was converted in his sixteenth year, and about four years after began to preach. In 1817 he joined the Philadelphia Conference. His various fields of labor, as indicated in the Conference Minutes, were: Talbot Circuit, 1817; Caroline, 1818; Daluphin, 1819; Lewiston, 1820; Dorchester, 1821-22; Accomac, 1823-24; and Annamessex, 1825. He then took a supernumerary relation until 1838, when, entering again the active work, he served the Church on Salisbury Circuit, 1839-40; Kent, 1841-42; Milford, 1843-44; and Berlin, 1845. Declining health then obliged him to take rest, and he settled at Newtown, Pa., where he died Dec. 13, 1867. He was a well-cultured man and did honor to his Church and generation as a student and a Christian. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868.

Quinquagesima

is the name by which the Sunday before Lent (q.v.) is designated. The first Sunday in Lent being called Quadragesima, this being further from Easter was called Quinquagesima (or fiftieth Sunday), reckoning the distance from Easter in round numbers. It was sometimes called *Quinquagesima, poenitentioe*, in order to distinguish it from the other Quinquagesima, or interval between Easter and Whitsuntide, called *Quinquagesima paschalis*,

or *loetitioe*. It is also called *Shrove-Sunday* (q.v.). In ordinary years Quinquagesima is the forty-ninth day before Easter; in leap-year it is the fiftieth.

Quinquarbores, Joannes (Or Jean Cinqarbre),

a learned Frenchman, was a native of Aurillac, in Auvergne. In 1554 he was made regius professor of the Hebrew language at Paris; in 1575 he was made dean of the faculty, and occupied this position until the year 1587, when he died. He wrote, *Institutio Linguae Ebraicoe, cum Notis*, etc. (Paris, 1610): — *De Re Grammnatica Hebraica Opus* (ibid. 1549, 1556, 1582; *Accessit etiam Liber de Notis*, i.e. *Abbreviaturis Hebroeorumn* [Venice, 1588, and Paris, 1609, *cum Notis P. Vignolii*): — *Notoe in Clenardi Grammaitica Hebraica* (Paris, 1549, 1564). He also translated into Latin the Chaldee of Jonathan on *Hosea*, *Joel*, *Amos* (ibid. 1556 and 1563). See First. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 106; iii, 124; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 113; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebr.* 4:250, 298; Jocher, *Allem. Gelehrten- Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

Quinquarticular Controversy

is a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 between the Arminians and Calvinists respecting the following five points: predestination, free will, effectual grace, perseverance, and the extent of redemption. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these same points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great offence to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford, and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed; but these limits having been exceeded by Thomas Cooke, a fellow of Brazenose College, Oxford, in a Latin sermon preached before the university in 1634, he was compelled to make a public recantation. See Collier, *Ecclesiastes Hist.*; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. iii. *SEE DORT, SYNOD OF; SEE FIVE POINTS.*

Quinquatria

an ancient Roman festival celebrated in honor of Minerva on March 19. Some writers allege that its observance was limited to one day; others, however, say that it lasted for five days. This last is the opinion of Ovid, who considers it to have been a festival held in commemoration of the

birthday of Minerva; and hence it was customary for women on that day to consult diviners and fortunetellers.

Quinquennalia

games celebrated among the ancient Romans in imitation of the Greek festivals at the end of every four years. On these occasions keen competitions were carried on in music, gymnastics, and horse-racing. Quinquennalia were observed in honor of Julius Caesar, and also of Augustus; but they seem to have been celebrated with peculiar splendor under Nero, from whose time they were discontinued, until at length they were revived by Domitian in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus.

Quintillani

were a sect of Montanists who appeared in Phrygia about 189. They were so called from their prophetess, Quintilla of Carthage. One of the peculiar tenets of this strange sect was that women are by the Scriptures entitled to perform episcopal and other ministerial duties. They attributed extraordinary gifts to Eve, in consequence of her having eaten of the forbidden tree, and quoted the history of Miriam, and the four daughters of Philip, who were prophetesses, in vindication of their proceedings. In their assemblies virgins appeared in white robes, personating prophetesses. The errors of this sect were condemned in the Council of Laodicea in 320. Tertullian charges the Quintillani with having opposed baptism, and wrote a work on that subject.

Quintillians

SEE QUINTILLANI.

Quintin Matsys

sometimes called the *Farrier of Antwerp*, was famous for having been transformed from a blacksmith to a painter by the force of love. He had followed the trade of a blacksmith and farrier near twenty years, when, falling in love with a painter's daughter, who was very handsome, and disliked nothing in him but his profession, he quitted his trade and betook himself to painting, in which art, assisted by a good natural taste, a master, and the power of love into the bargain, he made a very uncommon and surprising progress. He was a painstaking, diligent imitator of ordinary life, and much better at representing the defects than the beauties of nature.

One of his best pieces is a *Descent from the Cross*, in the chapel at the Cathedral of Antwerp, for which, and a multitude of other histories and portraits, he gained many admirers, especially for his laborious neatness, which, in truth, was the principal part of his character. He died in 1529. His works are dispersed throughout Europe.

Quin'tus Memmius

(2 Macc. 11:34). *SEE MEMMIUS.*

Qui procedis, Ab Utroque

(*who proceedest from both*, i.e. from the Father and the Son) is the beginning of a sequence of Adam of St. Victor to the Holy Spirit, omitted entirely by the compilers of *Songs of the Spirit*. The first verse runs thus in the original:

*“Qi procedis ab utroque,
Genitore, Genitoque,
Pariter, Paraclite,
Redde linguas eloquentes,
Fac ferventes in te mentes
Flamma tua divite.”*

There is an English translation, by P. S. Worsley, in the *Lyra Mystica*, p. 170 sq., and by Caswall, in *Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated*, p. 136 sq. German translations are given, together with the original, in Konigsfeld, *Lateinische Hymnen*, ii, 181 sq.; Simrock, *Lauda Sion*, p. 209 sq.; Bissler, *Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder*, p. 111, 221. See Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 187; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 73; Gautier, *Adam de S. Victor*, i, 115; Rambach, *Anthologie christlicher Gesange*, p. 293; Fortlage, *Gesange christlicher Vorzeit*, p. 401. (B. P.)

Quirenus

SEE CYRENIUS.

Quirinalia

a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Quirinus. It was kept on Feb. 17, being the day on which Romulus, who was called Quirinus, was said to have been carried up to heaven.

Quirini

SEE QUERINI.

Quirk

is an architectural term for a small acute channel or recess much used in mouldings.

Quiroga, Joseph

a Spanish Jesuit, was born at Lugo, in Galicia, and distinguished himself as a missionary in America. During his residence here he collected much information respecting the territories he visited. and on his return to Europe published his travels. He died in 1784.

Quisqueja

This island, one of the Great Antilles, now called *St. Domingo* or *Hayti*, was, at the time of the discovery of this part of the world, inhabited by a peaceable and harmless population, who were soon annihilated by Spanish cruelty. They adored the sun (Tonatiks) and the moon (Tona). Both luminaries resided at first on the earth, in the island of Quisqueja, of course, where a splendid cave was their mansion. Finally, they went to Turii (the heavens), thence to diffuse their light over the world. The cave is still shown; it has a diameter of 200 feet, and is 130 feet high. The purity of its form betokens the interference of human art. The figures of gods, genii, guardian spirits, are engraved in the mwalls. In a large number of places idols must have stood in ancient times. This supposition is in accordance with the scanty traditions that have reached us. More than a thousand idols were distributed at intervals in the interior (says the tradition), and the two largest, representing the sun and moon, stood at the entrance. This seems to have been the only temple of Quisqueja, for multitudes of worshippers flocked to it every day from all parts of the island. They believed that their country was the cradle of the human race. The first men were shut up in two caves of the Kauta mountain, and there watched by a giant. The jailer, having once ventured out of this recess, was changed into stone by the sun, whose rays were too powerful for him. The captive men, thus liberated, came forth in their turn. Many were those who shared the giant's fate, being transformed into animals, stones, or plants. Little by little those denizens of darkness became used to the light of day. The souls of men

repair to the mountains which cover the middle part of the island, and there, in a cool country, rich in springs, they feed on the savory fruit of the memmey-tree, called by the Spaniards apricots of St. Domingo. The living men piously abstain from touching those fruits, so as not to deprive the souls of their subsistence.

Their country was, primitively, much larger, and was not an island; but a terrible flood inundated the land, leaving only discovered the tops of the mountains. This happened under the following circumstances: A rich man, called Toja, lost by a sudden death his youngest son, whose mother had died in giving him birth. Not to part from the dear remains, he lout them into a large pumpkin. After some time he took off the lid, and saw, to his dismay, that the pumpkin was filled with greenish water, in which a multitude of fishes and aquatic monsters were swimming about. In his terror he had recourse to his friends, and deliberated with them what was to be dlone. Meanwhile his other children took the pumpkin in their midst to have a look at the sea which, they had heard, was hidden in it. When they saw their father returning from his call, conscious of punishable inquisitiveness, they put the pumpkin roughly on the ground and ran away. The funereal vessel, thus carelessly handled, got a rent, and hence the waters of the sea flowed, without intermission, night and day, until all lower parts of the earth were covered, and the mountain-tops alone protruded from the universal ocean. Those tops became islands and the abode of the surviving few. The sun and moon sent to Quisqueja as their representatives two other gods, Tokahuna and Temno, the supreme rulers. Other superior beings followed, and were all, more or less, solemnly worshipped. Images of stone and of clay were made of them, and decorated the great temple and the interior of the huts. These gods were thankful for the worship they received. and in return granted the pious people successful fishing and hunting, victory in battle (their images were fastened in battle with a string to the forehead of the combatants), plentiful crops, rain or sunshine, as circumstances required. The women were blessed with happy childbeds and the girls with pleasant husbands. A great festival was solemnized every year in honor of all these gods. The cacique on that occasion appeared with a drum made of the trunk of a hollow tree, which he beat unremittingly. The whole township followed him to the temple, where the priests received every coming crowd with tremendous shouts, and took possession of the offerings. The latter consisted of thin flour cakes which were broken in the presence of the god, and small

portions of them given back to the heads of the families. Those little slices were carefully preserved through the whole year. A general dance followed. It was at this solemn occasion that most of the matrimonial offers and arrangements took place. All traces of this ancient pagan worship were destroyed by the fanatical Spaniards, and the small Indian people was exterminated.

Quisshion

(*pulvinar, cussinus, culcitrum*), a cushion, usually of velvet, and stuffed with wool or horsehair, for the service-book on the south side of the altar, appears in Henry's VI's Book of the Hours, and was used by bishop Alndrewes. In the former it is on the south side, in the latter on the north. Albertis mentions the wooden desk, plated (*legile*), as a modern substitute. The book was first set on the right side and afterwards moved to the left side of the altar at mass.

Quistorp

a family of Christian theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. BERNHARD FR., was born at Rostock, April 11, 1718. In 1753 he was made superintendent, in 1766 doctor and professor of theology, in 1779 general superintendent, and afterwards chancellor and curator of the University of Greifswalde, where he died, Jan. 4, 1788. He wrote, *Dissertatio pist. de Atheismo Benedicti de Spiuozza* (Rostock, 1743): — *Diss. Epist. de Collatione Librorum n Scripturoe Sacre in Interpretatione S. S. haud Injusta* (ibid. 1736): — *Disp. Exegetico — dogmatic eaque Intug. de Judfeis Corde Compunctis* (ibid. 1749): — *Ob die Altviter vor und nach der Siindfuth haben schreiben kwlunnena? Disp. de Notione Filioruml et Filiarumz Dei* (ibid. 1751): — *Hist. de Adoptione Ecclesiastica V. T.* (ibid. 1755):)*Ob, ehe de sogenannte griechische Uebersetzung der siebzißg Dolmefscher von der Bibel des A. T. zu Standae gekommlen, schon eine griechische Uebersetzung der Bücher Moses vorhanden gewesen sei?* (ibid. 1756): *Num Michcelis Archangeli cum Diaboli de Coupore Moosis Disceptatio Fubula sit?* (Greifswalde, 1770): — *De Agelis Dei in Legislatione Sinaitica Ministris, Galatians iii, 19* (ibid. 1771): — *Disp. de yy tybb hçm dyb hrwt s albs. whrql j* — *reperio Chronicles 34:14, 15, et ^{<2238>}2 Kings 12:8* (ibid. 1771): — *De Triplici Christi Officio* (ibid. 1784). See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124 sq.; Winer, *Theol. Handbuch*, p. 436, 719.

2. JOHANN (1), was born at Rostock, Aug. 18, 1584. Having completed his studies at his native place and at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he travelled through Holland, Brabant, and Flanders, and after his return, in 1615, he became professor in his native city. In 1616 he was made doctor of theology, in 1645 he was called as pastor and superintendent of St. Jacobi, and died at Dobran, May 2, 1648. He wrote, *Annotationes in Omnes Libros Biblicos* (Frankfort, 1698): — *Comment. in Omnes Epp. Pauli: — Castigatio Hebræorum*, etc. See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 125; Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

3. JOHANN (2), son of the preceding, was born at Rostock, Feb. 5, 1624. He studied at Greifswalde, Königsberg, Copenhagen, and Leyden, was made doctor of theology, and died as *rector magnificus* Dec. 24, 1689. He wrote, *Catechesis Antipapistica: — Pia Desideria*, etc. See Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

4. JOHANN NIKOLAUS, son of the foregoing, was born at Rostock, Jan. 6, 1651, studied at his native place and Königsberg, travelled through Germany, Holland, and Denmark, and after his return, in 1676, he was made deacon of St. Nicolai, afterwards pastor and superintendent, and finally professor of theology. He died Aug. 9, 1715. His writings, which are very numerous, touch upon almost every department of theology, and are enumerated by Jocher in his *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v. See, also, Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christl. Kirche* (Jena, 1869), p. 372. (B. P.)

Quitaztli

is, according to Mexican mythology, the serpent woman who, at the beginning of the fourth age of the world, populated the earth by the successive birth of a number of twins. The latter are represented on monuments holding in their hands the shells of the eggs from which they have crept.

Quitman, Frederick Henry, D.D.

an eminent American divine of the Lutheran Church, was born in 1760, and after studying theology at home and abroad became pastor at Rhinebeck, on the Hudson, and greatly distinguished himself in the pulpit and the press. He died in 1832. Among his noteworthy publications are a *Treatise on Magic* (1810): — *Evangelical Catechism* (1814): — *Hymn-book of the*

Synod of New York (1817). See *Evangel. Rev.* Oct. 1858, p. 186; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 9:115 sq.

Quiver

Picture for Quiver (1)

is the rendering in the A. V. of two very different Hebrew words. The English word “quiver” is a variation of “cover” (from the French *couvrir*), and therefore answers to the second of the two Hebrew words. *SEE ARMOR.*

Picture for Quiver (2)

1. **yl æj** *tell*. This occurs only in ^{<0278>}Genesis 27:3 — “take thy weapons (literally “thy things”), thy *quiver* and thy bow.” It is derived (by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1504, and Furst, *Handwörterb.* ii, 528) from a root which has the force of *hanging*. The passage itself affords no clue to its meaning. It may therefore signify either a quiver or a suspended weapon—for instance, such a sword as in our own language. was formerly called a “hanger.” Between these two significations the interpreters are divided. The Sept., Vulg., and Targum Pseudo-Jon. adhere to the former; Onkelos, the Peshito and Arabic versions, to the latter.

Picture for Quiver (3)

2. **hPvḥi** *acshpah*. The root of this word is uncertain (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 161). From two of its occurrences, its force would seem to be that of containing or *concealing* (^{<875>}Psalm 127:5; ^{<2402>}Isaiah 49:2). It is connected with arrows only in Lam. 3:13. Its other occurrences are ^{<8923>}Job 39:23; ^{<2206>}Isaiah 22:6; and ^{<2156>}Jeremiah 5:16. In each of these the Sept. translates it by “quiver” (**φαρέτρα**), with two exceptions, ^{<8923>}Job 39:23, and ^{<875>}Psalm 127:5, in the former of which they render it by “bow,” in the latter by **ἔπιθυμία**.

Picture for Quiver (4)

The quiver is a case or box for arrows, which was slung over the shoulder in such a position that a soldier could with ease draw out the arrows when he wanted them (^{<2402>}Isaiah 49:2; ^{<2156>}Jeremiah 5:16). There is nothing in the Bible to indicate either its form or material, or in what way it was carried. The quivers of the Assyrians warriors, on the other hand, wore them slung

nearly horizontal. drawing out the arrows from beneath the arm (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. i. 354). The quiver was about four inches in diameter, supported by a belt passing over the shoulder and across the breast to the opposite side. When not in actual use, it was shifted behind, or hung at the side of the chariot, like that of the Assyrians. *SEE CHARIOT*. Among the ancient Greeks, the quiver was principally made of hide or leather, and was adorned with gold, painting, and braiding. It had a lid ($\pi\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$), and was suspended from the right shoulder by a belt passing over the breast and behind the back. Its most common position was on the left hip, and is so seen in the annexed figures, the right-hand one representing an Amazon, and the left-hand an Asiatic archer.

Picture for Quiver (5)

“Quiver” is also used figuratively for *house*, and arrows for *children* (^{<3975>}Psalm 127:5). *SEE ARCHER*.

Quobdas

is the magic drum used by physicians and sorcerers among the Laplanders to chase the evil spirits which are supposed to be the cause of the diseases. It is covered with figures of animals and mysterious characters, and embellished with divers ornamental appendages.

Quod permittat

is, in the Church of England, a writ granted to the successor of a minister for the recovery of pasture by the statute of Edward I, c. 24.

Quoin

the outer angle of a wall.

Quotations, Biblical.

The verbal citations contained in Scripture are of three classes:

- (a) Those which the later writers of the Old Test. make from the earlier.
- (b) The quotations made by Paul from heathen authors — viz. ^{<4173>}Acts 17:28 from Aratus, *Phoenom*, 5, or Cleanthes, *Hymn. ad Jov*. 5; ^{<4653>}1 Corinthians 15:33 from Menander’s *Thais*; and ^{<5012>}Titus 1:12 from Callimachus, *Hymn. ad Iov*. 8, according to Theodoret, or Epimenides

according to Jerome, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and others. To these may be added ^{<462>}Galatians 5:23, where the words **κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος** are identical with the words of Aristotle, *Pol.* iii, 8 (Gill, *Notes and Queries*, v, 175). Perhaps also ^{<447>}Acts 14:17 and ^{<3017>}James 1:17, from their rhythmical form, may be quotations.

(c) Those which the New Test. contains from the Old Test. The first and third of these classes are the most important, and the only ones demanding special notice here. The following treatment as to both is compiled from the various authorities on Biblical introduction and interpretation, with additions from other sources.

I. Parallel passages of the Old-Testament Scriptures. — The principal of these are the following: Many sections of the books of Chronicles seem to be quoted from the earlier Scriptures. The historical chapters of the book of Isaiah (36-39) are repeated in 2 Kings 18-20. The last chapter of Jeremiah reappears in ^{<124D>}2 Kings 24:25. Of Psalm 18 we have two copies, one in 2 Samuel 22. Compare also Genesis 46 with Numbers 26 and Ezra 2 with Nehemiah 7. Other instances are cited: ^{<3124>}Habakkuk 2:14 from ^{<3119>}Isaiah 11:9; ^{<3118>}Jonah 2:3 from ^{<1918>}Psalm 42:8; 2:5 from ^{<240D>}Isaiah 49:2; ^{<3008>}Obadiah 1:8 from Jeremiah 49; and several passages in the later Psalms, which are found also in the earlier. The reader will find a list of the variations discovered by a comparison of most of the foregoing passages in the notes to Cappelli, *Cuit. Sac.* (i, 30-44 [ed. 1775]). See also Kennicott, *Biblia Hebraica* (ii, 727, etc.), and *State of Printed Hebrew Text* (pt. i).

The question to be determined is, Are we to regard each of the textual variations thus brought to light as a blunder to be corrected in one or other of the parallel Scriptures, or as a deviation (intentional or otherwise) on the part of the later writer from the language of the earlier? In considering this question a distinction must be made between two classes of parallel passages—the one class consisting of those in which the same story is told, or the same sentiments expressed, by two different writers, and the later writer avails himself of the language of the earlier, though it may be without any very exact or servile adherence in every word and clause; the other consisting of those in which a public or other document is inserted in two separate records. It would seem that such variations as are met with in passages of the former description are more likely to be designed and original, being probably traceable to the free use which the later writer made of the materials furnished by the earlier; and that variations met with

in passages of the latter description are more likely to be blunders arising from the negligence of transcribers and similar causes. But this anticipation is only partially realized, inasmuch as errors of transcription are found in the former class of passages, and alterations obviously designed are found in the latter. Let us illustrate this by four examples, two of each class.

1. The very remarkable prophecy contained in ~~צמח~~ Isaiah 2:1-4 is found also in ~~צמח~~ Micah 4:1-3. The variations are few and of no great importance. But, such as they are, there is no reason to suppose that the text of either of these passages ever differed from what it is now. It is of no consequence in the present inquiry whether Micah borrowed from Isaiah or Isaiah from Micah, or both from an older prophet. There is no evidence whatever that the later writer made it a matter of conscience to reproduce in every minute particular the language of his predecessor. His heart was too full of the great thought embodied in the language to permit him to be minutely attentive to every fold of the dress in which it had been presented. Possibly, also, the quotation was made from memory; and, if so, the wonder is not that any varieties of expression are found in it, but that they are so few and so trivial. In such a case as this, therefore, it would be quite unwarrantable to correct the one passage from the other. The text in both passages is accurate and genuine, and any attempted emendations with the view of bringing the two passages into rigid harmony would certainly be alterations for the worse, not for the better.

2. The prophecy of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7 occupies a very conspicuous position in the Old Test., and, as we might expect, the whole narrative is repeated in 1 Chronicles (17), not, however, without a very considerable number of alterations. In this case, also, it is quite evident that most of the alterations are to be traced to the author of Chronicles, and cannot be regarded as various readings. As is usual, the later writer makes a free use of the earlier narrative, adapting it and the language in which it is conveyed to the circumstances of his own time. Thus he writes *dywd* for *rwd*, prefers, *μyhl ē* to *hwḥp* or *yōda*, sometimes substitutes *tWkl ḥni* for *hkl mḥni*, *kingdom*, and alters or omits words or clauses which appear to him obscure or unessential. The most remarkable omission is in ver. 13 as compared with ver. 14 of the narrative in Samuel. Compare also ver. 17 with ver. 19 of Samuel. Still, though it is evident that most of the variations between the two narratives are to be traced to the design of the later author, and cannot be regarded as errors of transcription, we do not think

that all of them can be accounted for in this way. Two instances may be given, in the one of which the text in Chronicles may fittingly be corrected by that in Samuel; in the other the text in Samuel may be corrected by that in Chronicles.

(1.) In ^{<3178>}1 Chronicles 17:18, 19 we read, “What can David speak more to thee *for the honor of thy servant*, **ÚDb[Ata,dwbk]** ...For thy *servant’s* sake, and according to thine own heart hast thou done all this greatness.” Not to mention the difficulty in the construction of the Hebrew in ver. 18, it is evident that the spirit of the whole passage is quite out of harmony with the context. Accordingly, on turning to the corresponding verses in Samuel, we are not surprised to find the sentiment expressed very different indeed, the words being “And what can David say more unto thee... for thy *word’s* sake, and according to thine own heart,” etc. (ver. 20, 21). It is not improbable that what we cannot but regard as the erroneous readings in Chronicles are to be traced to the similarity between **rbd** and **dbk** in the former of the two verses, and **rbd** and **db** in the latter. It may be added that in the Septuagint translation of Chronicles the objectionable words are omitted.

(2.) The other instance is in ^{<4072>}2 Samuel 7:23, compared with ^{<3172>}1 Chronicles 17:21. In the former we read, according to the authorized translation, “What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible. *For thy land, before thy people* (**ynEjnat** from before), which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, [from] the nations and their gods?” The text of this verse is obviously very confused; and in order to extract from it some tolerable sense, our translators have rendered **ynEjnat** as if it were **ynE]** and have inserted *from*, without any authority, towards the close. Now, without venturing to affirm that the text in Chronicles is to be received as in every particular the true and genuine one, we have no hesitation in borrowing from it what we believe to be an important emendation of the text in Samuel — viz. the substitution of **çrgl**, *to drive out*, for **xral** (the words are very similar), for *thy land*. This will allow us to give **ynEjnat** proper force, and render unnecessary the insertion of the unauthorized *ionm*; the meaning of the latter half of the verse when thus

corrected being as follows: “To drive out from before thy people, whom thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, nations and their gods.”

3. The two remaining examples are of a different description, consisting not of historical or prophetic passages freely made use of by a later writer, but of documents of which we have, so to speak, two editions. The first is David’s noble song of thanksgiving, of which two copies have come down to us — the one incorporated with the history in 2 Samuel 22; the other with the psalm-book as Psalm 18. Now, on comparing these two copies of the same song, we find scarcely a single line of the one exactly identical with the corresponding line of the other; some of the variations being of extremely little importance, others of greater moment. The question here again arises: How are these variations to be accounted for? How comes it that two copies of the same song, handed down to us in the same volume, should, though identical in the general sentiments expressed, in the train of thought, and in the order of the verses, present so many minute differences in the details of the composition? On first thought, we are disposed to conclude, somewhat rashly, that all the variations must be regarded as errors of transcription, and that in this case there is no room for the hypothesis of design on the part of the author or editor, inasmuch as we have here the case not of an independent author adapting to his own purpose the materials furnished by previous writers, but of a collector giving insertion to a document which, one would suppose, it is his duty to present as nearly as possible in the words of the original author. On comparing, however, the psalm with the history, it is evident that all the variations cannot be accounted for in this way. For example, the very first words of the psalm, “I will love thee, O Lord, my strength,” do not appear in the other copy; and of this the only admissible explanation plainly is that the words in question constitute an authorized addition to the song in its original form, the addition being made probably for the purpose of adapting it more perfectly to liturgical use. If this explanation be admitted, it follows that of this song there have been transmitted to us two *authorized* editions — the one, which is inserted in the history, presenting the song in its original form; the other presenting it in the slightly altered form which was given to it when incorporated with the authorized hymn-book of the Hebrew nation. In this way a considerable number of the variations may be accounted for, but not, by any means, all of them; for, with regard to many of them, it is impossible to discover any useful purpose which could be served by their introduction; and several of them

are just the sort of alterations which most usually arise from the mistake of transcribers-as, for example, the interchange of letters of similar form, the transposition of letters, etc. (thus for **aryw**, and *he was seen*, in ^{<1021>}2 Samuel 22:11, we find in ^{<1081>}Psalm 18:11 [10] **adyw**, and *he did fly*; and for **wrgj yw** in ^{<1026>}2 Samuel 22:46 we find **wgrj yw** in ^{<1086>}Psalm 18:46 [45]). The text in Samuel is the more antique in form-as, for example, in the more sparing insertion of vowel letters; but that of the Psalm appears to have been more carefully preserved. Thus, there is little doubt that for **rwBgan** ^{<1026>}2 Samuel 22:26, we ought to read **rbfj** as in the Psalm; and in ver. 28, **tawaf** of Samuel ought to be read **hTaw]** or **hTa yK**, as in the Psalm; and in the second clause also the reading in the Psalm is much to be preferred. So in vers. 33, 44, 47, 49. On the other hand, in vers. 5, 43, the reading in Samuel may be preferred to that of the Psalm.

4. Our last example is the Decalogue, of which we have two editions, in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, between which there are not a few differences, some of considerable importance. But it is very doubtful whether any of these differences can be laid to the charge of the copyist; certainly the more important of them must be traced to the author. They are principally to be found in the fourth and tenth commandments: in the latter, the two first clauses are transposed in Deuteronomy, and a slight addition and alteration made; and in the former, the *remember* of Exodus is exchanged for *observe* in Deuteronomy; *thy cattle* is expanded into *thine ox and thine ass and all thy cattle*; and the “reason annexed” in Exodus — “For in six days,” etc. — is entirely omitted in Deuteronomy, and another statement substituted for it — “That thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou; and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,” etc. The other alterations are of less importance. In each of the fourth and fifth commandments. the clause “As the Lord thy God hath commanded thee” is inserted in Deuteronomy, the promise in the latter being also expanded by the addition of the clause “that it may be well with thee;” and in the ninth, **awj;d [e** (*false witness*) is substituted for **rqv;d [e**. Now, there is not one of these variations which can be certainly traced to the oversight of a transcriber. It is, indeed, on first thought, surprising that any writer, however conscious of the guidance of the Divine Spirit, should have ventured to depart, even in the minutest particular, from the *ipsissima verba* of a document which had been stamped in so special a manner with the impress of Heaven. It is, perhaps, the most remarkable example of that

complete mastery of the essential over the accidental, of the spirit over the letter, which distinguishes the entire revelation at once of the Old Testament and of the New. But to explain this phenomenon does not fall within our present purpose. It is sufficient to remark that most of the variations are evidently to be traced to the first composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and that none of them can with any degree of certainty be placed in the category of various readings. *SEE DECALOGUE.*

From the four examples of parallel passages which have been under review, the following conclusions have been elicited: (*a.*) That most of the variations are to be traced to the author or editor, and not to the copyist; and, in all such cases, both forms of the passage must be preserved as belonging equally to the sacred text. (*b.*) That, notwithstanding, a considerable number of variations still remain which cannot be accounted for in this way, but probably arose through oversight in transcription. In such cases it is allowable to correct the more faulty text by the more accurate; but, in the absence of ally external testimony to the accuracy of the reading which we prefer, such corrections must be introduced with caution, and might, perhaps, with greater propriety be placed in the margin (as was the practice with the ancient Jewish critics) than incorporated with the text. The variations of this class would have appeared still more numerous had we selected our examples of parallel passages from those which are occupied with lists of names or numbers. See Kennicott, *Dissertation on the State of the Printed Hebrew Text*, pt. i.

II. *Quotations from the Old Testament in the New.* These form one of the outward bonds of connection between the two parts of the Bible. They are manifold in kind; but all that we need here to say respecting them may be summed up under the following heads:

1. *Sources whence the Quotations are made.* — These are two—the Hebrew original and the Septuagint translation. On comparing the passages, in order to apportion the quotations between these two sources, we find that by far the larger number are taken, either wholly or chiefly, from the Sept., while a very few materially differ from both the Sept. and the Hebrew. The latter were probably quoted from memory, the occasion not requiring punctilious accuracy in the citation. For the most part, the deviations from the text of the Hebrew or the Sept. are not material. They may be classed as follows:

(1.) Changes of person, number, or tense in particular words. Thus, in ^{<418>}Matthew 26:31, we read, **πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς**; while the Sept. gives it, **πάταξον τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται, κ. τ. λ.** (^{<393>}Zechariah 13:7) (this is the reading of the Alexandrine Codex; that of the Vatican differs considerably: **πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένους καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα**); ^{<498>}John 19:36, **Ὅστούν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ**, for **Ὅστούν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ**, ^{<124>}Exodus 12:46; ^{<124>}1 Peter 2:24, **Ὁὐ τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθητε**, for **μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθημεν**, ^{<236>}Isaiah 53:5, etc. Comp. also ^{<110>}Matthew 11:10 with ^{<301>}Malachi 3:1; and ^{<497>}John 19:37 with ^{<324>}Zechariah 12:4.

(2.) Substitution of synonymous words or phrases for those used in the Sept. or Hebrew: e.g. ^{<438>}John 13:18, **Ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον, ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ**, for **Ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλμην ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν**, Psalm 40 (41), 9. Comp. ^{<308>}Hebrews 8:8 sq. ^{<120>}Matthew 12:20, where **ἄσπετος ἡ γὰρ ἡμῶν τῆς γῆς** (^{<248>}Isaiah 42:3) is rendered by **ἕως ν' ἐκβάλη εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν**. Sometimes the words thus substituted are synonymous with those for which they are used only *historically*; as when Paul (^{<404>}Galatians 4:30) calls Isaac **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἐλευθέρας**, in a passage quoted from ^{<120>}Genesis 21:10, where, in the words of Abraham, he is mentioned by name as **ὁ υἱὸς μου Ἰσαάκ**. Occasionally, also, this kind of substitution is effected by the use of a word describing a species for one designating the genus to which it belongs; as when Paul, in ^{<410>}1 Corinthians 3:20, substitutes the words **τῶν σοφῶν** for the more general expression, **τῶν ἀνθρώπων**, used in the passage (^{<494>}Psalm 19:11) which he quotes; or as in ^{<127>}Matthew 22:37, where **διανοία** is put for **δύναμις** the special kind of strength intended being that of the mind.

(3.) Words and phrases transposed: e.g. ^{<510>}Romans 10:20, **Εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν**, for **Ἐμφανῆς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν**, ^{<231>}Isaiah 65:1, etc. The Codex Alex. gives this passage exactly as cited by Paul.

(4.) Words and clauses interpolated or added: e.g. ^{<461>}John 6:31, **ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν**, where the words **ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ** are an ad(lition (comp. ^{<178>}Psalm 78:24); ^{<455>}1 Corinthians 15:45,

Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, where the words πρῶτος and Ἀδάμ are added by the apostle (comp. ^{<0017>}Genesis 2:7). These additions are made sometimes from parallel passages, and sometimes of the writer's own device, for the purpose of rendering the meaning of the passage clearer, or connecting it more readily with the preceding or subsequent context.

(5.) Words omitted and passages abridged: e.g. ^{<0016>}Matthew 4:6, τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σου, καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου for τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου: ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τ.π.σ., ^{<0011>}Psalms 90:11, 12. Comp. also ^{<0024>}Matthew 22:24 with ^{<0025>}Deuteronomy 25:5; ^{<0027>}Romans 9:27, 28 with ^{<0022>}Isaiah 10:22, 23; ^{<0014>}Hebrews 4:4 with ^{<0013>}Genesis 2:3, etc.

(6.) Passages paraphrastically rendered, or the general sense only given: e.g. ^{<0025>}Romans 9:25, where we leave a paraphrastic rendering of ^{<0023>}Hosea 2:23; ^{<0016>}Romans 10:6 sq., a free rendering of ^{<0012>}Deuteronomy 30:12 sq.; ^{<0013>}1 Corinthians 1:31, where the general sense of ^{<0024>}Jeremiah 9:24 is given; comp. also ^{<0022>}1 Peter 2:22 with ^{<0024>}Isaiah 59:9.

(7.) Several passages quoted together, so as to form one connected sense: e.g. in ^{<0016>}2 Corinthians 6:16-18 we have a passage made up of no less than three different passages — ^{<0011>}Leviticus 26:11; ^{<0024>}Isaiah 3:11; ^{<0023>}Jeremiah 31:1. Comp. also ^{<0012>}Mark 1:2, 3, where ^{<0011>}Malachi 3:1 and ^{<0024>}Isaiah 40:3 are combined; also ^{<0018>}Romans 11:8, where ^{<0024>}Isaiah 29:10 and ^{<0012>}Deuteronomy 29:4 are strangely mixed together.

(8.) Several of these species of deviations combined together: e.g. ^{<0024>}Romans 2:24, τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, for δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντός τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. Here we have the substitution of τοῦ Θεοῦ for μου, and the omission of διὰ παντός. Comp. also ^{<0018>}Romans 11:3 with ^{<0014>}1 Kings 19:14, for an instance of the combination of omission, substitution, and transposition.

(9.) Passages rather indicated, or hinted at, than formally quoted: e.g. ^{<0014>}Ephesians 5:14, Ἔγχειραι ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός. The difficulty of assigning this quotation to any passage in the Old Test. has been felt by all interpreters,

and various theories have been proposed for the sake of removing it. The most probable, however, seems that which regards these words as formed upon ^{<2101>}Isaiah 60:1-3, and the passage as rather hinted at than quoted. Comp. also ^{<3135>}Hebrews 13:15 with ^{<3142>}Hosea 14:2. To this head may be also referred ^{<4073>}John 7:38, where no particular passage is quoted, but such passages as ^{<2344>}Isaiah 44:3; 4:1; 8:11; ^{<3148>}Zechariah 14:8; 13:1, are alluded to.

In the quotations of all kinds from the Old Test. in the New we find a continual variation from the *letter* of the older Scriptures. To this variation four causes may be specified as having contributed:

First. All the New-Test. writers quoted from the Sept. — correcting it, indeed, more or less, by the Hebrew, especially when it was needful for their purpose; occasionally deserting it altogether; still abiding by it to so large an extent as to show that it was the primary source whence their quotations were drawn. Their use of it may be best illustrated by the corresponding use of our liturgical version of the Psalms—a use founded on love as well as on habit, but which, nevertheless, we forego when it becomes important that we should follow the more accurate rendering. Consequently, when the errors involved in the Sept. version do not interfere with the purpose which the New-Test. writer had in view, they are frequently allowed to remain in his quotation (see ^{<4159>}Matthew 15:9 [a record of our Lord's words]; ^{<4018>}Luke 4:18; ^{<4434>}Acts 13:41 15:17; ^{<5150>}Romans 15:10; ^{<4043>}2 Corinthians 4:13; ^{<3809>}Hebrews 8:9; 10:5; 11:21). The current of apostolic thought, too, is frequently dictated by words of the Sept., which differ much from the Hebrew (see ^{<5124>}Romans 2:24; ^{<4155>}1 Corinthians 15:55; ^{<4007>}2 Corinthians 9:7; ^{<3835>}Hebrews 13:15). Or even an absolute interpolation of the Sept. is quoted (^{<3006>}Hebrews 1:6 [^{<4534>}Deuteronomy 32:43]). On the other hand, in ^{<4205>}Matthew 21:5; ^{<4189>}1 Corinthians 3:19, the Sept. is corrected by the Hebrew; so, too, in ^{<4013>}Matthew 9:13; ^{<4227>}Luke 22:37, there is an effort to preserve an expressiveness of the Hebrew which the Sept. had lost: and in ^{<4045>}Matthew 4:15,16; ^{<3137>}John 19:37; ^{<4154>}1 Corinthians 15:54, the Sept. disappears altogether. In ^{<4023>}Romans 9:33 we have a quotation from the Sept. combined with another from the Hebrew. In ^{<4120>}Mark 12:30; ^{<4207>}Luke 10:27; ^{<5129>}Romans 12:19, the Sept. and Hebrew are superadded the one upon the other. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in this respect stands alone, the Sept. is uniformly followed; except in the one remarkable quotation (^{<3300>}Hebrews 10:30), which, according neither with the Hebrew

nor the Sept., was probably derived from the last-named passage (^{<4129>}Romans 12:19), wherewith it exactly coincides. The quotation in ^{<4109>}1 Corinthians 2:9 seems to have been derived, not directly from the Old Test., but rather from a Christian liturgy or other document into which the language of ^{<2504>}Isaiah 64:4 had been transferred.

Secondly. The New-Test. writers must have frequently quoted from memory. The Old Test. had been deeply instilled into their minds, ready for service whenever needed; and the fulfilment of its predictions, which they witnessed, made its utterances rise up in life before them (comp. ^{<4017>}John 2:17, 22). It was of the very essence of such a living use of Old-Test. Scripture that their quotations of it should not of necessity be verbally exact.

Thirdly. Combined with this there was an alteration of conscious or unconscious design. Sometimes the object of this was to obtain increased force; hence the variation from the original in the form of the divine oath (^{<4141>}Romans 14:11); or the result “I quake” substituted for the cause (^{<4822>}Hebrews 12:21); or the insertion of rhetorical words to bring out the emphasis (^{<4826>}Hebrews 12:26); or the change of person to show that what men perpetrated had its root in God’s determinate counsel (^{<4051>}Matthew 26:31). Sometimes an Old-Test. passage is abridged, and in the abridgment so adjusted, by a little alteration, as to present an aspect of completeness and yet omit what is foreign to the immediate purpose (^{<4021>}Acts 1:20; ^{<4031>}1 Corinthians 1:31). At other times a passage is enlarged by the incorporation of a passage from another source. Thus in ^{<4048>}Luke 4:18, 19, although the contents are professedly those read by our Lord from Isaiah 61, we have the words “to set at liberty them that are bruised,” introduced from ^{<2886>}Isaiah 58:6 (Sept.); similarly in ^{<4108>}Romans 11:8, ^{<4594>}Deuteronomy 29:4 is combined with ^{<2990>}Isaiah 29:10. In some cases still greater liberty of alteration is assumed. In ^{<4501>}Romans 10:11 the word $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is introduced into ^{<2896>}Isaiah 28:16, to show that that is uttered of Jew and Gentile alike. In ^{<4512>}Romans 11:26, 27, the “to Zion” of ^{<2820>}Isaiah 59:20 (Sept. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\Sigma\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$) is replaced by “out of Sion” (suggested by ^{<2108>}Isaiah 2:3); to Zion the Redeemer had already come; from Zion, the Christian Church, his law was to go forth; or even from the literal Jerusalem (comp. ^{<4247>}Luke 24:47; ^{<4559>}Romans 15:19), for till she was destroyed the type was still in a measure kept up. In ^{<4087>}Matthew 8:17 the words of ^{<2504>}Isaiah 53:4 are adapted to the divine removal of disease, the outward token and witness of that sin which Christ was eventually to remove by his death, thereby

fulfilling the prophecy more completely. For other, though less striking, instances of variation see <4642>1 Corinthians 14:21; <4185>1 Peter 3:15. In some places, again, the actual words of the original are taken up, but employed with a new meaning; thus the ἐρχόμενος, which in <3113>Habakkuk 2:3 merely qualified the verb, is in <3805>Hebrews 10:37 made the subject to it.

Fourthly. Still more remarkable than any alteration in the quotation itself is the circumstance that in <4179>Matthew 27:9 Jeremiah should be named as the author of a prophecy really delivered by Zechariah; the reason being, as has been well shown by Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, that the prophecy is based upon that in <2489>Jeremiah 18:19: and that without a reference to this original source the most essential features of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy would be misunderstood. The case is, indeed, not entirely unique; for in the Greek of <4100>Mark 1:2, 3, where Malachi 3, 1 is combined with <2418>Isaiah 40:3, the name of Isaiah alone is mentioned; it was on his prophecy that that of Malachi partly depended. On the other hand, in <4102>Matthew 2:23; <4165>John 6:45, the comprehensive mention of the prophets indicates a reference not only to the passages more particularly contemplated, <2310>Isaiah 11:1; liv, 13, but also to the general tenor of what had been elsewhere prophetically uttered. *SEE NAZARENE.* On <4173>John 7:38 it may suffice here to remark that perhaps the best solution of the difficulty is to regard our Lord as not making any direct quotation from any part of the Old Test., but as only referring in metaphorical language, suited to the strain of his previous address (comp. ver. 37), to a fact which in plainer style is unquestionably announced in the ancient prophecies, viz. the abundant possession of divine knowledge by those who should live under the Messiah's reign. The passage <3045>James 4:5 is beset with difficulty. Not only is there doubt as to what "Scripture" is cited, but much obscurity hangs over the meaning of the words themselves so adduced. We cannot enter into the details of the investigation. Referring for these to Huther's note on the passage in Meyer's *Commentar*, pt. 15, the substance of which is given by dean Alford in his notes, we content ourselves here with saying that some interpreters understand πνεῦμα of the human spirit, and translate, "the spirit [temper, feeling of mind] which dwells in us lusts to envy [covetousness];" while others understand it of the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit implanted in the soul by God, and translate, either, "The Spirit which dwelleth in us lusts [desires, inclines] against envy;" or, "The Spirit which he [God] hath placed in us jealously desireth [us for himself]." In neither case can the statement be referred to any single passage in the Old

Test.; but if the last rendering be adopted, the writer may be supposed to refer generally to those parts of the Old Test. in which God is represented as dwelling in his people (⁽⁴⁶⁵³⁾Numbers 35:34; ⁽⁴⁶⁵⁷⁾Ezekiel 36:27), and as desiring them with a jealous affection (⁽⁴⁶²⁰⁾Deuteronomy 32:10 sq.). This is far from satisfactory, but it seems the best solution that has been offered.

2. Mode in which Quotations from the Old Test. in the New Test. are introduced. — For this purpose certain formulæ are employed, of which the following is a list: Καθώς or Οὕτω γέγραπται, Πῶς γέγραπται, Ἔστι γεγραμμένον, Ὁ λόγος ὁ γέγραμμένος, Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Ἐρρήθη, Καθώς εἴρηται, Κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Ἡ γραφή εἶπε or λέγει, or simply Λέγει (sup. Θεός vel. προφήτης), Περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, Ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, Εἴρηκε δέ τις, Βλέπετε τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, Καθὼς ἐλάλησε, Τότε ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή, Ἴνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ (τελειωθῇ) τὸ ῥηθέν (ἡ γραφή). Surenhusius is of opinion, and labors to prove, that by attending to the force of these different formulæ we may ascertain with what intent the words they respectively introduce are quoted, as each formula, he asserts, involves a different meaning (*Proef: in Bib. Catall.*). A fatal objection, however, to this opinion is that we find the very *same quotations*, expressed in the same words and brought to prove the very same points, introduced by *different* formulæ in different Gospels (Horne, *Intr od.* ii, 339). At the same time, there are obviously two classes of these formulæ, the difference between which is distinctly marked by the circumstance that, while some of them merely express the fact that what follows is a quotation, others of them intimate the existence of a material relation between the passage quoted and the subject of which the writer quoting it is treating. Thus, when it is simply said, “The Scripture saith,” nothing more is *necessarily* implied than that what follows is taken from the Old Test.; but when it is said, “Then was the Scripture fulfilled which saith,” or “This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled,” we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the statement with which he compares it in the passage quoted. We may therefore so far adopt the hypothesis of Surenhusius as to admit a distinction between these two classes, and expect to find in the passages introduced by the latter of them something more than a mere verbal quotation. *SEE FULFIL.*

Besides the quotations introduced by these formulæ there are a considerable number scattered through the writings of the apostles which

are inserted in the trail of their own remarks without any announcement whatever of their being cited from others. To the cursory reader the passages thus quoted appear to form a part of the apostle's own words. and it is only by intimate acquaintance with the Old-Test. Scriptures, and a careful comparison of these with those of the New Test.. that the fact of their being quotations can be detected. In the common version every trace of quotation is in many of these passages lost, from the circumstance that the writer has closely followed the Sept., while our version of the Old Test. is made from the Hebrew. Thus for instance, in ^{<A0E>}2 Corinthians 8:21, Paul says, *προνοούμενοι καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων*, which, with a change in the mood of the verb, is a verbatim citation of the Sept. version of ^{<A0E>}Proverbs 3:4. Hardly any trace of this, however, appears in the common version, where the one passage reads, "Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord. but also in the sight of men;" and the other, "So shalt thou find favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man." So, also, in ^{<A0E>}1 Peter 4:18, the apostle quotes word for word from the Sept. version of ^{<A0E>}Proverbs 11:31 the clause *εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἄσενῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται* a quotation which we should in vain endeavor to trace in the common version of the Proverbs, where the passage in question is rendered, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." Such quotations evidently show how much the minds of the New-Test. writers were imbued with the sentiments and expressions of the Old Test. as exhibited in the Alexandrine version.

3. Purposes for which these Quotations are introduced. — These, as appears from an examination of the passages, are as follows:

(1.) For the explanation or proof of some doctrinal position. Thus Paul, for the sake of explaining and confirming his doctrine of the efficacy of faith, quotes repeatedly from ^{<A0E>}Habakkuk 2:4 the sentence "The just shall live by faith." So, also, in order to prove that mere natural descent from Abraham did not of itself entitle any one to the divine favor, the same apostle quotes the terms of God's promise to Abraham, in which he expressly declares that in Isaac alone, of all Abraham's family, was the *seed* of Abraham — i.e. the spiritual Israel — to be called or chosen. Comp. also ^{<A0E>}Romans 4:7, 8; 9:12, 13,15, 17, 20, 21; 12:19. 20; 14:10,11, etc. It is to be observed that the passages thus adduced are almost always found in writings addressed to Jews, and are therefore to be regarded as

containing *argumenta e concessis*. They are always applied, if not in the words, at least in the sense, of the original from which they are taken.

(2.) For the purpose of pointing out the application of the passage quoted to some statement or description in the context into which it is introduced. From the circumstance that several of the passages thus adduced are, in the phraseology of the New Test., as well as in that of the Rabbinical writings, said to be “fulfilled,” it has been hastily inferred by some that they are all to be regarded as designed prophecies of the events to which they are applied. For this opinion, however, no adequate support seems to be afforded by the phrase in question. The general idea attached to the verb πληρόω is that of filling up to its full capacity anything of which it is predicated. Thus the Jews are said by Christ to have filled up the measure (πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον) of their fathers (Matthew 23:32). The phrase in question consequently is susceptible of application to whatever is thought of as supplying the complement of any given capacity, and that whether it is used in a literal or tropical sense. Hence it is appropriately used in the New Test. with respect to passages quoted from the Old Test. in the following cases:

First. When it announces the accomplishment of a prophecy contained in the words quoted. As the prediction is a mere empty declaration, as it were, until the fact predicted has occurred; so that fact, by giving meaning and force to the prediction, is viewed as its complement or filling up. Thus, the New-Test. writers, in recording the facts of our Lord’s history, when they come to any which formed the subject of ancient prophecy, whether explicit or typical, direct the attention of their readers to the circumstance by adducing the prediction and intimating its fulfilment in the fact they have recorded.

Secondly. When it introduces some description or statement which affords a parallel to what the writer has been saying. Such a description being regarded as involving a fact of general applicability to the human race, or to certain portions of it, is thought of as being, so to speak, in a state of deficiency until the measure of its applicability has been filled up. Each new case, therefore, which affords a parallel to that to which the description was originally applied goes so far to supply this deficiency by affording another instance in which the description holds; and hence the New-Test. writers are in the habit of quoting such descriptions as having been fulfilled in the cases to which they are applied by them. Thus a passage from the

prophecies of Jeremiah, in which a description is given of the desolation caused by the divine judgments upon the Jews, under the beautiful personification of Rachel rising from the dead looking in vain for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not, is adduced by ^{<1027>}Matthew 2:17, 18 as fulfilled in the sorrow which was produced by the massacre of the babes in Bethlehem by order of Herod. No person who studies the context of the passage as it occurs in the Old Test. can suppose for a moment that it contains a *prediction* of the cruelties which were perpetrated on the occasion related by the evangelist. The sole purport of the quotation seems to be to intimate, as bishop Kidder remarks, that “such another scene of sorrow appeared then (upon the murder of the innocents) as was that which Jeremy mentions upon another sad occasion” (*Demonstration of the Messiah*, pt. ii, p. 215). See, also, Sykes, *Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion*, etc., p. 217, 218; Blaney, *ad loc.*; Henderson, *ad loc.*, and *On Hos. ii, 1*; De Wette, *On Matt. 2:17, 18*; and Marsh’s *Notes to Michcelis*, i, 473. Comp. ^{<1157>}Matthew 15:7, 8, with ^{<2391>}Isaiah 29:13; ^{<1034>}Matthew 13:14 with ^{<4825>}Acts 28:25 and ^{<2109>}Isaiah 6:9, etc.

It appears, then, that even when a quotation is introduced by a part of the verb **πληρώω**, it does not necessarily follow that it is to be regarded as containing a prophecy. This is true as well of the conditional formula **ἴνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῆ**, as of the more direct **τότε ἐπληρώθη**, for these particles, as used in the New Test., frequently express nothing more than that occasion is given for a particular action or remark.

Besides the passages introduced as *fulfilled*, there are others referable to the same general head, which are introduced by others of the formulae above mentioned. Of these, some belong to both the classes just described — *prophecies* of which the New Test. announces the fulfilment, and *general descriptions* to which something parallel is brought forward. Another class consists of moral and religious maxims, which are adduced as applicable to the state of things of which the writer or speaker is discoursing, and which, though not said to be fulfilled thereby, are quoted under essentially the same idea. Such sentences embody, as it were, certain laws of human nature and conduct, certain general facts in the human economy, of which we are to expect the verification wherever the necessary conditions are exemplified. Like the laws of physical science, therefore, they are dependent for their verification upon the examination of the phenomena appropriate to that region to which they belong; and as no

law of science can be said to lie absolutely beyond the possibility of refutation until every one of the phenomena which it embraces has been examined and been found to support it, every experiment or occurrence that favors it may be said to fill up what is wanting to its perfect and undeniable certainty. Hence the New-Test. writers, in recording events or describing characters which accord with and so exemplify the truth of the moral maxims of the Old Test., speak of these as if they had contained actual pre-intimations of the occurrence to which they are applied. They contain, in fact, the *norm*, or *rule*, according to which the matter in question has occurred.

The usage of the New-Test. writers in the cases we have been considering is illustrated by that of the Rabbinical writers in their quotations from the Old Test., as Surenhusius has largely shown in his work upon this subject (*Βίβλος Καταλλαῆς*, etc., lib. i; see, also, Wihiner, *Antiquitates Hebroeorum*, i, 527 sq.). Instances have also been adduced of a similar usage by the classical and ecclesiastical writers. Thus, iElian introduces Diogenes Sinopensis as saying that “he *fulfilled* and endured the curses out of the tragedy” (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐκπλήροι καὶ ὑπομένει τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ἀράς). Olympiodorus says of Plato that “a swarm of bees made honey on his lips, *that it might become true* concerning him, ‘And from his tongue flowed a strain sweeter than honey,’” which is what Homer says of Nestor. Epiphanius says of Ebion, “But in him is *fulfilled* that which is written; I had nearly been in all mischief, between the Church and the Synagogue” (ἀλλ’ ἐν αὐτῷ πληροῦται τὸ γεγραμμένον, κ. τ. λ. *Hoeresis Ebion*. c. i]). So, also, the Latin *implere* is used by Jerome: “Coeterum Socraticum illud *in npletur* in nobis, Hoc tantullumm scio, quod nescio” (*Ep. 103 ad Paulin.*). *Comp. Clem. Rom. Ep. 1 ad Cor. sec. 3.*

Thirdly. The New-Test. writers make quotations from the Old, for the purpose of *clothing their own ideas in language already familiar to their readers, or attractive from its beauty, force, or dignity.* The writings of the Old Test. were the great classics of the Jewish nation, venerable at once for their literary value and their divine authority. In these the youth of Judaea were carefully instructed from their earliest years, and with their words all their religious thoughts and feelings were identified. Hence it was natural, and nearly unavoidable, that in discoursing of religious subjects they should express their thoughts in language borrowed from the books which had formed the almost exclusive objects of their study. Such quotations are

made for merely literary purposes — for ornament of style, for vigor of expression, for felicity of allusion, or for impressiveness of statement. The passages thus incorporated with the writer's own thoughts and words are not appealed to as proving what he says or as applying to any circumstance to which he refers; their sole use appears to be to express in appropriate language his own thoughts. Thus when Paul, after dissuading the Roman Christians from the indulgence of vindictiveness, adds, in the words of Solomon (~~2152~~ Proverbs 25:21, 22), "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head," the quotation evidently serves no other purpose than to express, in language of an appropriate and impressive kind, the duty which the apostle would enjoin, and which would have been equally intelligible and equally binding if expressed in his own words as when uttered in those of the inspired author of the Proverbs. On what other principle, moreover, are we to account for the quotation made by Paul, in ~~6108~~ Romans 10:18, from the 19th Psalm, where, in speaking of the diffusion of the Gospel among the Jews, he says, "But I say, have they not heard? Yes. verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the end of the world" — a passage originally applied by the Psalmist to the heavenly bodies? To insist upon regarding this as a prediction of the diffusion of the Gospel, or as furnishing even a parallel to it, is surely to sacrifice reason and common-sense to prejudice or some favorite theory.

It has appeared to some that the hypothesis of an *accommodation* of words originally used of one thing to designate another is inconsistent with due reverence to the divine Word. But wherein does the alleged irreverence of such a practice lie? To employ the words of Scripture to express low and unworthy ideas, or for the sake of giving point to mere worldly reasonings, is to use them irreverently; but to use them to convey ideas as elevated as those originally attached to them, if not more so (which is the case, e.g., in ~~6108~~ Romans 10:18), has but little appearance of treating them with irreverence. The only ground on which such a charge could be maintained is, that words once employed by an inspired writer in a peculiar combination become thenceforward *sacred to the expression in that combination of the one idea they were first used to designate*, whatever others they may be susceptible of expressing. But who is there that could seriously attempt to defend such a position as this? If this were the case, every quotation not made expressly as authority would be liable to censure; and, as the number of such in the New Test. is indisputably considerable,

hardly any of its writers would stand clear of blame. *SEE ACCOMMODATION.*

The truth is, the practice of making use, in this way, of previous and popular writers is one which was common not only in the days of the apostles, but which can hardly fail to be common wherever an established national literature exists. In proof of this we have only to examine the writings of the later classics of Greece and Rome, which abound in quotations direct and accommodated from their earlier authors. We see the same course pursued by the Rabbinical writers towards the Old Test. and by the Christian fathers towards both the Old Test. and the New Test., as well as towards the profane classics. Indeed, such quotations form so apt and natural an ornament of style that writers of all ages and countries, where the means of doing so exist, have availed themselves of it. Why, then, should we wonder that such a practice should have been followed by the sacred writers, who, in other respects, appear to have obeyed in the preparation of their works the ordinary rules and usages, both grammatical and rhetorical, of literary composition?

Literature. — Surenhusius, *Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, in quo secundus Vet. Theol. Hebrceorum Formulas allegandi et Modos interpretandi conciliantur Loca ex V. in N.T. allegata* (Amst. 1713, 4to); Drusius, *Parallela Sacra: h. e. Locorum V. 7'. cum iis quce in r. citantur conjuncta Commemoratio, Ebraice et Greece, cum Notis* (1616, 4to; published also in vol. viii of the *Critici Sacri*); Hoffmann, *Demonstratio Evangelica per ipsum Scriptur/arumn Consensum ex Oraculis V. T. in N. allegatis declanrafa, edidit T. G. Ie.elmnaier* (1773-79-81, 3 vols. 4to); Michaelis, *Einleitung in die gttlichen Schriften des N. B. Erster Theil*, p. 223-265 (Eng. transl. by Marsh, i, 200246); Owen, *Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers Explained and Vindicated* (1789, 4to); Randolph, *Prophecies and other Texts cited in the New Test. compared with the Iebrew Original and with the Sept. Version* (1782, 4to); Koppe, *Excursus I inl Ep. ad Romanos, N.T. Koppianum* (1806), 4:346; Horne, *Introduction*, ii, 281 (8th ed.); Davidson, *Hermeneutics*, ch. xi; Gough, *New Test. Quotations Collated with the Ol Test.* (Lond. 1853); Alexander, *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Test.* (ibid. 1853, 2d ed.); Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus* (Amer. ed.), i, 432 sq.

Quotations Of The Old Testament In The Talmud.

In order to understand many quotations which are cited in the Talmud from the Scriptures, we must remember that the ancient rabbins, in their colloquies and disputations, did not use a MS., but cited from memory — a mode of citation often found in the New Test. Dr. M. Steinschneider, in his essay *Jewish Literature*, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encycl.* § 2, vol. 27:p. 375, makes the following statement: "The influence of the Bible on gnomonics in particular is shown in the following steps —

- (1.) Biblical precepts were used unchanged in meaning and expression, as sentiments or favorite sayings of particular persons. *
- (2.) Biblical sentences, unchanged in form, were made by extending or contracting their contents into new expressions of various truths, which had elsewhere been clothed in known proverbs, so that these last were in some sense deduced from the Bible. A wide field was thus opened for the Midrash; and, finally, the words of the Bible were made into proverbs with an entirely different sense. †
- (3.) Lastly, Biblical phrases and ideas were used more or less intentionally in newly formed sententiae, ‡ and passed into proverbial forms, as they are to be found in the old Halachah (e.g. *Peah*, ii, 2).

* To illustrate Steinschneider's statement, we give the following example. In the Talmud (*Nidda*, fol. 51, col. 2) it was said in the school of R. Ishmael, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable" (⁽²³⁰⁴⁾Isaiah 42:41).

† In the Talmud (*Sabbath*, fol. 10, col. 1) the question was raised, how long the judges were obliged to sit at court. R. Sheshel answered, "Until mid-day." To which R. Chama said, "Where do you find this in the Scripture?" The answer was, "It is said, 'Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning' (⁽²¹⁰⁶⁾Ecclesiastes 10:16)." R. Jeremiah once engaged himself with R. Sera in the law. When the time for the evening prayer had already advanced, R. Jeremiah betook himself quickly to read it. To this R. Sera applied the passage (⁽¹³⁰⁹⁾Proverbs 28:9), "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination" (*Sabbath*, fol. 19, col. 1). Of R. Tarphon it is said that when some one told him something intellectual, he used to say *j rpw rwtpk*, "A knop and a flower in one branch" (⁽¹²⁵³⁾Exodus 25:33); but when the tale was not according to his taste, he

used the words (^{<Q47>}Genesis 42:39), “My son shall not go down with you” (*Bereshith Rabba*, ch. 91).

‡ E.g. $\dot{\gamma}mwj nt swkyl [ht\dot{c} rbk$, i.e. “He already drank for thee the cup of consolation” (*Bereshith Rabba*, fol. 20, etc.); i.e. to be comforted over something. The phrase “cup of consolation” is found in (^{<Q47>}Jeremiah 16:7.

1. As the ancient rabbins made the Bible their study for years, we must not wonder when, in their colloquies, they were able to quote a correct Biblical text. And yet we must bear three things in mind, in order not to have a misconception of the matter. To make this intelligible, we will quote the following examples:

(a.) *The Talmudists sometimes erroneously attribute a Biblical verse to another context.* Thus we read in the Talmud (*Pesachim*, fol. 109, col. 1), “It is every man’s duty to rejoice with his household on the feast, for it is written, ‘And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast,’ $Tj \dot{h}ncw]U\dot{G}j b]$

(^{<Q47>}Deuteronomy 16:14, where reference is made to the Feast of Tabernacles). The Tosaphoth on this passage, however, reads, “And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household” ($\dot{U}tyb\dot{h} hTaitj \dot{h}ncw]$). Now the original reading was that as in the Tosaphoth, which is found in (^{<Q47>}Deuteronomy 14:26, where the second tithe is spoken of. The rabbins, however, thought that the reading alluded to in the Tosaphoth is found in the section which treats of the Feast of Tabernacles; hence, when the editors of the Talmud found out the mistake, they substituted for the reading $tybw hta tj m\dot{c}w$ that of $tj m\dot{c}w\dot{h}j b$

(b.) *Sometimes sentences are quoted in the Talmud as Biblical which are not found in the Bible.* In *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, in *fine*, we read: Rab Nachman said Manioah was an ignorant man ($/rah \mu[]$), for it is written, “He went after his wife” (^{<Q47>}Judges 13:11). B. Nachman, the son of Isaac, asked, should this not also apply to Elkanah, for it is written, “And Elkanah went after his wife;” and to Elisha, of whom the Scripture says, “And he arose and followed her” (^{<Q47>}2 Kings 4:30)? He followed her, indeed! Yes, but he followed her words and advice, and so here likewise he (Manoah) went after her words and counsel. The Tosaphoth correctly remarks on what the Talmud says concerning Elkanah: $arqmh l kb hz qwsp \dot{\gamma}a\dot{c} aw\dot{h} \dot{c}w\dot{b}\dot{c}$; i.e. “It is an error, for this verse is not found in the whole Scripture.”

Ibid. fol. 55, col. 2, *in fine*, we read: “It is said in the name of R. Banah, once I had a dream, and I went to all [interpreters of dreams — the passage having reference to the twenty-four interpreters of dreams said to have been at Jerusalem], and the interpretation of the one was different from that of the other, but all were fulfilled, to fulfil what is said: All dreams go after the interpretation. But is this a verse of the Scripture? Yes, and according to R. Eliezer, who said, Whence do we know that all dreams go after the interpretation? For it is said, ‘And it came to pass as he interpreted’ (^{<0413>}Genesis 41:13).”

In the Talmud (*Pesachim*, fol. 56, col. 1) it is said that Jacob, before his death, cited the words $\mu\chi\tau\text{rb } d[w \mu l w [l \text{ } w\text{twkl } m \text{ } d\text{wbk}$; i.e. “blessed be the glorious name of his kingdom for ever and ever.” But such a quotation is nowhere found in the Scriptures.

In *Yoma*, fol. 85, col. 2, and *Berakoth*, fol. 62, col. 2, we read that the Scripture says, “If any one wants to kill you, kill him first” ($wgrhl \mu\kappa\chi\eta\rho hl \text{ } ab$), but such a passage is nowhere found. Oftentimes quotations are made from Ecclesiasticus, and are introduced by the phrases generally applied to scriptural passages, as in *Niddah*, fol. 16, col. 2 ($bytkdl$); *Berakoth*, fol. 48, col. 1 ($bytkd$); *Erubin*, fol. 65, col. 1 ($rman\zeta$); *Baba Kama*, fol. 92, col. 2 ($\mu y a y b n b \text{ } rman\zeta$, ^{<0713>}Judges 11:3; $hrwtb \text{ } bytk \text{ } hz \text{ } rbd$, ^{<1230>}Genesis 28:9; $\zeta l \text{ } w\zeta mw \text{ } mybwtkb$, Ecclesiasticus 13:20). As these passages are already enumerated in this *Cyclopedia*, we can only refer to the art. ECCLESIASTICUS *SEE ECCLESIASTICUS*.

(c.) *Biblical phrases are here and there changed for the sake of brevity.* In *Erubin*, fol. 31, col. 2 (*Berakoth*, fol. 27, col. 2; *Kiddushin*, fol. 54, col. 1), those things are mentioned which may be used for the Erub (i.e. the ceremony of extending the Sabbath boundary). But to prove those things which may not be used, the phrase is $wl \mu q w \text{ } \check{a}skh \text{ } \hat{t}nw$. But these four words are nowhere found in this connection together.

Sometimes some verses are contracted into one, as ^{<6115>}Deuteronomy 11:5 and 6, in *Rosh ha-Shana*, fol. 4, col. 2; ^{<2097>}Proverbs 19:17 and 14, 31, in *Berackoth*, fol. 18, col. 1; Ezekiel 15:4, and ^{<2492>}Jeremiah 36:22, in *Sabbath*, fol. 20, col. 1; ^{<6143>}Leviticus 14:39 and 44, in *Maccoth*, fol. 13, col. 2; ^{<6913>}Leviticus 19:13, and 5:23; *ibid.* fol. 16, col. 1. The same is often

the case in the New Test., e.g. ^{<4216>}Matthew 21:5, where ^{<2302>}Isaiah 42:2 and ^{<3899>}Zechariah 9:9 are connected; ^{<3369>}Isaiah 6:9 and 10 in ^{<4011>}Mark 1:11; ^{<3416>}Isaiah 40:6, 7, and 52:10, in ^{<4104>}Luke 3:4, 5, 6; ^{<1264>}Exodus 16:14, 15; ^{<4117>}Numbers 11:7; ^{<17824>}Psalms 78:24 in ^{<4161>}John 6:31, 49, etc.

2. Having thus shown the mode of quotations, we will now give a list of passages which are read otherwise in the Talmud than in our Bible:

A. Passages quoted in the Mishna.

1. ^{<1825>}Leviticus 25:36, **w tam j qtAl a**; *Baba Metsia*, ch. v, § 11, **wmm**.
2. ^{<1812>}Numbers 28:2, **phl a trmaw**; *Taanith*, ch. 4:§ 2, **phyl a**
3. ^{<1822>}Numbers 32:22, **pyqn ptyyh**; *Shekalim*, ch. iii, § 2, **pyyqn** [thus likewise in two MSS.].
4. ^{<1819>}Deuteronomy 24:19, **bwçtAal**; *Peah*, ch. vi, § 4, **kwçtAl b** [three times].
5. ^{<1833>}Joshua 8:33, the words **l arçyAl kw to ^wral** are quoted *Sotah*, ch. 7:§ 5, but instead of **pyr fwçw** the reading is **wyr fwçw** [probably on account of the antecedent **wynqzw** and following **wyfpwçw**; the reading in the Mishna is also marked by Michaelis, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1720, ad loc., and so likewise in the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic versions].
6. ^{<3103>}Isaiah 10:13, **ytçwç**; *Yadain*, ch. 4:§ 4, **ytswç** [in the Bible (with the exception of our passage) **hsç** is always read with the Samnech].
7. ^{<3421>}Ezekiel 46:21, **y[wxqm t[bra**; *Middoth*, ch. ii, § 5, **tw[xqm [bra** [probably on account of the following **t[xqm** in v, 22; **[bra** is the reading also of one MSS.].
8. ^{<1014>}Amos 9:14, **l arçy ym[twbç ta ytbçw**; *Yadain*, ch. 4:§ 4, reads after **hdwhyw l arçy**.
9. ^{<3916>}Malachi 3:16, **rps**; *Aboth*, ch. iii, § 3, **rpsb** [which is supported by seven MSS. and the Syr.].

10. ^{<1012D>}Malachi 3:23, *aybnh hyl a μkl j l ç ykna hnh*; *Eduyoth*, ch. 8:§7, *aybnh whyl a ta μkl j l ç ynnh*.
11. ^{<1087>}Psalms 68:27, *ynda μyhl a*; *Berakoth*, ch. 7:§ 3, *hwby μyhl a hwby* is the reading of eleven MSS.].
12. ^{<801>}Job 1:1, *aryw rçyw μt awhh çyah hyhw μyhl a*; *Sotah*, ch. v, § 5, *μyhl a ary rçyw μtçya*.
13. ^{<1028>}Proverbs 22:28, *μyw* [; *Peah*, ch. v, § 6, *μyl w* [[but ch. 7:§ 3, the reading is, as in the Bible, *μl w* [].
14. ^{<4815>}2 Chronicles 28:15, *yçybl h*; *Sotah*, ch. 8:§ 1, *μyçybl h*

B. Passages quoted in the Gemara.

15. ^{<1008>}Genesis 7:8, *hrj Ɔ]hNnyae* *Pesachim*, fol. 3, col. 1, *hrwhf hnnya*
16. ^{<10023>}Genesis 7:23, *hmhBAd* [*iμdame* *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, *d* [*w*
17. ^{<1012D>}Genesis 15:2, in *Berakoth*, fol. 7, col. 2, we read: “R. Jochanan said, in the name of R. Sineon beni-Yochai, from the day wlien God created the world, no one called him Lord (*wda*) until Abraham came and called him Lord, f)r it is written (^{<10158>}Genesis 15:8), ‘And he said, Lord God (*ynda]hwbf*), whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?’” [But in 15:2, we already read *hwby ynda μrba rmayw*.]
18. ^{<10216>}Genesis 25:6, *μhrbal rça μyçgl yph ynbl w*; in the *Bereshith Rabba*, sect. 61, fol. 67, col. 4 (where the question is whether Abraham had one or more concubines), it is stated that the reading is *μçgl yp* [one concubine. This reading of the Midrash is followed by Rashi, who, in his commentary on ^{<10216>}Genesis 25:6, remarks, “The textual reading is *μçgl yp*, defective, because Abraham had only one concubine, namely, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah.” But this reading is contrary to the Masorah, which distinctly remarks that the word *μyçgl yp* occurs twice *entirely plene*, that is, with the two Yods after the two Chireks. The one instance is in ^{<10216>}Genesis 26:6, and the other in ^{<10214>}Esther 2:14].

19. ^{<Q1518>}Genesis 35:18, *ymynb plene; in Sotah*, fol. 36, col. 2, where the passage in ^{<Q1427>}Genesis 49:27, *ārfy baz ymynb*, is treated, we read that, with the exception of 49:27, the word *ymynb* is written *mynb*, defective. [From this statement, it seems that at that time ^{<Q1518>}Genesis 35:18; 42:4; 43:14, 16, 29; 45:12 was written *mynb*.]
20. ^{<Q173>}Exodus 12:3, *l aecpædī* [in *Pesachim*, fol. 6, col. 2, *l arçy ynb td*] [so Samuel, Sept., Syr., Vulg., Targum; comp. our *Horæ Samaritance* on Exodus, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1876, loc. cit.; in the Talmud editions of Prague, Vienna, and Warsaw, the word *ynb* is omitted].
21. ^{<Q176>}Exodus 12:6, *hzhivdj bi Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 2, *wçarh çdj l* 22. ^{<Q136>}Exodus 13:16, *tpō/f*; ^{<R18>}Deuteronomy 6:8, *tpōfo* 11:18, *tpōwfoiln Menachothl* fol. 34, col. 2, we read, “The sages propound, Rabbi Ishmael said in *tpffl tpōfl tpfwfl*; the four compartments [in the phylactery] are indicated.” [To understand this, we will remark that the word *tpff* occurs only three times, as indicated above; in two instances it has no *w* (^{<R18>}Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18), and in the third (^{<Q136>}Exodus 13:16) there is a *w* after the first *f*, i.e. *tpfwf*; hence R. Ishmael regards it as a dual, and makes of the three words *four*, to obtain the four compartments in the phylacteries. But Chayim, in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, tells us that “in the correct codices, as well as in the Book of Crowns,* the reading is *tpffl* (^{<R18>}Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18) and *tpfwfl w* (^{<Q136>}Exodus 13:16), but there is no *w* between the *p* and the *t*; yet I myself have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even *tpfwfl* in ^{<Q118>}Deuteronomy 11:18 is written with a *w* after the first *f*“ The latter statement proves that our present reading is correct.]
- *The Book of Crowns (*ygt rps*) is an ancient treatise, containing Masoretical rules on the ornamental letters. It has lately been published, for the first time, by Burges (Paris, 1866).
23. ^{<Q201>}Exodus 31:1, *rBdylj* in *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 1, *rmayw*

24. ^{<B0425>} Leviticus 4:25, 30, 34, **tnoḥi** defective; in *Sanhedrin*, fol. 4, col. 1, we read that the school of Shammai read **twnrq twnrq twnrq**, while that of Hillel, **tnrq tnraq twnrq** [i.e. once *plene* written; the same is also said in *Zebachim*, fol. 37, col. 2; comp. also the note in Michaelis, *Biblia Hebr.* ad loc.].
25. ^{<B002>} Leviticus 10:12, **rBdyj**; *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, **rmayw**
26. ^{<B050>} Leviticus 15:10, **acwhi**; *Nidda*, fol. 33, col. 1, **aḥnhw bytk**
27. ^{<B088>} Leviticus 18:18, **j Qtaḅ htj aḶ a, hVaw**; *Kiddushin*, fol. 50, col. 2, **al htwj a l a ḥḥa arq rmad j qt.**
28. ^{<B059>} Numbers 5:19, **bkiv; ab ma**; *Gittin*, fol. 60, *Yoma*, fol. 37, col. 2, **bkḥ al ma bkḥ ma.**
29. ^{<B086>} Numbers 18:16, **hDpṭædj A~Bmaewdp**; in the Talmud seems once to have stood **hl [mw** after **ḥdj**, at least this is intimated in the Tosaphoth, or additional commentary to the Talmud; *Erakin*, fol. 18, col. 2, where it is stated **whwnaxm al w Ēzh arqm rj a wnḥpj w**, i.e. “We sought for this reading, but could not find it.”
30. ^{<B087>} Deuteronomy 6:7, **ÚBkyb**; *Berakoth*, fol. 2, col. 1, **!bkḥb**, [thus likewise the Samar. and Vulg.].
31. ^{<B089>} Deuteronomy 6:9, **twzwm**; *Menachoth*, fol. 34, col. 1, R. Meir seems to have read **tzwm.**
32. ^{<B091>} Deuteronomy 6:20, **hm; to µkta**; Jerusalem Talmud, *Pesachim*, ch. 10:§ 4, **wntwa.**
33. ^{<B092>} Deuteronomy 23:1, **wybaē ānk**; *Berakoth*, fol. 21, col. 2, **ānk ta**
34. ^{<B097>} Deuteronomy 25:7, **ymbj hba; ab**; *Yebamoth*, fol. 106, col. 2, R. Ashai found R. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read **ymbj hba al w** (with **w** conjunctive). In correct codices, as is also evident from the Masorah, it is read **hba al** [some Hebr. MSS., 1 Samuel, the Syr., Ar., and Vulg. have **al w**].

35. ^{<6187>}Joshua 3:17 is quoted in *Berakoth*, fol. 54, col. 1, but instead of *hwhhy tyrb ^wrah* it reads *hwhy ^wra*, and *e ywgh l k wmt rça d[* the reading is *µwt d[µyh l k*
36. ^{<6101>}Joshua 10:11, *l aecjapna* *Berakoth*, fol. 54, col. 2, *l arçy ynb ynpm:*’
37. ^{<6147>}Joshua 14:7, 10. These two verses for the sake of brevity are thus contracted (see No. 1, *c*, above), *Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 1, *hnç µy[bra ^b bl k rmaq d (?) ^l nm ta l grl [nr b çdqm h db[db[hçm ytwa j l çb µynwmçw çmj ^b µwyh ykna ht[w /rah*, i.e. “It is said of Caleb, forty years old was I when Moses the servant of the Lord sent me from Kadesh-barnea to espy ont the land, and now I am this day fourscore and five years old.”
38. ^{<6116>}Joshua 16:6, *hl væñaiĩ*; *Zebachim*, fol. 118, col. 2, Rabbi Abdini bar-Chasa said, the Scripture says, *wl w hl yç tnat*, to which the commentary remarks, *arçmb wytaxm al w wytçpyj*, i.e. “I have sought but not found it in the Scripture, but I found in Joshua 16: *hl yç tnat wytaxm l ba*,
39. ^{<6151>}Judges 15:20; 16:31, where Samson is said to have judged Israel twenty years (^{<6161>}Judges 16:31). The Talm. Hieros. *Sotah*, fol. 17, “One passage reads, and he judged Israel forty years, and another that he judged Israel twenty years. R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it.” [On this passage R. Chayim, in his preface to the Rabbinic Bible, makes the following interpretation: “To me it appears, however, that there is no difficulty in it; for what the Talmud speaks about Samson refers to the Midrashic interpretation, viz. ‘Why is the verse, that he judged Israel twenty years, repeated twice? R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him (viz. Samson) twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it, and this makes forty years.’ Hence the Talmnd does not say, Why is it written in the text, The judged Israel forty years?’ but simply, The judged forty years,’ that is, according to the Midrash. And now everything comes out right when thou lookest into it.” We may well subscribe what Claudius Capellanus, in his *Mare Rabbinicum Infidum*, 1p. 350, note, says, “Tam insigne mendacium quod decept

doctissimum Buxtorfium facile corruet vel sola adductiole loci Talmudici.” This much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud, one codex at least had the reading, Judges 15: **hnc̄ μy[bra]**]

40. ^{<1024>}1 Samuel 2:24, **μyr b[eh]**; in *Sabbath*, fol. 55, col. 2, “is not the reading **μyr b[eh]**? Whereupon R. Hunnah ben R. Joshua said the reading is **μrb[m]** [Rashi remarks that the reading of the most trustworthy codices is **μyrb[m]**: *plene*, i.e. with a Yod after the Resh.]

41. ^{<1035>}2 Samuel 3:35, **twrbhl** ; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 20, col. 1, it is written **twrkhl** , but is read **twrbhl** [a number of MSS. read **twrkhl** ; comp. also the Diets. of Kimchi, *Lib. Rad.* s.v. **hrk**, and Menachen ben-Sarug, *Lex. Rad.* **rb** and **rk** (ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1854, p. 48, 109)].

42. ^{<1045>}2 Samuel 24:15, **rqBbimē aecyB[er]bd, h[er]hy[^]Tyid[wa] t[Ad[w];** *Yoena*, fol. 2, col. 2 , **μ[b rbd h ^tyw d[w]m t[d[w] rqbh ^m**

43. ^{<1073>}2 Kings 17:31, **zj b[ia]**; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 63, col. 2, **^j bn** [D. Kimchi also asserts to have seen the Nun (“) final, instead of the ^ *majuscular*, as written now].

44. ^{<1217>}2 Kings 23:17; in *Erakin*, fol. 33, col. 1, the whole verse is quoted with the exception of **htc̄[rca hl ah**.

45. ^{<2316>}Isaiah 38:16, **'ynge h[ui]**; *Aerakoth*, fol. 55, col. 1, **ynyj tw**

46. ^{<2405>}Isaiah 42:5, **μhyfww[ui]**; *Bereshith Rabba*, sect. 12, fol. 15, 3, **μhyfwwnw** [i.e. leaders].

47. ^{<2507>}Isaiah 58:7, **μL[it]aab**; Jerusalem Talmud, *Kethuboth*, ch. 11:§ 3, **μl [tt] a**.

48. ^{<2608>}Ezekiel 40:48; 47:1; *Erubin*, fol. 2, col. 1, **l a byakd tybh μl wa j tp**; but such a passage is not to be found in the Scriptures. [Tosaphoth remarks on this passage, “Such a passage is nowhere to be found, but we find written (40:48) **tybhi μl wa** and **tybhij tp**, (47:1).”]

49. ^{<3411>}Ezekiel 44:9, is quoted *Moed Katon*, fol. 5, col. 1, but with the addition **ynt rçl** after **yçdqm**.
50. ^{<3011>}Hosea 4:11, **vwt tçp** *pleine*; *Yoma*, fol. 76, col. 2, it is written **çryt** and read **çwryt**.
51. ^{<3016>}Amos 4:6, **yTæi; ynæ}µgwi** *lidda*, fol. 65, col. 1, **yt tn ykna µg**
52. ^{<3011>}Amos 8:11, **hny]yr bDææ** *Sabbath*, fol. 138, col. 2, **hwyr bD ta yr bD** is found in the ed. princeps, but later editions, Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Sept., Syriac, Vulg., Targum, read **r bD**].
53. ^{<3011>}Amos 9:11, . **tWbv]ta, yTæywi** *Berakoth*, fol. 28, col. 1 (ed. princeps), **tybç ta byçm ynnh** [Later ed. reads as in our text of the Bible.]
54. ^{<3012>}Micah 4:2, **µyæ** *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 2, **µym [i 55**.
^{<3120>}Zechariah 12:10, **yl a**; *Sukka*, fol. 52, col. 1, **wyl a** [forty codices have **wyl a** , and so many Jewish commentators].
56. ^{<3012>}Malachi 1:2, **bqçyiyl hæm** many editions of the Talmud have **yql am** for **yl ham**, but this is of no importance, since the ed. princeps, *Sanhedron*, fol. 82, col. 1, only quotes the first part of the verse till **hnw [w r [** .
57. ^{<3115>}Psalms 5:5, **Úrçy]ab hTai [vr, /pçAl ææb yKæ r**; *Chagiga*, fol. 12, col. 2, **al hTai [vr, /pçAl ææb [r; ÚrWçm Bæ rWgy**; But this does not stand in the Bible as Tosaphoth already remarked, **arqm hz ^ya** .
58. ^{<3110>}Psalms 16:10, **Úydysjæ** *Erubin*, fol. 19, col. 1; *Yomna*, fol. 87, col. 1 (in five eds. of the Talmud) read **dysj** [so likewise Sept., Syriac, Vulg. Jerome].
59. ^{<3111>}Psalms 56:11, **I Læa}hnyBir bD; I Læa}µyhææBæ r bD**; *Berakoth*, fol. 60, col. 1, **r bD I I ha hwhwb µyhl ab**
60. ^{<3121>}Psalms 68:21, **twaxwð twMl i** *Berakoth*, fol. S, col. 1, **twml w**

61. ^{<97B>} Psalm 95:5, **Wrxy;wydy;tvByw]** *Kethuboth*, fol. 5, col. 1, **wrxy bytkhw bytk wdy** ‘.
62. ^{<97C>} Psalm 97:7, **Wwj Jivta]** *Jerusalem Talmud, Edulyoth*, fol. 44, col. 1, **wwj tcy** [comp. Epistle to the Hebrews, 1:6, **προσκυνησάτωσαν, κ. τ. λ.**].
63. ^{<97D>} Psalm 127:5, **wtPyḥAta;** *Kiddushin*, fol. 30, col. 2, without **ta**.
64. ^{<97E>} Psalm 139:5, **hkPKi** *Chagiga*, fol. 12, col. 1, **!pk**.
65. ^{<97F>} Proverbs 8:13, **[r;taoc;** *Pesachim*, fol. 113, col. 2, **[r yanwç**
66. ^{<97G>} Proverbs 11:17, **dsḥ;çya;** *Taanlith*, fol. 11, col. 2, **çya dysj**
67. ^{<97H>} Proverbs 15:1, **byvḥe** *Berakoth*, fol. 17, col. 2, **byçm**.
68. ^{<97I>} Job 2:8, **dvçtḥḥ]** *Midrash Bereshith Iabba*, sect. 64 (towards the end), **rygthl** .
69. ^{<97J>} Job 13:4, **l l ḥ;** *Chullin.*, fol. 121, col. 1, **l yl ḥ**
70. ^{<97K>} Job 14:6, **ht[AyKa]** *Jerusalem Talmud, Berakoth*, ch. v, § 1, **hta yk** .
71. ^{<97L>} Job 36:5, **samyabw]ryBk l aA^h;** *Bel rakoth*, fol. 8, col. 2, **ḡt samy al rybk l a ^h**, without the Vav before **al** [It may be that the Talmud confounds this passage with ^{<97M>} Job 8:20, **ḡTAsimjæ ab l aA^h]**
72. ^{<97N>} Job 36:11, **WLkj]** *Sanhedrin*, fol. 108, col. 1, **wl by**.
73. ^{<97O>} Ruth 3:15, **ybae** *Midrash Ruth*, ad loc. **hbh bytk**.
74. ^{<97P>} Ecclesiastes 9:14, **ḡyl wçç]ḡydxm]** *Nedarim*, fol. 32, col. 2, **ḡymrj w ḡydxm** .
75. ^{<97Q>} Ecclesiastes 9:15, **ḡkj** ; *Vedarimn*, fol. 32, col. 2, **ḡkj w**.

76. ^{<1105>} Ecclesiastes 10:5, **axʿyʿ**; *Kethtuboth*, f(1. 62, col. 2; *Moed Katon*, fol. 18, col. 1; *Baba Mezia*, fol. 68, col. 1, **axwyç**.
77. ^{<1129>} Daniel 2:29, *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 2, where for **htnaʿnyw[r wql s** is written **!nwy[r wqyl s tna**.
78. ^{<1044>} Daniel 4:14, **ʿyvyʿpʿirmamʿ**; *Pesachim*, fol. 33, col. 1; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 38, col. 2, **ʿyçydyq rmambw** [some codices have also **rmambw**].
79. ^{<1068>} Daniel 6:18, **tyatyhw**; *Nidda*, fol. 69, col. 2, **tyatyhw**
80. ^{<1013>} Daniel 10:13, **µyrçhidhāi**; *Berakoth*, fol. 4, col. 2, **µyrçh ʿm dj a**.
81. ^{<1043>} Ezra 4:3, **Wnyhēal etyʿbi twob**; *Erakin*, fol. 5, col. 2, **wnyhl a tyb ta twnbl**.
82. ^{<1046>} Nehemiah 4:16, **hkal m]µ/Yhiv]rmv]nāal y]Lh**; *Mregil hkal ml µwyhw rmçml hl yl h but in *Berakoth*, fol. 2, col. 2, **hkal m** and **rmçm** are extant.*
83. ^{<1088>} Nehemiah 8:8, **µyhāah; triʿtB]rpSBi**; *Nedarim*, fo]. 37, col. 2, **µyhl ah trwt rpsb trwt**, so likewise the Sept., Vulg., Syr.].
84. ^{<1088>} Nehemiah 8:8, **µyhl ah**, *ibid.* **µyhl a**; but in *Megillah*, fol. 3, col. 1, **µyhl ah**.
85. ^{<1085>} Nehemiah 8:15, **tc[]**; *Sukka*, fol. 37, col. 1, **Wc[]y**ʿ.
86. ^{<1087>} Nehemiah 8:17, **l hQhAl k; WV[Ywi**; *Erakin*, fol. 32, col. 2, **j l wgh ynb wç[yw**; for **[Wvy** read **[çwyh**, *ibid.*
87. ^{<1087>} 1 Chronicles 3:17, **/nB]l ayTāiv]rSai hynkyanb**; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 37, col. 2, **l aytl ç wnb rysa hynky ynb wnb**
88. ^{<1040>} 1 Chronicles 4:10, **h[rmetycā]ym fādy; hty]hw**; *Temutrah*, fol. 16, col. 1, **yt[rm hç[w ydm[dy**.

89. ^{<B74>}1 Chronicles 5:24, $y[\text{ay}]\text{w}[\text{p}][\text{w}]$; *Baba Bathra*, fol. 123, col. 2, $y[\text{çy}]\text{w}[\text{r}]\text{p}[\text{j}]$ ‘.
90. ^{<B45>}1 Chronicles 16:5, . $[y\text{m}\text{æ}]\text{h}[\text{i}]$; *Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 2, $[y\text{m}\text{çh}]\text{l}$.
91. ^{<B79>}1 Chronicles 17:9, $/\text{tLb}[\text{i}]$; *Berakoth*, fol. 7, col. 2, $\text{wtw}[\text{l}]\text{kl}$
92. ^{<B38>}1 Chronicles 26:8, $\mu/\text{da},\text{rb}\text{ç}[\text{y}]\text{nb}[\text{i}]\text{naLa}[\text{A}]\text{K}$; *ibid.* fol. 64, col. 1, $\mu\text{wda}[\text{d}]\text{bw}[\text{h}]\text{l}[\text{a}]\text{I}[\text{k}]$ ‘.
93. ^{<B24>}1 Chronicles 26:24, $\text{hv}\text{m}[\text{A}^{\wedge}]\text{B}$,; *Babd Bathra*, fol. 110, col. 1, $\text{h}\text{ç}[\text{n}]\text{m}[\text{ }^{\wedge}]\text{b}$.
94. ^{<B73>}1 Chronicles 27:34, $\text{W}\text{hyn}[\text{B}]\text{A}^{\wedge}[\text{B}]$, $[\text{dy}/\text{hy}]$; *Berakoth*, fol. 3, col. 2, $[\text{dy}\text{w}\text{h}\text{y}[\text{ }^{\wedge}]\text{b}]\text{w}\text{hynb}$
95. ^{<B13>}2 Chronicles 31:13, $/\text{I}[\text{A}]\text{rt}[\text{y}]\text{w}$; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 103, col. 1, $\text{w}[\text{l}]\text{rtj}[\text{y}]\text{w}[\text{w}]\text{l}[\text{a}]\text{ }[\text{m}\text{çy}]\text{w}[\text{b}]\text{y}\text{tkd}[\text{y}]\text{am}$.

96. In fine, we will quote the following interesting passage. In the Jerusalem Talmud, *Taanith*, fol. 68, col. 1, we read the following: “Three codices [of the Pentatemuch] Were found in the court of the Temple, one of which had the reading $\text{w}/[\text{m}]$, the other $\text{y}\text{f}\text{w}\text{f}[\text{ç}]\text{i}$ and the third differed in the number of passages whereiin ayh is read with a Yod; thus in the one codex it was written $\text{ }^{\wedge}[\text{m}]$ *dwelling* [^{<B37>}Deuteronomy 33:27], while the other two codices had $\text{hn}/[\text{m}]$; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid. In the second codex, again, $\text{y}\text{f}\text{w}\text{f}[\text{ç}]\text{i}$ was found [in ^{<B211>}Exodus 24:11], while the other two codices had $\text{y}\text{r}\text{ç}[\text{i}]\text{A}[\text{t}]\text{a}$; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex, again, there were only nine passages which had ayh written with a Yod [as it is generally written awh , with a Vav], whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid.”

3. The different passages which we have presented here, and which might be yet increased to a great extent, do not justify us in presuming that the readings found in the Talmud were those of the Old-Testament codices of that time, and much less in the presumption that the readings of the Talmud

are to be preferred to those of our text, for the following reasons: 1. We have not as yet a critical edition of the Talmud; 2. The formulas ‘!k al ak arqt l a, i.e. “read not so, but so,” and trwsml ma çyw arqml ma çy, i.e. “there is a solid root for the reading of the text, and there is a solid root for the traditional pronunciation,” already indicate that these variations arose partly for the sake of allegory, partly for exegetical purposes. Thus Richard Simon, *Disquisit. Crit. de Variis Bibl. Edit.* cap. 3, p. 17, remarks on the formula!k al ak arqt l a, Cavendum est, ne ista loquendi formula quam frequenter in Talmude usurpant *ne legas sic sed sic ad lectionum varietatem trahatur. Lusus enim est allegoricus illis doctoribus admodum familiaris qui servata dictionum ut ita loquar substantia diversos unius ejusdemque vocis legendae modos pueriliter comminiscuntur.*” To illustrate this, the following may suffice. ^{<25413>} Isaiah 54:13, we read, “thy son,” **ËyaB**; but in *Berakoth*, fol. 64, we read, “Do not read **ËyaB**; ‘thy sons, but **ËyaB**’thy builders, thy wise, whereby it should be proved that ‘the wise build the peace in the world.’” *Sanhedrin*, fol. 37, col. 1, the word **wydgB**] “his raiment,” in ^{<1272>}Genesis 27:27, is read **wydgB** “his perfidious,” to prove thereby the perfidy of Jose ben-Joeser’s nephew. (For more such examples the reader is referred to G. Surenhusius **Βίβλος καταλλαγής**, p; 59 sq. [Amst. 1713].) As to the second formula, **wk ma çy** Buxtorf (*De Punct. Antiq.* p. 96, 103-110) makes the following correct remark: “Usus vero hujus axiomatis Talmudici hic est. Cum de re seu quaestione aliqua disputant ac in diversas sententias abeunt, saepe accidit ut uterque dissentientium fundamentum suum in uno eodemque Scripturse loco, imo et in eadem voce ponat: unus sc. in communi et recepta lectione, alter in lectione mystica et allegorica, eadem illa voce sed allis vocalibus animata vel aliter explicata. Prior dicit: *est mater lectionis*, q. d.: mea sententia innititur communi et receptae lectioni, cum punctis et vocalibus propriis, *sensui literali*. Alter dicit: *est zmater lectionis*, h. e. ego meam sententiam elicio et educo ex sensu mystico et lectione vel expositione aliqua per traditionem accepta, qua didici, hanc vocem pro infinita fecunditate legis sic quoque posse legi et explicari.” “To illustrate this, the following may suffice: In ^{<1216>}Exodus 12:46 we read concerning the Passover, “In one house shall it be eaten,” **l kaye**But in the Talmud, *Pesachim*, fol. 86, col. 2, two inferences are deduced from this passage. R. Jehudah maintains that the man who partakes of the Passover, *he* must eat it (**l kaye**) in one place (**dj a tybb**), but that the Passover itself may be

divided, and a part of it may be eaten by another company in another place; basing his argument upon the *twrws*m, viz.: *l k̄ayche* must eat it at one place. Whereas R. Simeon maintains that the Passover itself must be eaten (*l k̄ayē* in one place (*dj a tybb*), and cannot be divided between two different companies in different places, though the man himself, after having eaten his Passover at home, may go to another place and partake of another company's Passover; basing his argument upon the *arqm* viz. *l k̄ayē* it must be eaten in one place. To the same category belongs the rule that *μy[bc]* (^{
}Leviticus 12:5) is to be read *μy[βov]* two weeks, and not *μy[βv]* seven days; and that *bl j b* (^{
}Leviticus 23:19) is to be pronounced *bl j βi* in the milk, and not *bl j B* in the fat.

4. Literature. — Compare Pesaro, Aaron di, *twdl wt ṛha ṛhatyb* (Frankf. ad Viadr. fol.), which also gives all the passages found in the Midrashim and Sohar; Surenhusius *Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς* (Amsterd. 1713); Weisse, in *Bechinath ha-Olsam* (ed. Stern, Vienna, 1847), praef. p. xix adn.; Fromman, *Oputscula Philologica*, i, 146; Schorr, in *He-chaluz* (Lemberg), i, 97-116; ii, 56; Geiger, in *Judische Zeitschrift*, iv (1866), p. 43, 99 sq., 165-171; S. Rosenfeld, *hrwth tqj rps* (Vilnae, 1866); Buxtorf filius, *Anti-critica*, pt. ii, cap. 21:p. 808; Strack, *Prolegomena Critica* (Lips. 1873), p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

Quotidian

(*secta chori*), payment for duties performed in choir and personal attendance at divine service. The praesentarius paid it in foreign cathedrals.

Quotidiana Oratio

(*daily prayer*) is the name sometimes applied to the Lord's Prayer on account of its daily use by Christians. *SEE LORDS PRAYER.*

Qwanti

the god of war among the Chinese. Magnificent processions are held in honor of this deity. Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

R

Raa

one of the principal deities of the Polynesian, or South-Sea Islanders. The third order of divinities appears to have consisted of the descendants of Raa. These were numerous and varied in their character, some being gods of war and others of medicine.

Raah

SEE GLEDE.

Ra'amah

[some *Raua'nmah*] (Heb. *Ramah'*, *hm[ʔi]* once *Rama'*, *am[ʔi]* 1 Chronicles i, 9), a *shuddering*, hence a horse's *mane*, as in ^{<18319>}Job 39:19; Sept. ^ϛΡεγμά, but ^ϛΡαμμα [v.r. ^ϛΡαγμά in ^{<2722>}Ezekiel 27:22; Vulg. *Regma* and *Reema*), the fourth son of Cush, and the father of Sheba and Dedan (^{<1007>}Genesis 10:7; 1 Chronicles i, 9), B.C. post 2513. It appears that the descendants of Cush colonized a large part of the interior of Africa, entering that great continent probably by the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb. A section of the family, however, under their immediate progenitor, Raamah, settled along the eastern shores of the Arabian peninsula. There they founded nations which afterwards became celebrated, taking their names from Raamah's two sons, Sheba and Dedan. SEE CUSH. Though Sheba and Dedan became nations of greater importance and notoriety, yet the name Raamah did not wholly disappear from ancient history. Ezekiel, in enumerating the distinguished traders in the markets of Tyre, says, "The merchants of Sheba and *Raamah*, they were thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious stones, and gold" (27:22). The eastern provinces of Arabia were famed in all ages for their spices. The position of Sheba (q.v.) is well known, and Raamah must have been near it.

There can be little doubt that in the classical name *Regina* (^ϛΡεγμά of Ptolemy, 6:7, and ^ϛΡήγμα of Steph. Byzantium), which is identical with the Sept. equivalent for Raamah, we have a memorial of the Old-Test.

patriarch and of the country he colonized. The town of Regma was situated on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf, on the northern side of the long promontory which separates it from the ocean. It is interesting to note that on the southern side of the promontory, a few miles distant, was the town called Dadena, evidently identical with Dedan (q.v.). Around Regina Ptolemy locates an Arab tribe of the Anariti (*Geog.* 6:7). Pliny appears to call them Epimaranitae (vi, 26), which, according to Forster (*Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 64), is just an anagrammatic form of *Ramanitoe*, the descendants of *Raamah* — an opinion not improbable. Forster traces the migrations of the nation from Regma along the eastern shores of Arabia to the mountains of Yemen, where he finds them in conjunction with the family of Sheba (*ibid.* p. 66-71). There the mention of the *Ramanitoe* tribe by Strabo, in connection with the expedition of Gallus (xvi, p. 781), seems to corroborate the view of Forster. Of Sheba, the other son of Raamah, there has been found a trace in a ruined city so named (*Sheba*) on the island of Awl (Marasid, s.v.), belonging to the province of Arabia called El-Bahreyn, on the shores of the gulf. **SEE SHEBA**. Be this as it may, however, there can be no doubt that the original settlements of the descendants of Raamah were upon the south-western shores of the Persian gulf. Probably, like most of their brethren, while retaining a permanent nucleus, they wandered with their flocks, herds. and merchandise far and wide over Arabia. For the different views entertained regarding Raamah, see Bochart (*Phaleg.* 4:5) and Michaelis (*Spicileg.* i, 193). The town mentioned by Niebuhr called *Reymeh* (*Descr. de l'Arabie*) cannot, on etymnological grounds, be connected with Raamah, as it wants an equivalent for the V: nor can we suppose that it is to be probably traced three days' journey from San'a, the capital of Yemen.

Raami' ah

(Heb. *Raamyah'*, **hym** **ri** *thundesr of Jehovah*; Sept. **Ῥεελμό** [v. r. **Νααμία**), one of the chief Israelites who returned from exile with Zerubbabel (^{<1007>}Nehemiah 7:7), B.C. 445. In the parallel list (^{<1502>}Ezra 2:2) he is called REELIAH, and the Greek equivalent of the name in the Sept. of Nehemiah appears to have arisen from a confusion of the two readings, unless, as Bullrington (*Geneal.* ii, 68) suggests, **Ῥεελμό** is an error of the copyist for **Ῥεελαία**, the-uncial letters *ai* having been mistaken for *m*. In 1 Esdras 5:2 the name appears as REESALAS.

Raam'ses

(~~am~~)Exodus 1:10). *SEE RAMSES.*

Rab

SEE RABBI; SEE RABBINISM.

Rab

properly ABBA ARIKHA, a noted Jewish teacher, was born at Kaphri, a small place between Sura and Nehardea, in Babylon, about A.D. 170. In early life he went in quest of knowledge into Palestine, and became one of the most favorite scholars of Jehudah the Holy (q.v.). On his return to the East he labored, some say for thirty years (between A.D. 188 and 219!, at Nehardea as *meturgeman*, or *amrats*, under Shela and Samuel; and at the close of that relationship, he entered upon the higher sphere of school rector and judge at Sura (or Sora), where he exercised those offices till the end of his life. "In this college, which was called *LeRab* (**brb**), being an abbreviation of *Beth-Rab* (**brtyb**), *the school of Rab*, the disciples assembled two months in the year—viz. *Adar* and *Elul* — in autumn and spring, for which they were denominated *Yarche Kullah* (**yj ry hl k**), *the months of assembly*; and into it all the people were admitted a whole week before each principal festival, when this distinguished luminary delivered expository lectures for the benefit of the nation at large. So eager were the people to hear him, and so great were the crowds, that many could find no house accommodation, and were obliged to take up their abode in the open air on the banks of the Sora River (*Succa*, 26 a). These festival discourses were denominated *rigle* (**yl gr**), and during the time in which they were delivered all courts of justice were closed (*Baba Kamna*, 113 a)." After holding the presidency for about twenty-eight years, Rab died in A.D. 247, lamented by the whole nation. The esteem in which he was held during his lifetime is best expressed in the title "Rab," i.e. teacher, by which they called him, just as Jehudah the Holy was called "Rabbi" or "Rabbenu" in Palestine. One of Rab's main works was the systematic exposition of the Mishna (q.v.), a copy of which, as revised and somewhat amended by Rab himself, in his later years, he had brought from Palestine. This second recension of the Slishna became the authorized or canonical form of that work, and, under the Aramaic name of *Matnita ce Be-Rab*, "the Mishna of the School of Rab," constituted the *text* of the Babylonian Talmud. But,

besides his labors as an oral expositor on the Mishna, Rab was the author of two important works which greatly contributed to the advancement of Biblical exegesis. These were, *Siphra* or *Siohras de Be-Rab*, “the Book of the School of Rab” (**brybd arps**), a Midrash on Leviticus; and *Siphre* or *Siphre de Be-Rab* (**brybd yrps**), a similar commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy. These works have, indeed, been sometimes attributed to other authors, but the greatest weight of authority assigns them to the doctor of Sura. An analysis of these works is given in the article MIDRASH, where also some of the editions are mentioned. The best edition of the *Siphra* is that of M. L. Malbim, with the commentary *Hatora vehamitzva* (Bucharest. 1860), and that of Weiss (Vienna, 1862); the *Siphre* has been best edited by M. Friedmann (ibid. 1864). Rab also enriched the present *Seder Tephiloth*, or *Order of Common Prayers*, and some of the finest prayers and thanksgivings are the production of his pen. See Grhitz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4:214, 232, 279, 289, 293; Fiurst, *Kultur- u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien*, p. 33 sq.; id. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3, 125 sq.; Etheridge, *Introdulction to Hebrez Literature*, p. 157 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, art. “Iab;” De Rossi, *Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 272 sq.; Joel, *Etwas uber die Bucher Sifra und Sifre* (Breslau, 1873); but above all, the excellent monograph by Milhlfelder, *Rab: ein Lebensbild zur Geschichte des Talliuds* (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

Rabad

(**dbar**), or ABRAHAM IBN-DAUD, for which the acrostic stands, a noted rabbi, was born at Toledo about 1110, and died as a martyr 1180. He was one of the most renowned Talmudists of his time, highly esteemed for his historical knowledge. He is the author of the **hl BQhisa** (*The Successions of Tradition*), written in the form of annals, giving the history of the world from Adam to his own time (1161), and showing the uninterrupted chain of tradition to his day, against the opinion of the Karaites, who denied all tradition. As a supplement to this chronicle, Ibn-Daud wrote a succinct history of the Roman empire, from its foundation by Romulus till the West Gothic king Reccared, entitled *Memoirs of the Events of Rome* (**ymwr yrbd ^wrkg**), and the *History of the Jewish Kings during the Second Temple* (**ynç tybb l arçy ykl m yrbd**). These histories were first published, together with the *Seder Olam*, in Mantua (1513), then in Venice

(1545), and Basle (1580); the *Sepher Ha-kabbalah* by itself, with the *Seder Olam Rabba and Sutta* (Cracow, 1820), and with a Latin translation by Gilbert Genebrard (Paris, 1572). He also wrote a work in Arabic, *Akida Rafina*; in Hebrew, *Emunah Ramah* (ed. Well, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1857), on the elements of nature and their capability of leading to elements of religious faith; on these elements of faith, and on the medicine for the soul in its infirmities. He also wrote *Astronomical Notices* and *Replies* to Abn-Alpha-rag on the section of the law named the "Journeyings," i.e. Numbers 33 etc. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 7 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 6:176183, 212; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, ii. 425; Dessauer, *Gesch. der Juden*, p. 295; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten*, p. 70 sq.; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain*, p. 60; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 193; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 251; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 420, 427; Guggenheimer, *Die Religionsphilosophie des R. Abr. ben-David ha-Levi* (Augsburg, 1860); Levita, *Massoreth ha-Massoreth* (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1867), p. 108. (B. P.)

Rabanus Maurus

SEE RHABANUS.

Rabardeau, Michel

a French Jesuit, was born at Orleans in 1572, and became a member of the order in 1595. He had enjoyed the very best educational facilities, and was therefore employed by the Society in its schools. He taught philosophy and moral theology, and became successively rector of Bourges and of Amiens. He died at Paris in 1649. He is celebrated especially for his mastery of casuistry and his intimate knowledge of the canon law. In the domain of the latter he displayed his power in 1640, when Hersaut the Oratorian sought a schism in the Church of France by his work *Optati Galli de Cavendo Schismate*, after cardinal Richelieu had attempted the assumption of the patriarchate. Rabardeau, in his *Optatus Gallus Benigno Janu Sectus* (Paris, 1641, 4to), defended the cardinal, and tried to prove that such an assumption bore in it no trace of a schism, as the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople in nowise interfered with the power of the Roman papacy and its supreme authority. Of course, at Rome the book was displeasing, and was put into the *Index*. See Sotwell, *Bibl. Scriptor. Soc. Jesu.* — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rabat

is a linen neck-collar worn by ecclesiastics.

Rabaudy, Bernard De,

a French theologian, was born in 1681, at Toulouse, of an ancient noble family. At an early age he took the monastic vow with the Dominicans, and, after having completed his education, he taught at Limoges and in the University of Toulouse. In 1706 he was nominated superintendent of the order in France, and in 1716 was made successor to the general of the order in a professorship at Toulouse. He died there Nov. 3, 1731. He wrote, *Exercitationes Theologice* (Toul. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo), and *Questiones de Deo Uno* (ibid. 1718, 8vo). See }chard, *Bibl. Script. Ord. Prædicat.* vol. ii. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rabaut, Paul,

a French Protestant divine, who was a martyr to the cause of true Christianity in France, was born at Bedarieux, near Montpellier, in 1718. He was educated at the seminary in Lausanne for the holy office of the ministry, and became one of the “Preachers of the Desert,” among whom he soon ranked as first in many respects. In 1743 he was made pastor of the Reformed Church at Nismes, and there became the leader of French Protestantism. This was a time of persecution indeed. The government of Louis XV had taken up anew the task of rooting out the heretical doctrines which had flourished their banner in the face of the very man who had given authority to his government by saying “*L’etat c’est moi.*” In spite of allopposition, and in the face of a host of plotting enemies, Rabaut maintained his position, and in 1785 he was even emerited. But in 1793, when the great Revolution succeeded, he was arrested as a traitor, and only gained his freedom in 1794 by the reversal of the 9th Thermidor. He died shortly after (Sept. 25, 1794). Rabaut took part in the Reform National Synod of 1744, and was presiding officer of that in 1763; and although his heterodox views on many important points made him a pronounced Chiliast in doctrine and an Episcopalian in government, he was yet so greatly revered for his fortitude, consistency, frankness, and devotion to Protestantism that his leadership was never rejected, but always gladly accepted by the Huguenot successors. He was not a great man. His education was moderate, his power in the pulpit ordinary. It was his sterling qualities of character that made him a leader in the Israel of

France. His eldest son, Paul, also called St. Etienne, who was born in 1743, and was both preacher and lawyer, distinguished himself as a leader of the Revolution, to which both he and his wife fell martyrs. It was his influence that carried through the National Council religious equality for all France. His novel *Triomphe de l'intolérance* (Lond. 1779; republished at Paris in 1820 and 1826 under the title *Le Vieux Cevenol*) is important for the history of French Protestantism. Another son (the second), Antoine R. — Pommier, who was born Oct. 24, 1744, was also a preacher, and likewise distinguished himself in the Revolution. He finally entered the civil service, but in 1815 he was obliged to quit France on account of his having voted for the execution of Louis XVI, and was only allowed to return in 1818. He died at Paris in 1820. He published *Anuictaire Ecclesiastique, a l'Usaye des trois Seances sur P. R. et les Prot. Francais au XVIIIe Siele* (Lausanne, 1859). See *New York Nation*, 18:267; *London Academy*, Aug. 1, 1874, p. 119; De Felice, *Hist. of the French Protestants*, p. 416, 451,462; Register, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838-47; Smith, *Hist. of the Huguenots*; Bridel, *Sketches of Paul Rabaut and the French Protestants of the 18th Century* (transl. from the French. with an Appendix containing portions of Paul Rabaut's writings now first published [Lond. 1861, 12mo]). (J. H. W.)

Rab'bah

(Heb. *Rabbah'*, **hBri**), the name of several ancient places both east and west of the Jordan, although it appears in this form in connection with only two in the A. V. The root is *urob*, meaning *much*, and hence *great*, whether in size or importance (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1254; Furst, *Handwörterb.* ii, 347). The word survives in Arabic as a common appellative, and is also in use as the name of places — e.g. *Rabba*, on the east of the Dead Sea; *Rabhah*, a temple in the tribe of Medshidj (Freitag, 2, 107 a); and perhaps also *Rabaut*, in Morocco. In the following account we chiefly follow the usual Biblical and archaeological authorities, with additions from other sources. **SEE RABBI.**

1. A very strong place on the east of Jordan, which, when its name is first introduced in the sacred records, was the chief city of the Ammonites. In five passages (^{<RB1>}Deuteronomy 3:11; ^{<1026>}2 Samuel 12:26; 17:27; ^{<440>}Jeremiah 49:2; Ezra 21:20) it is styled at length **^/M[iynB]tBri** *Rabbdth-bene-Ammon*, A. V. "Rabbath of the Ammonites," or "of the children of Ammon;" but elsewhere (^{<6325>}Joshua 13:25; ^{<1010>}2 Samuel 11:1;

12:27, 29; ^{<300>}1 Chronicles 20:1; ^{<240>}Jeremiah 49:3; Ezra 25:5; ^{<300>}Amos 1:14) simply “Rabbah.” The Sept. generally has ῥαββάθ, but in some MSS. occasionally ῥαβάθ, or ἡ ῥαββά. In ^{<085>}Deuteronomy 3:5 it is τῆ ἄκρα τῶν υἱῶν ῥαμμών in both MSS. In ^{<035>}Joshua 13:25 the Vat. has ῥαββα ἡ ἐστὶν κατὰ πρόσωπον ῥαράδ, where the first and last words of the sentence seem to have changed places. Other various readings likewise occur.

Rabbah appears in the sacred records as the single city of the Ammonites; at least no other bears any distinctive name, a fact which contrasts strongly with the abundant details of the city life of the Moabites. Whether it was originally, as some conjecture, the Ham of which the Zuzim were dispossessed by Chedorlaomer (^{<045>}Genesis 14:5), will probably remain forever a conjecture. The statement of Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. ‘Ajucav) that it was originally a city of the Rephaim implies that it was the Ashteroth Karnaim of Genesis 14. In agreement with this is the fact that it was in later times known as *Astarte* (Steph. Byz. quoted by Ritter, p. 1155). In this case, the dual ending of Karnaim may point, as some have conjectured in *Jerushalaim*, to the double nature of the city — a lower town and a citadel. When first named it is in the hands of the Ammonites, and is mentioned as containing the bedstead of the giant Og (^{<081>}Deuteronomy 3:11), possibly the trophy of some successful war against the more ancient Rephaim. With the people of Lot, their kinsmen the Israelites had no quarrel, and Rabbath-of-the-children-of-Ammon remained to all appearance unmolested during the first period of the Israelitish occupation. It was not included in the territory of the tribes east of Jordan; the border of Gad stops at “Aroer, which faces Rabbah” (^{<035>}Joshua 13:25). The attacks of the Bene-Ammon on Israel, however, brought these peaceful relations to an end. Saul must have had occupation enough on the west of Jordan in attacking and repelling the Philistines and in pursuing David through the woods and ravines of Judah to prevent his crossing the river, unless on such special occasions as the relief of Jabesh. At any rate, we never hear of his having penetrated so far in that direction as Rabbah. But David’s armies were often engaged against both Moab and Ammon. His first Ammonitish campaign appears to have occurred early in his reign. A part of the army, under Abishai, was sent as far as Rabbah to keep the Ammonites in check (^{<000>}2 Samuel 10:10, 14), but the main force under Joab remained at Medeba (^{<007>}1 Chronicles 19:7). The following year was occupied in the great expedition by David in person against the Syrians at Helam, wherever

that may have been (³⁰⁰¹⁵2 Samuel 10:1519). After their defeat the Ammonitish war was resumed, and this time Rabbah was made the main point of attack (11:1). Joab took the command, and was followed by the whole of the army. The expedition included Ephraim and Benjamin, as well as the king's own tribe (ver. 11), the "king's slaves" (ver. 1, 17, 24), probably David's immediate body-guard, and the thirty-seven chief captains. Uriah was certainly there, and, if a not improbable Jewish tradition may be adopted, Ittai the Gittite was there also. *SEE ITTAI*. The ark accompanied the camp (ver. 11), the only time that we hear of its doing so, except that memorable battle with the Philistines, when its capture caused the death of the Eli-priest. On a former occasion (⁰⁸¹⁰⁵Numbers 31:6) the "holy things" only are specified—an expression which hardly seems to include the ark. David alone, to his cost, remained in Jerusalem. The country was wasted, and the roving Ammonites were driven with all their property (xii, 30) into their single stronghold, as the Bedouin Kenites were driven from their tents inside the walls of Jerusalem when Judah was overrun by the Chanaanans. *SEE RECHABITE*, The siege must have lasted nearly, if not quite, two years; since during its progress David formed his connection with Bathsheba, and the two children, that which died and Solomon, were successively born. The sallies of the Ammonites appear to have formed a main feature of the siege (³⁰¹¹⁷2 Samuel 11:17, etc.). At the end of that time Joab succeeded in capturing a portion of the place — the "city of waters," that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream which rises in and still flows through it. The fact (which seems undoubted) that the source of the stream was within the lower city, explains its having held out for so long. It was also called the "royal city" (^{hkwll Mhiry}), perhaps from its connection with Molech or Milcom — "the king" more probably from its containing the palace of Hanun and Nahash. But the citadel, which rises abruptly on the north side of the lower town, a place of very great strength, still remained to be taken, and the honor of this capture, Joab (with that devotion to David which runs like a bright thread through the dark web of his character) insists on reserving for the king. "I have fought," writes he to his uncle, then living at ease in the harem at Jerusalem, in all the satisfaction of the birth of Solomon — "I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters; but the citadel still remains: now, therefore, gather the rest of the people together and come; put yourself at the head of the whole army, renew the assault against the citadel, take it. and thus finish the siege which I have carried so far," and then he ends with a rough

banter (comp. ^{<1006>}2 Samuel 19:6) — half jest, half earnest — “lest I take the city and in future it go under my name.” The waters of the lower city once in the hands of the besiegers, the fate of the citadel was certain, for that fortress possessed in itself (as we learn from the invaluable notice of Josephus, *Ant.* 7:7, 5) but one well of limited supply, quite inadequate to the throng which crowded its walls. The provisions also were at last exhausted, and shortly after David’s arrival the fortress was taken, and its inmates, with a very great booty, and the idol of Molech, with all its costly adornments, fell into the hands of David. We are not told whether the city was demolished or whether David was satisfied with the slaughter of its inmates. In the time of Amos, two centuries and a half later, it had again a “wall” and “palaces,” and was still the sanctuary of Molech” — “the king” (^{<3000>}Amos 1:14). So it was also at the date of the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 49:2, 3), when its dependent towns (“daughters”) are mentioned, and when it is named in such terms as imply that it was of equal importance with Jerusalem (Ezra 21:20). At Rabbah, no doubt Baalis, king of the Bene-Ammon (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 40:14), held such court as he could muster, and within its walls was plotted the attack of Ishmael which cost Gedaliah his life and drove Jeremiah into Egypt. The denunciations of the prophets just named may have been fulfilled either at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or five years afterwards, when the Assyrian armies overran the country east of Jordan on their road to Egypt (Josephus, *Ant.* 10:9, 7). See Jerome, *on Amos* 1:41.

In the period between the Old and New Testaments, Rabbath-Ammon appears to have been a place of much importance and the scene of many contests. The natural advantages of position and water supply, which had always distinguished it, still made it an important citadel by turns to each side during the contentions which raged so long over the whole of the district. It lay on the road between Heshbon and Bosra, and was the last place at which a stock of water could be obtained for the journey across the desert; while, as it stood on the confines of the richer and more civilized country, it formed an important garrison station for repelling the incursions of the wild tribes of the desert. From Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 285-247) it received the name of *Philadelphia* (Jerome, *on Ezra* 25:1), and under this name it is often mentioned by Greek and Roman writers (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 16; Ptolemy, *Geog.* v, 15), by Josephus (*War*, i, 6, 3; i, 19, 5; ii, 18, 1), and upon Roman coins (Eckhel, iii, 351; Muinet, v, 335), as a city of Arabia, Coele-Syria, or Decapolis. The district either then

or subsequently was called Philadelphene (Josephus, *War* iii, 3, 3), or Arabia Philadelphensis (Epiphanius, in Ritter, *Syriev*, p. 1155). In B.C. 218 it was taken from the then Ptolemy (Philopator) by Antiochus the Great, after a long and obstinate resistance from the besieged in the citadel. A communication with the spring in the lower town had been made since (possibly in consequence of) David's siege, by a long secret subterranean passage, and had not this been discovered to Antiochus by a prisoner, the citadel might have been enabled to hold out (Polybius, v, 17). During the struggle between Antiochus the Pious (Sidetes) and Ptolemy, the son-in-law of Simon Maccabaeus (B.C. cir. 134), it is mentioned as being governed by a tyrant named Cotylas (*Ant.* 13:8, 1). Its ancient name, though under a cloud, was still used; it is mentioned by Polybius (v, 71) under the hardly altered form of *Rabbatamana* (**Ραββατάμωνα**). About B.C. 65 we hear of it as in the hands of Aretas (one of the Arab chiefs of that name), who retired thither from Judaea when menaced by Scaurus, Pompey's general (Josephus, *War*, i, 6, 3). The Arabs probably held it till the year B.C. 30, when they were attacked there by Herod the Great. But the account of Josephus (*War*, i, 19. 5, 6) seems to imply that the city was not then inhabited, and that although the citadel formed the main point of the combat, yet that it was only occupied on the instant. The water communication above alluded to also appears not to have been then in existence, for the people who occupied the citadel quickly surrendered from thirst, and the whole affair was over in six days.

Picture for Rabbah (1)

At the Christian aera Philadelphia formed the eastern limit of the region of Permea (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 3). It was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and as far down as the 4th century was esteemed one of the most remarkable and strongest cities of the whole of Ccele-Syria (Eusebius, *Onomast.*; Ammianus Marc. in Ritter, p. 1157). Its magnificent theatre (said to be the largest in Syria), temples, odeon, mausoleum, and other public buildings were probably erected during the 2d and 3d centuries, like those of Jerash, which they resemble in style, though their scale and design are grander (Lindsay). Among the ruins of an "immense temple" on the citadel hill, Mr. Tipping saw some prostrate columns five feet in diameter. Its coins are extant, some bearing the figure of Astarte, some the word Herakleion, implying a worship of Hercules, probably the continuation of that of Molech or Milcom. From Stephanus of Byzantium we learn that it was also called Astarte, doubtless from its containing a temple of that

goddess. Justin Martyr, a native of Shechem, writing about A.D. 140, speaks of the city as containing a multitude of Ammonites (*Dict. with Trypho*), though it would probably not be safe to interpret this too strictly.

Picture for Rabbah (2)

Philadelphia became the seat of a Christian bishop, and was one of the nineteen sees of “Paltestina tertia” which were subordinate to Bostra (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 228). The church still remains “in excellent preservation” with its lofty steeple (lord Lindsay). Some of the bishops appear to have signed under the title of *Bakatha*; which Bakatha is by Epiphanius (himself a native of Palestine) mentioned in such a manner as to imply that it was but another name for Philadelphia, derived from an Arab tribe in whose possession it was at that time (A.D. cir. 400). But this is doubtful (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 612; Ritter, p. 1157).

Picture for Rabbah (3)

When the Moslems conquered Syria, they found the city in ruins (Abulfeda inl Ritter, p. 1158; and in note to lord Lindsay); and in ruins remarkable for their extent and desolation even for Syria, the “land of ruins,” it still remains. The ancient name has been preserved among the natives of the country. Abulfeda calls it *Amman* (*Tab. Syr.* p. 19), and by that name it is still known. The prophet Ezekiel foretold that Rabbah should become “a stable for camels,” and the country “a couching-place for flocks” (~~26~~ Ezekiel 25:5). This has been literally fulfilled, and Burckhardt actually found that a party of Arabs had stabled their camels among the ruins of Rabbah. Too much stress has, however, been laid upon this minute point by Dr. Keith and others (*Evidence from Prophecy*, p. 150). What the prophet meant to say was that Ammon and its chief city should be desolate; and he expressed it by reference to facts which would certainly occur in any forsaken site in the borders of Arabia; and which are now constantly occurring not in Rabbah only, but in many other places. Rabbah lies about twenty-two miles from the Jordan at the eastern apex of a triangle, of which Heshbon and es-Salt form respectively the southern and northern points. It is about fourteen miles from the former and twelve from the latter. Jerash is due north, more than twenty miles distant in a straight line, and thirty-five by the usual road (Lindsay, p. 278). It lies in a valley which is a branch, or perhaps the main course, of the Wady Zerka, usually identified with the Jabbok. The *Moiel-Amman*, or water of Amman, a mere streamlet, rises within the basin which contains the ruins of the town.

The main valley is a winter torrent, but appears to be perennial, and contains a quantity of fish, by one observer said to be trout (see Burckhardt, p. 358; G. Robinson, 2, 174; “a perfect fish-pond,” Tipping). The stream runs from west to east, and north of it is the citadel on its isolated hill. The public buildings are said to be Roman, in general character like those at Jerash, except the citadel, which is described as of large square stones put together without cement, and which is probably more ancient than the rest. Among the ruins are chiefly noticeable a spacious church, built with large stones, and having a steeple; a temple, with part of the side walls and a niche in the back wall remaining; a curved wall along the water-side, with many niches, and in front of it a row of large columns, four of which remain, though without capitals; a high-arched bridge over the river, still perfect, apparently the only one that had existed. The citadel on the hill, a structure of immense strength, and the theatre have been referred to above. ‘The remains of private houses scattered on both sides of the stream are very extensive. They have been visited, and described in more or less detail, by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 357-360), Seetzen (*Reisen*, i, 396; 4:212214), Irby (June 14), Buckingham (*E. Syria*, p. 68-82), lord Lindsay (5th ed. p. 278-284), G. Robinson (ii, 172178), lord Claud Hamilton (in Keith, *Evid. of Proph.* ch. vi), De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, i, 387 sq.), Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 544 sq.), Porter (*Handb. of Palest.* p. 302), Bitdeker (*Palastina*, p. 319), and the Rev. A. E. Northern, in the *Quart. Statement* of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” April, 1872, p. 57 sq., where a plan is given.

2. (hBrh; with the definite article; Sept. $\Sigma\omega\theta\eta\beta\alpha$ v. r. Ἀρεββα ; Vulg. *Aebba*) a city of Judah, named, with Kirjath-jearim, in ⁽⁶¹⁰⁸⁾Joshua 15:60 only. It lay among the group of towns situated to the west of Jerusalem, on the northern border of the tribe of Judah (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). It is probably only an epithet for Jerusalem itself, which otherwise would not appear in the list. **SEE JUDAH** (*Tribe of*).

3. In one passage (⁽⁶¹⁰⁸⁾Joshua 11:8) ZIDON is mentioned with the affix *Rabbah-Zidon-rabbah*. This is preserved in the margin of the A. V., though in the text it is translated “great Zidon.”

4. Although there is no trace of the fact in the Bible there can be little doubt that the name of Rabbah was also attached in Biblical times to the chief city of Moab. Its Biblical name is “Ar,” but we have the testimony of Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. Moab) that in the 4th century it possessed the

special title of Rabbath-Moab, or, as it appears in the corrupted orthography of Stephanus of Byzantium, the coins, and the Ecclesiastical Lists, *Rabathmoba*. *Rabbathmoma*. and *Ratba* or *Robba Moabitis* (Reland, *Palest.* p. 226, 957; Seetzen, *Reisen*, 4:227; — titter, p. 1220). This name was for a time displaced by *Areopolis*, in the same manner that Rabbath-Ammon had been by Philadelphia: these, however, were but the names imposed by the temporary masters of the country, and employed by them in their official documents; and when they passed away, the original names, which had never lost their place in the mouths of the common people, reappeared, and *Rabba*, like *Ammam*, still remains to testify to the ancient appellation. Rabba lies on the highlands at the southeast quarter of the Dead Sea, between Kerak and Jibel Shihan. Its ruins, which are unimportant, are described by Burckhardt (July 15), Seetzen (*Reisel*, i, 411), De Saulcy (Jan. 18), and Porter (*Handb. for Palestine*, p. 297 sq.). **SEE AN.**

Rab'bath Of The Children Of Ammon,

and OF THE AMMONITES. (The former is the more accurate, the Hebrew being in both cases; רַבַּת [iyne]t Bir; Sept. ἡ ἄκρα τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμών, Ραββαθ υἱῶν Ἀμμών; Vulg. *Rabbath filiorum Ammon*.) This is the full appellation of the place commonly given as RABBAH **SEE RABBAH** (q.v.). It occurs only in ^{<RB>}Deuteronomy 3:11 and ^{<EZ>}Ezekiel 21:20. The *th* is merely the Hebrew “construct state,” or mode of connecting a word ending in *ah* with one following it. **SEE GIBEATH; SEE KIRJATH; SEE RAMATH**, etc.

Rabbenu Gershom

or, more properly, *Rabbi* GERSHOM BEN-JEHUDA, the reputed founder of the Franco-German Rabbinical school, in which the studies of that of Babylonia were earnestly revived, was born about 960, and died in 1028. He was called “The Ancient,” “The Light of the Exile,” and was the founder of monogamy and other “institutions” among the Jews, which were for a long time disputed and rejected, and himself was placed under ban for attempting to abrogate the Mosaic precept respecting the marriage of a man with the childless wife of his deceased brother. Gershom also wrote a commentary on the Talmud, and some hymns and penitential prayers, which are extant in the Machzor. For reasons unknown he went to Mayence, where he founded a college, which soon attracted the youth of

Germany and Italy. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 328; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 114; Gritz, *Gesch. der Juden* (Leips. 1871), v, 364 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten*, p. 32 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth, at. s. Sekten*, ii, 388; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 310; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 283 sq.; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 69; Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. synagogalen Poesie*, p. 238; id. *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 171-174; Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. derjiid. Poesie*, p. 51, 156; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, i, 226; Frankel. *Monactsschrift*, 1854, p. 230 sq. (B. P.)

Rabbenu Tam

SEE TAM.

Rab'bi

Picture for Rabbi

(**Ραββί**, **yBæ**), a title of honor given by the Jews to their learned men, authorized teachers of the law, and spiritual heads of the community, and which in the New Test. is frequently given to Christ. In the following article we combine the Biblical and Talmudical statements on the subject, with additions from later sources.

I. Different Forms, and the Signification of the Title. — The term **yBæ** *Rabbi*, is a form of the noun **brj** *Rab* (from **bbir**; *to multiply, to become great, distinguished*), which in the Biblical Hebrew denotes *a great man; one distinguished either for age, position, office, or skill* (^{<B30>}Job 32:9; ^{<200>}Daniel 1:3; ^{<160>}Proverbs 26:10); but in the canonical books it does not occur with this suffix. It is in post-Biblical Hebrew that this term is used as a title, indicating sundry degrees by its several terminations for those who are distinguished for learning, who are the authoritative teachers of the law, and who are the appointed spiritual heads of the Jewish community. Thus, for instance, the simple term **brj** *Rsab* without any termination, and with or without the name of the person following it, corresponds to our expression *teacher, master*, **διδάσκαλος** ‘, and is the lowest degree; with the pronominal suffix first person singular-viz. **yBæ** *Rabbi*, **Ραββί**, *my Rabbi* (^{<127>}Matthew 23:7, 8; 26:25, 49; ^{<100>}Mark 9:5; 11:21; 14:45; ^{<80>}John 1:38, 49; 3:2, 26; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8) — it is a higher degree; and with the pronominal suffix first person plural — viz. **^Bæ** *Rabban*,

ⲫⲁⲃⲃⲟⲛ, *our teacher, our master*, in the Chaldee form — it is the highest degree, and was given to the patriarchs (ⲙⲓⲃⲁⲥⲛ) or the presidents of the Sanhedrim. Gamaliel I, who was patriarch in Palestine A.D. 30-50, was the first that obtained this extraordinary title, and not Simon ben-Hillel, as is erroneously affirmed by Lightfoot (*Harmony of the Four Evangelists*, ^{<4023>}John 1:38). This is evident from the following statement in the *Aruch* of R. Nathan (s.v. *yyba*): “We do not find that the title *Rabbon* began before the patriarchs rabbon Gamaliel I, rabbon Simon his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were presidents.” Lightfoot’s mistake is all the more strange since he himself quotes this passage elsewhere (comp. *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations*, ^{<4027>}Matthew 23:7). ⲁⲃⲣⲓ however, which, as we have said, is the noun *bri* with the Chaldee pronominal suffix first person plural, is also used in Aramaic as a noun absolute, the plural of which is ⲁⲃⲣⲓⲁ and ⲙⲓⲃⲣⲓ (comp. Chaldee paraphrase on ^{<4801>}Psalms 80:11; ^{<4802>}Ruth 1:2); pronominal suffix second person singular Ⲏⲃⲣⲓ (Song of Songs 6:4); pronominal suffix third person plural ⲁⲃⲣⲓⲁ (ⲁⲃⲣⲓⲁ ^{<4882>}Psalms 83:12). Accordingly ⲫⲁⲃⲃⲟⲛⲓ in ^{<4105>}Mark 10:51, which in ^{<4006>}John 20:16 is spelled ⲫⲁⲃⲃⲟⲛⲓ, is the equivalent of *ynbri Rabbani*, my *master*, giving the Syriac pronunciation to the *Kamets* under the *Beth*. As such it is interpreted by the evangelists (ⲉⲓⲃⲁⲥⲕⲁⲗⲟⲥ, ^{<4013>}John 1:39; 20:16; ^{<4028>}Matthew 23:8).

II. Origin and Date of these Titles. — Nathan ben-Jechiel (q.v.) tells us, in his celebrated lexicon denominated *Aruch* (s.v. *yyba*), which was finished A.D. 1101, that Mar Rab Jacob asked Sherira Gaon, and his son Hai, the co-Gaon (A.D. 999), for an explanation of the origin and import of these different titles, and that these spiritual heads of the Jewish community in Babylon replied as follows: “The title *Rab* (*br*) is Babylonian, and the title *Rabbi* (*ybr*) is Palestinian.” This is evident from the fact that some of the Tanaïm and Amoraïm are simply called by their names without any title — e.g. Simon the Just, Antigonus of Soho, Jose ben Jochanan, Rab, Sammuël, Abajê, and Rabba; some of them bear the title *Rabbi* (*ybr*) — e.g. rabbi Akiba, rabbi Jose, rabbi Simon, etc.; some of them have the title Mar (*rm*) — e.g. mar Ukba, mar Januka, etc.; some the title of *Rab* (*br*) — e.g. rab Hana, rab Jehudah, etc.; while some of them have the title *Rabbon* (*br*) — e.g. rabbon Gamaliel, rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, etc.

The title *Rabbi* (ybr) is that of the Palestinian sages, who received there of the Sanhedrim the laying-on of the hands, in accordance with the laying-on of the hands as transmitted in unbroken succession by the elders (μῆτις), and were denominated *Rabbi*, and received authority to judge penal cases; while *Rab* (br) is the title of the Babylonian sages, who received the laying-on of hands in their colleges. The more ancient generations, however, who were far superior, had no such titles as *Rabbon* (˘br), *Rabbi* (ybr), or *Rab* (br), either for the Babylonian or Palestinian sages, as is evident from the fact that Hillel I, who came from Babylon, had not the title *Rabbon* (˘br) attached to his name; and that of the prophets, who were very eminent, it is simply said ‘Haggai the prophet,’ etc.; ‘Ezra did not come up from Babylon,’ etc., without the title *Rabbon* being affixed to their names. Indeed, we do not find that this title is of an earlier date than the patriarchate. It began with rabbon Gamaliel the elder (A.D. 30), rabbon Simon, his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were patriarchs or presidents of the Sanhedrim (μῆτις). The title *Rabbi* (ybr), too, comes into vogue among those who received the laying-on of hands at this period — as, for instance, rabbi Zaddok, rabbi Eliezer ben-Jacob, etc., and dates from the disciples of rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai downwards. Now the order of these titles is as follows: *Rabbi* is greater than *Rab*; *Rabbon*, again, is greater than *Rabbi*; while the simple name is greater than *Rabbon*. No one is called *Rabbon* except the presidents.” From this declaration of Sherira Gaon and Hai, that the title *Rabbi* obtained among the disciples of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, the erudite Gratz concludes that “we must regard the title *Rabbi*, which in the Gospels, with the exception of that by Luke, is given to John the Baptist and to Jesus, as an anachronism. We must also regard as an anachronism the disapprobation put into the mouth of Jesus against the ambition of the Jewish doctors, who love to be called by this title, and the admonition to his disciples not to suffer themselves to be styled *Rabbi* καὶ φιλοῦσι (οἱ γραμματεῖς)...καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββὶ ῥαββί. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί, ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 23:7, 8). This, moreover, shows that when the Gospels were written down the title *Rabbi* stood in so high a repute that the fathers could not but transfer it to Christ” (*Geschichte der Juden* [Berl. 1853], 4:500). But even supposing that the title *Rabbi* came into vogue in the days of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, this would by no means warrant Gratz’s conclusion, inasmuch as Jochanan lived upwards of a hundred years, and survived four presidents

— viz. Hillel I (B.C. 30-10), Simon I (A.D. 10-30), Gamaliel I (A.D. 30-50), and Simon II (A.D. 50-70), and it might therefore obtain in the early days of this luminary, which would be shortly after the birth of Christ. The Tosaphoth at the end of *Eduyoth*, however, quoted in the *Aruch* in the same article, gives a different account of the origin of this title, which is as follows: “He who has disciples, and whose disciples again have disciples, is called *Rabbi*; when his disciples are forgotten (i.e. if he is so old that his immediate disciples already belong to the past age), he is called *Rabbon*; and when the disciples of his disciples are also forgotten, he is simply called by his own name.” This makes the titles coeval with the origin of the different schools, and at the same time accounts for the absence of them among the earliest doctors of the law.

Some account of the rabbins and the Mishnical and Talmudical writings may be found in Prideaux (*Connection*, pt. 1, bk. 5, under the year B.C. 446; pt. 2, bk. 8, under the year B.C. 37); and a sketch of the history of the school of Rabbinical learning at Tiberias, founded by rabbi Judah Hak-kodesh, the compiler of the Mishna, in the 2d century after Christ, is given by Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, 2, 391). See also Note 14 to Burton, *Bampton Lectures*, and the authorities there quoted — for instance, Bruker (ii, 820) and Basnage (*Hist. des Juifs*, iii, 6, p. 138). Compare Hill, *De Rabbinis* (Jel. 1741); Bohn, *ibid.* (Erf. 1750); Muller, *De Doctoribus* (Vitemb. 1740). **SEE MASTER.**

Rabbim

SEE BATH-RABBIM.

Rabbinic Bibles

also called *Mikraoth Gedoloth* (תלמוד גדולות), or *Great Bibles*, is the name given to the following Hebrew Bibles, which, besides the original text, also contain the commentaries of sundry Jewish rabbins.

1. swl qnwa μwgrt μ[çmwj μyrç[w h[bra ydy l [^wy[h br μ[spdn yçrçwryp μ[w hayzynywb açrywnam ygrybmwb l aynd, fol. This is the first Rabbinic Bible published by Bomberg, and carried through the press by Felix Pratensis (q.v.) (Venice, 1516-17) (j ar = 278). It consists of four parts, with a separate title-page to each, and with the following contents:

- a.** The *Pentateuch*, with the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos (q.v.) and the commentaries of Rashi (q.v.).
- b.** The *Prophets*, with the Chaldee of Jonathan ben-Uziel (q.v.) and the commentaries of Kimchi (q.v.).
- c.** The *Hagiographa*, viz. the Psalms, with the Tarcum of Joseph bar-Chija (q.v.) and D. Kimchi's (q.v.) commentary; *Proverbs*, with Joseph's Targum and David Ibn-Jachja's (q.v.) commentary; *Job*, with Joseph's Targum and the commentaries of Nachmauides (q.v.) and Fartissol (q.v.); the Five Megilloth (i.e. *Canticles*, *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther*), with Joseph's Targum and Rashi's commentary; *Daniel*, with Ralbag's (q.v.) commentary; *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Chronicles*, with Rashi's and Simon Darshan's, or Cain's (q.v.), commentary. Appended to the volume are the Targum Jernsalem on the Pentateuch, the second Targum on Esther, the variations between Ben-Asher (q.v.) and Ben-Naphtali, the differences between the Eastern and Western cod., Alaon heil-Asher's (q.v.) Dissertation on the Accents, Maimonides's (q.v.) thirteen articles of faith, the 613 precepts (q.v.), a table of the Parashioth and Haphtaroth (q.v.), according to the Spanish and German rituals.

This edition, however, did not prove acceptable to the Jews, since it did not come up to all the requirements of Masoretic rules, as can be seen from the remark Levita makes in his *Masoreth ha-Masoreth*: "Let me therefore warn and caution every one who reads the folio or quarto editions of the four-and-twenty books published here in Venice in the year 1517 to pay no attention to the false remarks printed in the margin in the form of *Keri* and *Kethib*, *plene* and *defective*, *Milel* and *Milra*, and *variations in the vowels and accents*, or to any of those things which ought not to have been done, as I have stated above. The author of them did not know how to distinguish between his right hand and his left. Not being a Jew, he knew nothing about the nature of the Masorah, and what he did put down simply arose from the fact that he sometimes found variations in the copies which he had before him, and, as he did not know which reading was the correct one, he put down one in the margin and another in the text. Sometimes it so happened that he put the correct reading into the text and the incorrect one — into the margin, and sometimes the reverse is the case; thus he was groping in darkness like a blind man. Hence they are not to be heeded, for they are confusion worse confounded." When Levita states that the editor

was no Jew. he is wrong: he was born a Jew, in 1513 embrace Christianity at Rome, and died in 1539. The defectiveness of this first edition induced Bomberg to undertake another edition, for which he employed as editor the celebrated Jacob ben-Chajim (q.v.), and which he published under the title

2... . **çdqh hwhy r[ç.** , i.e. *Porta Dei Sancta* (Venice, 1524-25, 4 vols. fol.). This edition is an improvement upon the former, and its contents are as follows:

a. *The first volume*, embracing the Pentateuch (**hrwt**), begins, 1, with the elaborate introduction of the editor, in which he discusses the *Masorah*, the *Keri*, and *Kethub*, the variations between the Talmud and the Masorah, the *Tikune Sopherim* (**µyrpws ynwqt**), and the order of the larger Masorah; 2, an index of the sections of the whole Old Test. according to the Masorah; and, 3, Aben-Ezra's preface to the Pentateuch. Then follow the five books of Moses in Hebrew, with the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel, and the commentaries of Rashi and Aben-Ezra, the margins being filled up with as much of the Masorah as they would admit.

b. *The second volume*, comprising the earlier prophets (**µynwçar µyaybn**), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings, has the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uziel, and the commentaries of Rashi, Kimchi, and Levi ben-Gershon, and the Masorah in the margin.

c. *The third volume*, comprising the later prophets (**µynwrj a µyaybn**), i.e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, contains the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uziel, the commentaries of Rashi, which extend over all the books in this volume, of Aben-Ezra on Isaiah and the minor prophets, and of Kimchi on Jeremiah, and the Masorah in the margin.

d. *The fourth volume*, comprising the Hagiographa (**µybwtk**), gives the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Joseph the Blind, the commentaries of Rashi on the Psalms, Ezra, Nehemiah, the Five Megilloth. and Chronicles of Aben-Ezra on the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, the Five Megilloth, Ezra, and Nehemiah; of Levi ben-Gershon on Proverbs and Daniel; of Saadiah on Daniel and the second Targum of Esther.

But the most valuable part of his labors are the appendices to this volume, which are, “1, the Masorah which could not be got into the margin of the text in alphabetical order, with Jacob ben-Chajjim’s directions; 2, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and the Eastern and Western codd.; and, 3, a treatise upon the points and accents, containing the work *twnygnhw dwqnh ykrd*, or *dyqwnh yl l k*, by Moses Nakdan. Jacob ben-Chajjim bestowed the utmost labor in amassing the Masorali and in purifying and arranging those materials which Felix Pratensis published very incorrectly in the first edition of Bomberg’s Rabbinic Bible. He was, moreover, the first who, in his elaborate introduction, furnished the Biblical student with a treatise on the Masorah; and his edition of the Bible is of great importance to the criticism of the text, inasmuch as from it most of the Hebrew Bibles are printed. Keniicott published a Latin translation of Jacob ben-Chajim’s valuable introduction from an anonymous MS. in the Bodleian Library in an abridged form (comp. *Dissertation the Second* [Oxford, 1759], p. 229244), and Ginsburg has published an English translation of the whole with explanatory notes in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1863. In after-life Jacob ben-Chajim embraced Christianity, a circumstance which will account for Elias Levita’s vituperations against him (*wtmçn yht bwqn rwrxb hrwrx*, i.e. (Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes’).”

3. A revised and improved edition of the second Bombergian Bible was published at Venice in 1546-48, under the supervision of Cornelius Adelkind. The changes made in this edition consist in omitting Aben-Ezra’s commentary on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, while Jacob ben-Asher’s (q.v.) commentary on the Pentateuch and Isaiah di Trani’s (q.v.) commentary on Judges and Samuel are inserted.

4. Bomberg’s fourth Rabbinic Bible, by Joan. de Gara, carried through the press and corrected by Isaac ben-Joseph *µl s* and Isaac ben-Gershon Treves (Venice, 1568, 4 vols. fol.). The correctors remark at the end that they have reinserted in this edition the portion of the Masorah which was omitted in the edition of 1546-48. Appended is the so-called Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch. Wolf (*Bibliotheca lHebr.* ii, 372) says: “In catalogo quodam MSS. codicum Hebr. Bibl. Bodlej. observatum vidi, quod haec editio opera Genebrardi passim sit castrata in iis quae contra rem Christianam et praecipue contra Romanos dicuntur;” but Steinschneider (in *Catalogus Libr. Hebr.*) states, “sed exemplar tale in Bodl. non exstat.”

5. [braw p̄yrç[h ^m hrwt yçmwj hçmj [dwnw l arçyb wmc l wdg, published at Venice in 1617-19 (4 vols. fol.) by Pietro and Lorenzo Bragadin, and edited by the celebrated Leon di Modena (q.v.) and Abraham Chaber-Tob ben-Solomon Chajim Sopher. It contains the whole matter of the foregoing edition, and is preceded by a preface written by Leon di Modena. This edition, however, is of less value to the critical student, being castrated by the Inquisition, under whose censorship it was published, as may be seen from the remark of the censor at the end: “Visto per me, Fr. Renato da Mod. a. 1626.”

6. !tl çmm rwdw rwd l kb!trmabl! [wçt h . [i.e. God, thy salvation is in thy word, and thy kingdom is from generation to generation], printed at Basle in 1618-19 (2 vols. fol.), and edited by John Buxtorf. This Bible is divided into four parts, the latter of which, consisting of the later prophets and Hagiographa, is dated 1619. The title-page is followed by a Latin preface by Buxtorf, a table of the number of chapters in the Bible, and a poem of Aben-Ezra on the Hebrew language. Besides the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrases, it contains as follows:

- 1,** Rashi on the whole Old Test.;
- 2,** Aben-Ezra on the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Job, the Five Megilloth, and Daniel;
- 3.** Moses Kimchi on the Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah;
- 4,** D. Kimchi on Chronicles;
- 5,** Ralbag on the earlier prophets and Proverbs;
- 6,** Saadiah on Daniel;
- 7,** Jacob ben-Asher on the Pentateuch;
- 8,** Jachja on Samuel;
- 9,** the Masorah Finalis and Buxtorf’s *Tiberias*, etc.;
- 10,** the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali;
- 11,** the variations between the Eastern and Western codices;
- 12,** a treatise on the accents.

The whole is formed after Jacob ben-Chajim’s second edition (1546-48), with some corrections and alterations by Buxtorf. Buxtorf, in editing this Bible, has erected to himself a lasting monument. Of course, like every human work, it is imperfect; but, in spite of its deficiencies, the student must still thank the editor for this work, and Richard Simon, in his *Histoire Critique du V. T.* p. 513, certainly does great injustice when he says: “Bien

qu'il pretende que son edition est plus exacte que les autres, les Juifs cependant ne lestant pas beaucoup, h cause des fautes qui s'y rencontrent, surtout dans les commentaires des rabbins, ofu ii a laisse les erreurs des copistes, qui etoient dans les editions precedentes, et ii y en a ajoute de nouvelles. 11 seroit necessaire d'avoir de bons exemplaires manuscrits de ces commentaires des rabbins, pour les corriger en une infinite d'endroits; et c'est it quoi Buxtorfe devoit plutot s'appliquer, qu'n reformer la punctuation du texte Caldaïque."

7. חמ תי יהק רפס, or the Amsterdam Rabbinic Bible, edited by Moses Frankfurter (Amsterdam, 1724-27, 4 vols. royal fol.). This is unquestionably the most valuable of all the Rabbinic Bibles. It is founded upon the Bomberg editions, and gives not only their contents, but also those of Buxtorf's, with much additional matter. This is the last Rabbinic Bible which is described in bibliographical works, and for this reason we give here the literature pertaining to the above Bibles: Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebr.* ii, 365 sq.; Le Long-Mash, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 95 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Handbuch der bibl. Literatur*, i, 249 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 6 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s.v. "Rabbinic Bibles;" Carpzov, *Citica Sacra* (Lipsiae, 1748), p. 409 sq.; R. Simon, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Test.* p. 512 sq. **SEE FRANKFURTER.**

a. *The first volume*, including the Pentateuch, contains:

- 1**, an index of the things explained by R. Abdias Seforno, according to the *Parashanyoth*;
- 2**, a treatise by the same author on the Law;
- 3**, approbationis of the synagogues of Amsterdam, Frankfort, and others;
- 4**, an explication by Moses (the author) of the signs used to designate the unithors referred to;
- 5**, ancient prefaces at the head of former editions;
- 6**, an index of the chapters of the books of the Old Test.;
- 7**, the prefaces of R. Chiskuni;
- 8**, the preface of Levi ben-Gershon (Ralbag), with a revision of the Talmud;
- 9**, the preface of R. Abdias Seforno;
- 10**, the preface of Aben-Ezra.

To the sacred text are added the *Targums* (that of Onkelos in the Pentateuch; in the other volumes, such as exist), the commentaries of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Baal-Turim, the Greater and the Lesser *Masorah*, the notes (in this vol.) of Levi beln-Gershon, Chiskuni, Jacob de Letkias, the *Imre-Noach* (“Precepts of Noah”), and the commentary of R. Abdias Seforno. The *Komets Minchah* (a collection from various commentaries) is added by the editor. The columns are so disposed that the Hebrew text and the Taergum are in the centre of the page, printed in square type; the Lesser Masorah in the intermediate space, and the Greater Masorah (likewise in square type) at the bottom. At the sides, in large round (Rabbinic) letters, in the inner margin, is the commentary of Rashi; in the outer margin, that of Aben-Ezra and sometimes that of Chiskuni. In the lesser column, in small round type, are placed Baal-Turim, the *Home-Noach*, and the *Komets Minchah*; in the lower part of the page, the commentaries of Ralbag and Seforno, in small round type.

b. *The second volume* contains the earlier prophets (accompanied by the Targum and Masorah as above), with the commentaries of Rashi, Ralbag, and Esaias, also extracts from the book *Keli Jaker* by R. Samuel Lafiado, and the *Minchah Ketanah* (extracts from the commentaries of Moses Alsheich and R. Aaion ben-Chajim; also a commentary called *Leb Aharon* on the book of Joshua and Judges) of the editor in the margin. The prefaces of Kimchi, Levi ben-Gershon, and R. Sanmuel Lafiado in the *Keli Jaker*, follow the title of this volume.

c. *The third volume* contains the later prophets (the text, etc., arranged as before), with the commentaries of Rashi, Radak (R. David Kimchi), Aben-Ezra on Isaiah and Jeremiah, R. Samuel Laniado, I. Jacob ben-Rab, R. Abdias Seforno, Samuel Almesnires, and R. Isaac Gershon, and the *Minchah Gedolah* (a series of extracts similar to the above) by the editor.

d. *The fourth volume*, containing the Kethubim (in like style), has the prefaces of Aben-Ezra, Aben-Esaias, and Simeon ben-Zemach in the *Ohel Mesh'nat* and the *Mishpat Zedek*. There are also various commentaries on the Iagiographa, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Isaac Jabez, Aben-Jechaja; Abdias Seforno on the Psalms, and extracts from the *Miozma Lattora* of Samnel Arepol; on the Proverbs, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Menahem Hammeiri, with the commentary *Kab Venaki* of Solonlon benAbraham; on Job, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Ramban, Abo, Perizol, Abdias Seforno, and Simeon ben-Zemach; on the

Canticles, by Rashi, AbenEzra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Meri Arama, and Abdias Seforno; on Ruth, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Ecclesiastes, by the same commuentators, with the addition of Abdias Seforno; on Esther, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, AbenJechaja; on Daniel, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Saadias, AbenJechaja, Isac Jabez, and Rallag;t on Ezra and Nehemiah, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Chronicles, by Rashi, Radak, and Aben-Jechaja. The editor has also added his own commentary throughout this volume of the work, under the title *Minchah Ereb*. At the end of the work ale placed the Greater Masorah, the variations of the Eastern and Western Recensions (so called), and the treatise on the accents. Each of the assistants in the work is celebrated in Hebrew verse.

According to Wolff, this edition of the Rabbinic Bible is the most. copious and the best. Some interpolations from MSS. have been introduced, in some instances entire, in others by extracts. Verses of ^{אריב}Joshua 21:36, 37 have been rejected, and this is marked in the margin, which states that they exist in some MSS., but not in the most correct and ancient ones. In some copies designed for the use of Christians, Tyschendorf has remarked that the treatise of R. Abdias Seforno, *De Scopa Legis*, is wanting.

8. The latest Rabbinic Bible, with thirty-two commentaries, is the *μϋϘwryp b l μ[twl wdg twarqm*, published at Warsaw by Lebenson (1860-68, 12 vols. small fol.). It contains, besides the original Hebrew, the Chaldee of Onkelos and Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch, the Chaldee on the prophets and Hagiogralpha, and the second Targum on Esther. Of commentaries, it contains that of Rashi on the whole Bible; Aaron Pesaro's (q.v.) Toldot Aaron; Asheri's and Norzi's (q.v.) commentary on the Bible; Aben-Ezra on the Pentateuch, the Five Megilloth, the Minor Prophets, the Psalms, Job, and Daniel; Mloses Kirnchi on Proverbs; Nachmanides on the Pentateuch; Obadiah de Seforno (q.v.) on the Pentateuch, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes; El. Wilna (q.v.) on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Isaiah, and Hezekiah; S. E. Lenczyz and S. Edels on the Pentateuch; J. HI. Altschuler on the prophets and Hagiographa, D. Kimchi on the later prophets; Ralbag on Joshua, Kings, Proverbs, and Job; Is. di Trani on Judges and Samuel; S. Oceda (q.v.) on Ruth and Lamentations; Eliezer ben-Elia Harote on Esther; Saadias on Daniel. It also contains the Masorah Magna and Parva, a treatise on the vowel-points and accents, the various readings between Asher and Naphtali, and the introduction of Jacob ben-Chajim. This edition

is recommended by the greatest Jewish authorities in Poland, as Meisels, of Warsaw; Muscat, of Prague; Heilprin, of Bialystock, etc. (B. P.)

Rabbinical Dialect

Picture for Rabbinical Dialect

By this term we understand that form of the Hebrew language in which the principal Scripture commentators among the rabbins wrote, as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrabanel, Rashi, together with the Mishna, the Jewish Prayer-books, etc. Books in this dialect are generally printed in a round character, more resembling writing than the ordinary square Hebrew letters; but the power, value, and pronunciation of the letters are precisely the same as in Biblical Hebrew. The Rabbinical characters are given below. Although substantially Hebrew, yet this dialect has so many peculiarities as to require a separate study. The scholar who is well versed in the pure or classic Hebrew of the Holy Scriptures would be unable to read the first two lines in the Talmud without an especial indoctrination in its grammatical forms, aside from the difficulty of explaining words derived from the Greek, Latin, French, Arabic, and the like. The orthography, too, of this dialect has, to the reader of pure Hebrew, often an uncouth, and at first sight unintelligible, appearance. This is caused by the habit of inserting the letters **a w y**, instead of using the corresponding vowelpoints, and thus **a** stands for or-, as **ynaç** for **ynç**; **yam** for **ymi**; **w** stands for or T as **µl wk**: for **µl ku wr twpl** for **wrtpl** ;for .. or .., as **çwryp** for **cWrPçrçpya** for **rvpā**; also for or dagesh, as **twnymyl** for **t/nymyl**] **hsyk** for **hSkas** Sometimes a radical in verbs is dropped either at the beginning, middle, or end of a word. It drops the first, as **dj** for **dj a çn** for **çna an**: for **ana ^n** for **^na rm l k** for **l ka** . It drops the second, as **ya** for **ywa sq**: for **µdq, hç** for **h[ç µyl t** for **µyl ht twt** for **twj t**; or it drops the third, as **ya** for **^ya yb** for **^yn, yb** for **tyb yk** for **^yk bç** for **tbç kç** for **[kç wt** for **bwt** Parts of words are often prolonged, as by doubling letters, or inserting double *Yod*; and to this and many other peculiarities must be added the use of numerous abbreviations, requiring a study in itself—thus e.g. **aa** ‘ may be **yna rmwa yba ynda whyl a rma dha rma dj a ^pwa rçpa ya ^ma ^ma çya tça trma ya ^ya µyrmwa h[aa** stands for **wyl [wnyba µhrba µwl çh**

We give a list of such works as will help the student in this branch of literature.

(I.) Grammars. — J. H. Mai, *Grammatica Rabbinica* (Giessen, 1712); Mercer, *hamra wa harçk yqwdqd yj wl*, *Tubulce in Gr. L. Chald. quce et Syr. dicitur: multa intesrim de Rabbinico et Talmudico Stilo traduntur* (Paris, 1560); Reland, *Analecta Rabbinica* (Ultraj. 1723); Millius, *Catalecta Rabbinica* (ibid. 1728); Alting, *Synopsis Institutionumz Rabbinorum* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); Danz, *ˆnbrd atl gs*, *sir e Rabbinismus E' nucleatus* (Jena, 7th ed. 1735); Cellarius, *Rabbinismus sive Inst. Gram?. Rabbisorunm Scriptis, Legendis, et Intellig. acconmodata* (Zeiz, 1684); Genebrard, *Isacgoge cad Legenda et Intellic gendica Rabbinorum Comment.* (Paris. 1563); Tychsen, *Elem. Dialect. Rabb.* (Bitzow, 1753), Dukes, *Die Spirache der Mischlna, lexicogr. und gramman t. betrachtet* (Esslingen, 1846); Geiger, *Lehr- u. Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischna* (Breslau, 1845); Landau, *Geist und Spirache der Uebraer nach demn zweiten Tempelbau* (Prague, 1822); Luzzatto, *Elemntenti Granmmaticali del Caldeo Biblico e del Dialecto Talmudico Babilonese* (transl. into German by KrUiger [Breslau, 1873]); Faber. *Alnzerkuungenz zuir Erlerungu des Talmudischen und Rabbinischen* (Gottingen, 1770); Weiss, *Studien uber die Sprache der Mischna* (Heb. [Vienna, 1867]); Nolan, *An Introduction to Chaldee Grammatr*, etc. (Lond. 1821).

(II.) Rabbinical Lexicons and Word-books. — Buxtorf. *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum* (Basle, 1640, fol. [new ed. by Fischer, Leips. 1866 sq.]); id. *Lexicon Breve Rabbinico-Philosophicum* (ibid. 1607, and often since); Hartmann, *Supplementa ad J. Buxtorfii et W. Gesenii Lexicon* (Rostock, 1813); id. *Thesaurus Linguce Hebraicce e Mishna augend.* (ibid. 1825-26); *µymkj ˆwçl*, *Worterbuch enthaltend hebr. Worter u. Redensarten, die sich im Talmud befinden* (Prague, 1845-47, 2 pts.); Nathan ben-Jechiel, *HaAruch* (Rome, 1515); Dessauer, *Leshon Rabbanan* (Erlangen, 1849); Stern, *Ozar ha-Millin* (Vienna. 1864); Levy, *Neuhebraisches und chaldaisches Worterbuch* (Leips. 1875 sq.); Rabinei, *Rabbinisch- aramaisches Worterbuch* (Lemberg, 1857); Young, *Rabbinical Vocabulcary*, etc. (Edinb. s. a.).

(III.) Miscellaneous. — For the abbreviations, comp. Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* vols. ii, iv), and also Buxtorf (ed. Fischer), where at the end of each letter the abbreviations of the respective letter are given. (B. P.)

Rabbinism

is that development of Judaism which, after the return from Babylon, but more especially after the ruin of the Temple and the extinction of the public worship, became a new bond of national union, and the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. After the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Mosaic constitution could be but partially re-established. The whole structure was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form. The Levites who had returned from the captivity, it is true, were the officiating priesthood, and no more. They were bound to be acquainted with the forms and usages of the sacrificial ritual; but the instruction of the people and the interpretation of the law by no means fell necessarily within their province. From the captivity the Jews brought with them a reverential, or, rather, a passionate, attachment to the Mosaic law; and this it seems to have been the prudent policy of their leaders, Ezra and Nehemiah, to encourage by all possible means as the great bond of social union, and the unfailing principle of separation from the rest of mankind. By degrees, attachment to the law sank deeper and deeper into the national character: it was not merely at once their Bible and their statute-book; it entered into the most minute detail of common life. "But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies. Whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. Certain men rose to acknowledged eminence for their ingenuity in explaining, their readiness in applying, their facility in quoting, and their clearness in offering solutions of, the difficult passages of the written statutes. Learning of the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of this self-formed spiritual aristocracy," or rabbinical oligarchy, which, itself held together by a strong corporate spirit, by community of interest, by identity of principle, has contributed, more than any other external cause, to knit together in one body the widely dispersed members of the Jewish family, and to keep them the distinct and separate people which they appear in all ages of the world.

The first stage of development appears in the work of the so-called *Sopherim*, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q.v.); and their work will be more fully described in the art. SCRIBES. The *Sopherim* were followed

by another class of men, known as the *Tanaim*, or teachers of the law (the **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** in the N.T.), comprising a period from B.C. 200 to A.D. 220. While we reserve a description of their work for the art. SCRIBES, we will only mention that from this school proceeded the oldest Midrashim, as *Aechilta*, *Siphra*, and *Siphri* **SEE MIDRASH, AND THE MISHNA** (q.v.). The most distinguished rabbins of the Tanaim (who are in part given already, or will be given, in this *Cyclopopdia*) were:

- 1.** Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200-170), whose famous maxim “Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving wages, but be like servants who serve their master without expecting to receive wages; and let the fear of the Lord be upon you” (*Aboth*, i, 3) a maxim pronounced by Pressense (in his *Jesus Christ: his Times*, etc.) as “[a noble and almost evangelical one],* truly a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development” — is said to have given rise to Sadduceeism;
- 2.** Jose ben-Joeser, of Zereda, and his companion, Jose ben-Jochanan, of Jerusalem;
- 3.** Jochanan, the high-priest (commonly called John Hyrcanus, q.v.);
- 4.** Jehoshua ben-Perachja, the reputed teacher of Christ, and his colleague, Nithai of Arbela (q.v.);
- 5.** Simon ben-Shetach (q.v.) and Jehudah benTabai;
- 6.** Shemaja (q.v.) and Abtalion; **7.** Hillel I (q.v.);
- 8.** Simon ben-Hillel I (q.v.);
- 9.** Gamaliel I (q.v.);
- 10.** Simon II ben-Gamaliel (q.v.), who fell at the defence of Jerusalem;
- 11.** Jochanan ben-Zachai (q.v.);
- 12.** Gamaliel II, of Jabne (q.v.);
- 13.** Simon II ben-Gamaliel II (q.v.) and R. Nathan ha-Babli (q.v.);
- 14.** Jehudah I the Holy (q.v.); and,
- 15.** Gamaliel III.

The Tanaim were followed by the *Amoraim*, or later doctors of the law; and the fruits of their work are laid down in the Talmud (q.v.), the completion of which (about A.D. 500) terminated the period of the Amoraim, to be opened by that of the *Saboraim*, or the teachers of the law after the conclusion of the Talmud. To this period (A.D. 500-657), perhaps, belongs the collection, or final redaction, of some of the lesser Talmudic treatises and the Masorah (q.v.). After the Amoraim came the so-called *Gaonim*, or the last doctors of the law in the chain of Rabbinic succession, comprising a period from A.D. 657 to 1040. The work of these different schools, together with the biographies of the most distinguished men, will be treated more fully in the art. SCRIBES *SEE SCRIBES* .

On the dissolution of the Babylonian schools, Spain, Portugal, and Southern France became the centre of Rabbinism. As early as about A.D. 1000 the Talmud is said to have been translated into Arabic. In Spain, the most flourishing school was that of Cordova, founded by Moses ben-Chanoch (q.v.). Besides Cordova, Rabbinism flourished in Granada, then in Lucena, the most famous representative of which was Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi (q.v.). To the 11th and 12th centuries belong especially Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q.v.), Aben-Ezra (q.v.), the Kimchis (q.v.), and Solomon Parchon (q.v.). In France flourished Gershom ben-Jehudah, or Rabbenu Gershom (q.v.), and Rashi (q.v.). But the most distinguished of all was Moses Maimonides (q.v.), of Cordova, whose philosophical treatment of tradition divided Judaism, after his death, into two hostile parties; and the Spanish and French schools were divided for some time. When, in 1305, Asher ben-Jechiel, of Germany, came into Spain, he succeeded in bringing the French school, which was hostile to philosophy, to supremacy, and thus philosophy was proscribed. But there was another kind of philosophy — if it deserve that name at all — which was especially cultivated in these times — the so-called Cabala, as it especially appears in the Sohar (q.v.). As the foremost representatives of this branch of literature, we may mention Meir ibn-Gabbai (q.v.), Joseph Karo (q.v.), Salomo al Kabetz, Moses Cordovero (q.v.), Isaac Loria (q.v.), Moses Galante (q.v.), Samuel Laniado (q.v.), Jacob Zemach, and Hajim Vidal. The invention of the art of printing produced a new activity in the Church as well as in the Synagogue, and the first printed edition of the Talmud, in 1520, at Venice; the edition of the second Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, by Jacob ben-Chajim, in 1526; and the writings of Elias Levita (q.v.), are the first Jewish fruits of the art. Rabbinism was again revived and represented in the schools of Brody,

Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Firth, Frankfort, Venice, and Amsterdam. The party spirit which, in former ages, was represented in the Spanish and French schools was revived in the Portugueso-Italian and Germano-Polish schools. Moses Mendelssohn (q.v.), and his friends — as Hartwig Wessely, David Friedlanider, and others — opened a new epoch, and endeavored to enlighten their coreligionists; but the chasm was not healed. On the contrary, a final division was produced; and Reformed and Orthodox Judaism are the two antipodes of the present day. As a religious system, “Rabbinism,” says the late Dr. M’Caul, “has fared like all other religious systems: it has had prejudiced assailants to attack, and over-zealous admirers to defend it. The former have produced whatever they could find objectionable; the latter have carefully kept out of view whatever seemed to its disadvantage. The truth is, that it is a mixed system of good and bad. Founded on the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets, it necessarily contains much truth and wisdom; but, expounded and enlarged by prejudiced men, it presents a strange incongruity of materials.” See the art. “Rabbinism,” in Herzog’s *Real-Encycl.*; the same art. in *Theol. Universal-Lexicon*; *Wese n des Rabbimismus*, in Jost, *Gesch. cl. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, i, 227 sq.; M’Caul, *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews* (London, 1838), ch. iv — “Rabbinism Considered as a Religious System,” p. 69 sq. (B. P.)

* The clause in brackets is found in the Amer. ed. of 1868, but is omitted in the 4th Engl. ed. (London, 1871).

Rab’bith

(Heb. **רַבִּית** *Rabbith’* [always with the art.], *multitude*; Sept. **Ῥαββίθ** v. **Ῥαββίθιον**), a city in the tribe of Issachar (¹⁶⁸⁰Joshua 19:20). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 166) found a village, *Arubuni*, three English miles west of Bethshean, which he is disposed to identify with the *Rebbo* of Jerome, and the *Rabbith* of Joshua. But this is beyond the bounds of Issachar. Probably the locality in question is in the north-east part of the tribe, possibly at the ruins *Sumurieh* (? Samaria).

Rabbling

a term employed to denote the summary ejection, on Christmas-day, 1688, of Episcopal clergymen and their families by the Scottish populace, after the Revolution. The incumbents were turned out of their houses, and often into the snow; the church doors were locked, and the key was taken

away. These measures were certainly harsh and uncalled for; but the people had been exasperated, especially in the west country, by twenty-five years of bloodshed and persecution. Though they were “rude, even to brutality,” yet, as lord Macaulay says, “they do not appear to have been guilty of any intentional injury to life or limb.” The better part of the people put a stop to the riotous proceedings on the part principally of the Cameronians; but a form of notice, or a threatening letter, was sent to every curate in the Western Lowlands.

Rabbling Act

a law passed by the Scottish Parliament, in 1698, to prevent disturbance and riots at the settlement of ministers. The Episcopalians in the North rabbled the Presbyterians, especially on the law of an ordination; for they did not like to see their incumbents supplanted. So violent were their measures that the legislature had thus to interfere against them. *SEE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.*

Rabbo’ni

(Ῥαββουνί, or Ῥαββονί ‘, for Chaldaic *ynBari* *my master*), the title of highest honor applied by the Jews to the teachers of the law. *SEE RABBI.* In ^{<4105>}Mark 10:51 (where it is translated “Lord”), and ^{<4316>}John 20:16, it is applied to Christ; but, as it seems to us, rather in its literal acceptation than with reference to the conventional distinction which it implied (if such distinction *then* existed) in the Jewish schools. There were but seven great professors, all of the school of Hillel, to whom the title was publicly given. There is some difference as to their names, and even the Talmud varies in its statements. But the only one there whose name occurs in Scripture is Gamaliel, unless, indeed, as some suppose, the aged Simeon, who blessed the infant Saviour (^{<4125>}Luke 2:25), was the same as the Rabban Simeon of the Talmud. *SEE SIMEON.*

Rabe

SEE ROSENBACH.

Rabh

SEE RAB.

Rab'-mag

(gmAbri; *Rab-nm r*, chief magician; Sept. ῥαβ-μάγ or ῥαβαμάχ), a word found only in ^{<249B>}Jeremiah 39:3 and 13, as a title borne by a certain Nergal-sharezer who is mentioned amongst the “princes” that accompanied Nebuchadnezzar to the last siege of Jerusalem. Nergal-sharezer is probably identical with the king, called by the Greeks Neriglissar, who ascended the throne of Babylon two years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar. *SEE NEERGAL-SHAREZER*. This king, as well as certain other important personages, is found to bear the title in the Babylonian inscriptions. It is written, indeed, with a somewhat different vocalization, being read as *Rabu-Emga* by Sir H. Rawlinson. The signification is somewhat doubtful. *Rabu* is most certainly “great,” or “chief,” an exact equivalent of the Hebrew *bri* whence Rabbi, “a great one, a doctor;” but *Mag* or *Emga*, is an obscure term. It has been commonly identified with the word “Magus” (Gesenius, *cad voc. gm*; Calmet, *Commetaire Litteral*, 6:203, etc.); but this identification is somewhat uncertain, since an entirely different word — one which is read as *Magusu* — is used in that sense throughout the Behistun inscription (Oppert, *Expedition Scientifique en Mesopotamie*, ii, 209). Sir H. Rawlinson inclines to translate *emgat* by “priest,” but does not connect it with the Magi, who in the time of Neriglissar had no footing in Babylon. He regards this rendering, however, as purely conjectural, and thinks we can only say at present that the office was one of great power and dignity at the Babylonian court, and probably gave its possessor special facilities for obtaining the throne. *SEE MAGI*.

Rab'saces

(ῥαψάκης), a Graecized form (Ecclesiasticus 48:18) of the name RAB-SHAKEH *SEE RAB-SHAKEH* (q.v.).

Rab'-saris

(Heb. syrsAbri; *Rab-Saris*), a name applied to two foreigners, but probably rather the designation of an office than of an individual, the word signifying *chief eunuch*; in ^{<200B>}Daniel 1:3, Ashpenaz is entitled the master of the eunuchs (Rab-sarisim). Luther translates the word, in the three places where it occurs, as a name of office, the arch-chamberlain (*der Erzkammerer, der oberste Kammerer*). Josephus (*Ant.* 10:8, 2) takes them as the A. V. does, as proper names. The chief officers of the court were

present attending on the king; and the instance of the eunuch Narses would show that it was not impossible for the Rab-saris to possess some of the qualities fitting him for a military command. In ^{<1259>}2 Kings 25:19, a eunuch (*syrsi*; *Saris*, in the text of the A. V. “officer,” in the margin “eunuch”) is spoken of as set over the men of war; and in the sculptures at Nineveh “eunuchs are represented as commanding in war; fighting both on chariots and on horseback, and receiving the prisoners and the heads of the slain after battle” (Layard *Nineveh*, ii, 325). But whether his office was really that which the title imports, or some other great court office, has been questioned. The chief of the eunuchs is an officer of high rank and dignity in the Oriental courts; and his cares are not confined to the harem, but many high public functions devolve upon him. In the Ottoman Porte the Kisklar Aga, or chief of the black eunuuchs, is one of the principal personages in the empire, and in an official paper of great solemnity is styled by the sultan the most illustrious of the officers who approach his august person, and worthy of the confidence of monarchs and of sovereigns (D’Ohsson, *Tab. Gen.* iii, 308). It is, therefore, by no means improbable that such an office should be associated with a military commission; perhaps not for directly military duties, but to take charge of the treasure, and to select from the female captives such as might seem worthy of the royal harem. *SEE EUNUCH.*

1. (Sept. Ῥαβσαρείς v. r. Ῥαφίς) An officer of the king of Assyria sent up with Tartan and Rab-shakeh against Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah (^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:17). B.C. 713.

2. (Sept. Ναβουσαρείς v. r. Ναβουζαρίς.) One of the princes of Nebuchadnezzar, who was present at the capture of Jerusalem, B.C. 588, when Zedekiah, after endeavoring to escape, was taken and blinded and sent in chains to Babylon (^{<289B>}Jeremiah 39:3). Rab-saris is mentioned afterwards (ver. 13) among the other princes who at the command of the king were sent to deliver Jeremiah out of the prison. It is not improbable that we have not only the title of this Rab-saris given, but his name also, either *Sarsechim* (ver. 3) or (ver. 13) *Nebushasban* (worshipper of Nebo, ^{<234D>}Isaiah 46:1), in the same way as Nergal-sharezer is given in the same passages as the name of the Rab-mag.

Rab'-shakeh

(Heb. *Rabshakeh'*, *hqwb̄ḥi*; Sept. *Ῥαψάκης* v. r. *Ῥαβσάκης*), an Aramaic name, signifying *chief cup-bearer*, but applied to an Assyrian general (^{<12187>}2 Kings 18:17, 19, 26, 28, 37; 19:4, 8; ^{<2310>}Isaiah 36:2, 4, 12, 13, 22; 37:4,8). B.C. 713. Notwithstanding its seemingly official significance, it appears to have been used as a proper name, as Butler with us; for the person who bore it was a military chief in high command under Sennacherib, king of Assyria. Yet it is not impossible, according to Oriental usages, that a royal cup-bearer should hold a military command; and the office itself was one of high distinction, in the same way as *Rab-saris* denotes the chief eunuch, and *Rab-mag*, possibly, the chief priest. See Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, 2, 440. Luther, in his version, is not quite consistent, sometimes (^{<12187>}2 Kings 18:17; ^{<2310>}Isaiah 36:2) giving Rabshakeh as a proper name, but ordinarily translating it as a title of office — arch-cupbearer (*der Erzschenke*). The word *Rab* may be found translated in many places of the English version; for instance, ^{<12518>}2 Kings 25:8, 20; ^{<2491>}Jeremiah 39:11; ^{<2124>}Daniel 2:14 (*μῦχ βαββῆρι*), *Rab-tabbachin*, “captain of the guard” — in the margin, “chief marshal,” “chief of the executioners;” ^{<2008>}Daniel 1:3, *Rab-sarisin*, “master of the eunuchs;” 2:48 (*ῥαββῆρι*), *Rab-signin*, “chief of the governors;” 4:9; 5:11 (*ῥαββῆρι*), *Rab-chartummin*, “master of the magicians;” ^{<3106>}Jonah 1:6 (*ἰββῆρι*), *Rab-hachobel*, “ship-master.” It enters into the titles Rabbi, Rabboni, and the name Rabbah. *SEE RABBI*.

Rab-shakeh

is the last named of three Assyrian generals sent against Jerusalem in the reign of Hezekiah. Sennacherib, having taken other cities of Judah, was now besieging Lachish; and Hezekiah, terrified at his progress, and losing, for a time, his firm faith in God, sends to Lachish with an offer of submission and tribute. This he strains himself to the utmost to pay, giving for the purpose not only all the treasures of the Temple and palace, but stripping off the gold plates with which he himself, in the beginning of his reign, had overlaid the doors and pillars of the house of the Lord (^{<12186>}2 Kings 18:16; ^{<1438>}2 Chronicles 29:3; see Rawlinson, *Bampton Lectures*, 4:141; Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 145). But Sennacherib, not content with this — his cupidity being excited rather than appeased — sends a great host against Jerusalem under Tartan, Rab-saris, and Rab-

shakeh; not so much, apparently, with the object of at present engaging in the siege of the city as with the idea that, in its present disheartened state, the sight of an army, combined with the threats and specious promises of Rab-shakeh, might induce a surrender at once. In Isaiah 36, 37 Rabshakeh alone is mentioned, the reason of which would seem to be that he acted as ambassador and spokesman, and came so much more prominently before the people than the others. Keil thinks that Tartan had the supreme command, inasmuch as in 2 Kings he is mentioned first, and, according to ~~2301~~ Isaiah 20:1, conducted the siege of Ashdod. In 2 Chronicles 32 where, with the addition of some not unimportant circumstances, there is given an abstract of these events. it is simply said that (ver. 9) “Sennacherib king of Assyria sent his servants to Jerusalem.” Rab-shakeh seems to have discharged his mission with much zeal, addressing himself, not only to the officers of Hezekiah, but to the people on the wall of the city, setting forth the hopelessness of trusting to any power, human or divine, to deliver them out of the hand of “the great king, the king of Assyria,” and dwelling on the many advantages to be gained by submission. Many have imagined, from the familiarity of Rab-shakeh with Hebrew, that he either was a Jewish deserter or an apostate captive of Israel. Whether this be so or not, it is not impossible that the assertion which he makes on the part of his master, that Sennacherib had even the sanction and command of the Lord Jehovah for his expedition against Jerusalem (“Am I now come up without the Lord to destroy it? The Lord said to me, Go up against this land to destroy it”), may have reference to the prophecies of Isaiah (8:7, 8; 10:5, 6) concerning the desolation of Judah and Israel by the Assyrians, of which, in some form, more or less correct, he had received information. Being unable to obtain any promise of submission from Hezekiah, who, in the extremity of his peril returning to trust in the help of the Lord, is encouraged by the words and predictions of Isaiah, Rabshakeh goes back to the king of Assyria, who had now departed from Lachish. *SEE HEZEKIAH.*

Rabulas, Of Edessa

all Eastern prelate who flourished near the opening of the 5th century, was a student of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and, in 431, was prominently identified with the Antiochites at the council in Ephesus. In the following year, however, Cyril of Alexandria succeeded in gaining Rabulas to his side; and after this we hear of him as a devout orthodox. He energetically opposed Nestorius, and greatly weakened the Nestorians. He condemned

the bishop of Edessa, the writings of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, banished and drove off the teachers from the school at Edessa who were reputed favorable to their doctrines, and thus became an unwilling instrument in the founding of the school at Nisibis by Barsulmas and in the spread of Nestorianism in the East. He died in 436. His successor at Edessa was Ibas (q.v.). Under the name of Rabulas there is extant an old canonical collection of the Syrian Church, pieces of which are contained in the edition of the *Nomoncanon* of Bar-Hebraeus by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* vol. x).

Rabusson

PAUL, a French monastic, was born Sept. 5, 1634, at Gannat. After having entered monastic life among the Clugniacs, he taught theology in the abbeys of St. Martial at Avignon, and St. Martin des Champs at Paris. He was also made twice the general of his order (1693-1705, 1708-14). He died at Paris, Oct. 23, 1717. He wrote works of interest only to the student of his order. See Nicéron, *Memoires*, vol. I. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ra'ca

(Ὶ **Ρακά**), a term of reproach used by the Jews of our Saviour's age (^{<402>}Matthew 5:22). Critics are agreed that it is but the Greek form of the Chaldee term **aqyrēyka'** (the terminal **a** being the definite article, used in a *vocative* sense), with the sense of "worthless;" but they differ as to whether this term should be connected with the root **qwr** conveying the notion of *emptiness* (Gesén. *Thesaur.* . 1279), or with one of the cognate roots **qqr**; (Tholuck) or **[qr**; (Ewald), conveying the notion of *thinness* (Olshausen, De Wette, *On Matthew* v, 22). The first of these views is probably correct. We may compare the use of **qyrēaii**," in ^{<404>}Judges 9:4; 11:3, *al.*, and of **kevé** in ^{<502>}James 2:20. Jesus, contrasting the law of Moses, which could only take notice of overt acts, with his own, which renders man amenable for his motives and feelings, says in effect: "Whosoever is rashly angry with his brother is liable to the judgment of God; whosoever calls his brother raca is liable to the judgment of the Sanhedrim; but whosoever calls him fool (**μωρέ**) becomes liable to the judgment of Gehenna." To apprehend the higher criminality here attached to the term fool, which may not at first seem very obvious, it is necessary to observe that while "raca" denotes a certain looseness of life and

manners, “fool” denotes a wicked and reprobate person: foolishness being in Scripture opposed to spiritual wisdom (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad loc.*).
SEE FOOL.

Racchei

is the name sometimes given by mistake to the *Zacchei* (q.v.).

Racci, Matteo

a noted Jesuit missionary of the 16th century, is closely identified with the Romanizing work of that aera in the Chinese empire. The very year which marks the death of Xavier (1552), marks the occurrence of an event which opened China to the Europeans. A party of Jesuit missionaries, at whose head was Racci, in that year landed stealthily at Macao. These missionaries of Rome had determined to win over the Chinese to Christianity by stratagem. They had studied mathematics and natural science, with a view to astonish the natives by their exhibitions. Some objects, common enough in Europe, but unheard of in China, were prepared as presents for the mandarins and others. A clock that showed the rising and setting of the sun and moon; a prism that by the emission of its rainbow-rays was mistaken for a fragment of the celestial hemisphere, and maps which exhibited the world of barbarians, with China filling the east and Europe in the remote west, produced sensations of wonder such as had never before stirred the placid spirit of the viceroy of Canton. Instead of driving them away from the country, as they feared, he actually detained the Jesuits to exhibit and explain their wonders; for only they had the secret of keeping that curious machine in action, and only they could manage the spectrum, and expound the new system of geography. Literary men crowded the palace to see the Jesuits and to hear their wisdom, and the missionaries thus gained an influence which they knew well how to utilize. The popularity thus acquired by Racci, Ruggiero, and others was truly astonishing; and by virtue of an imperial edict, Racci took up his residence near the royal palace. and enjoyed the highest reputation for learning. He courted the literati; withheld from their knowledge such parts of the sacred history and doctrine as were likely to offend their prejudices or wound their pride; by his influence at court secured the protection of his brethren in the provinces; and by extreme sagacity surrounded himself with a considerable number of persons who might be variously described as pupils, partisans, converts, or novices. In a secret chapel he disclosed to the more favored

symbols of his worship, yet so shaped as not to be repugnant to their heathen notions, and intermingled with other symbols from the religion of Confucius. Racci died in 1610, and was honored with a solemn funeral. The remains of a foreigner never before had such a distinction. It is said that both mandarins and the people saluted with a mournful admiration the corpse of the Jesuit as it was taken to the grave by a company of Christians, with a splendid cross going before it; and that it was interred, by the order of the emperor, in a temple dedicated to the true God.

Rac(c)ovian Catechism

was a Polish Protestant compilation stating the different articles of the Slavic Reformers. It was published in 1605 at Racova, a city in the Polish palatinate Sandomir, which owed its origin to the Reformer John Sieminsky, and by his son's (Jacob) acceptance of the Socinian doctrines became the headquarters of this branch of the Polish Reformed Church. Racova became the seat of a theological school. The general synods were held there, of which those of 1580 and 1603 are of historic importance; and, the printing of the Socinians being done there, the catechism came to be known as the Raccovian. It was prepared by Schmalz, Morkorzowsky, and Volkel, and was based on the theological writings of F. Socinus. A Latin edition was published in 1609, dedicated to King James I. of England; a German edition in 1608, dedicated to the Wittenberg University. In 1818 Rees made an English version of the Raccovian Catechism. An abridgment was published in Polish and German in 1605, 1623; and in 1629 in Latin. See Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, ii, 370; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; London, *Divinity of Christ* (see Index); Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 391; Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Hallam, *Intr. to Hist. of Lit.* i, 554; ii, 335. (J. H. W.)

Race

(prop. /wome²⁰¹¹ Ecclesiastes 9:11; δρόμος, "course;" but in the A.V. the rendering, likewise, of j rāpa *path*, and in the New Test. only of ἄγών and στάδιος). Races were evidently known to the Hebrews (²⁰¹¹Ecclesiastes 9:11). In the New Test. there are allusions to the various gymnastic sports and games celebrated by the Greeks. So the term "race" is often used in comparisons drawn from the public races and applied to Christians, as expressing strenuous effort in the Christian life and cause;

and we are exhorted to strive after the rewards of the Gospel as strenuously as the athletes did in the public games (~~402~~ 1 Corinthians 9:24-27; ~~810~~ Galatians 2:2; 5:7; ~~3476~~ Philippians 2:16; 3:14; ~~5116~~ 2 Timothy 2:5; 4:6-8; ~~5810~~ Hebrews 12:1). Among the principal public games noticed by the historians are the Olympic, which were celebrated every fifth year, the Pythian, Nemean, and the Isthmian. These exercises principally consisted in trials of strength and skill — in running on foot, wrestling, leaping, throwing the dart and discus, also in the horse-race and chariot-race. *SEE GAME.*

Picture for Race (1)

The stadium in which they took place was an oblong area terminated at one end by a straight line, at the other by a semicircle having the breadth of the stadium for its base. Around this area were ranges of seats rising above one another in steps. After the Roman conquest of Greece, the form of the stadium was often modified, so as to resemble the amphitheatre, by making both its ends semicircular, and by surrounding it with seats supported by vaulted masonry, as in the Roman amphitheatre. The Ephesian stadium still has such seats around a portion of it.

Picture for Race (2)

The most strict and laborious preparation was made for these *agonistic* contests. alnd the whole course of preparation, as well as the contest, was governed by strict and established rules. The athletes who contended for the prize were divested of clothing; every impediment was removed; the prize was placed on a tripod in the middle of the stadium, in the full view of the competitors; and the crown was placed upon the conqueror's head the moment the issue was proclaimed by the judges. Those persons who designed to contend in these games were obliged to repair to the public gymnasium at Elis ten months before the solemnity, where they prepared themselves by continual exercises. No man who had omitted to present himself in this manner was allowed to contend for any of the prizes; nor were the accustomed rewards of victory given to such persons, if by any means they introduced themselves and overcame their antagonists. No person who was himself a notorious criminal, or nearly related to any such, was permitted to contend; and, further, if any person were convicted of bribing his adversary, a severe fine was laid upon him. Nor were these precautions alone thought a sufficient guard against evil and dishonorable contracts and unjust practices, but the contenders were obliged to swear

that they had spent ten whole months in preparatory exercises; and both they and their fathers, or brethren, took a solemn oath that they would not, by any sinister or unlawful means, endeavor to stop the fair and just proceedings of the games (Potter, *Greek Antiq.*).

Picture for Race (3)

The races themselves were (1) *the foot-race*, (2) *the horse-race*, (3) *the chariot-race*, (4) *the torch -race*, either (a) on foot or (b) on horseback. Of all these the first was the simplest and the best test of personal capacity. Hence the exercise of *running* was in great esteem among the ancient Grecians, insomuch that those who prepared themselves for it thought it worth their while to use means to burn or parch their spleen, because it was believed to be a hindrance to them and to retard them in their course. Homer tells us that swiftness is one of the most excellent endowments a man can be blessed withal:

*“No greater honor e’er has been attain’d
Than what strong hand or nimble feet have gain’d.”*

Picture for Race (4)

Indeed, all those exercises that conduced to fit men for war were more especially valued. Swiftness was looked upon as an excellent qualification in a warrior, both because it serves for a sudden assault and onset, and likewise for a nimble retreat; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that the constant character which Homer gives of Achilles is, that he was swift of foot; and in the Holy Scripture, David, in his poetical lamentation over those two great captains Saul and Jonathan, takes particular notice of this warlike quality of theirs: “They were swifter than eagles, stronger than lions” (¹⁰¹²³2 Samuel 1:23). *SEE AHIMAAZ.*

Picture for Race (5)

Such as obtained victories in any of these games, especially the Olympic, were universally honored — nay, almost adored. At their return home they rode in a triumphal chariot into the city, the walls being broken down to give them entrance; which was done (as Plutarch is of opinion) to signify that walls are of small use to a city that is inhabited by men of courage and ability to defend it. At Sparta they had an honorable post in the army, being stationed near the king’s person. At some towns they had presents made to them by their native city, were honored with the first place at shows and

games, and ever after maintained at the public charge. Cicero reports that a victory in the Olympic games was not much less honorable than a triumph at Rome. Happy was that man esteemed who could but obtain a single victory; if any person merited repeated rewards, he was thought to have attained the utmost felicity of which human nature is capable; but if he came off conqueror in all the exercises, he was elevated above the condition of men, and his actions styled wonderful victories. Nor did their honors terminate in themselves, but were extended to all about them; the city that gave them birth and education was esteemed more honorable and august; happy were their relations, and thrice happy their parents. It is a remarkable story which Plutarch relates of a Spartan who, meeting Diagoras, that had himself been crowned in the Olympic games, and seen his sons and grandchildren victors, embraced him and said, "Now die, Diagoras; for thou canst not be a god!" By the laws of Solon, a hundred drachms were allowed from the public treasury to every Athenian who obtained a prize in the Isthmian games, and five hundred drachms to such as were victors in the Olympiali. Afterwards, the latter of these had their maintenance in the Prytaneum, or public hall of Athens. The rewards given in these games have been thus rendered into English by Addison, from the Greek:

Picture for Race (6)

*"Greece, in four games thy martial youth were train'd,
For heroes two, and two for gods ordain'd:
Jove bade the olive round his victor wave;
Phoebus to his an apple-garland gave;
The pine Palaemomn; nor with less renown,
Archemorus couferr'd the parsley crown."
(Anc. Med. Dial. 2.)*

Picture for Race (7)

Compare with these fading vegetable crowns that immortal life which the Gospel offers as a prize to the victor, in order to understand the apostle's comparison (^{<4025>}1 Corinthians 9:25; ^{<4084>}1 Peter 5:4). *SEE CROWN.*

Ra'chab

(^{<4005>}Matthew 1:5). *SEE RAHAB.*

Ra'chal

(*l* κ^ϛ; , *trade*; Sept. ^ⲓΡαχάλ v. r. ^ⲓΡαχήλ), a town in the tribe of Judah, and apparently in the southern part; being one of those to which David sent presents out of the spoil of the Amalekites (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}1 Samuel 30:29). “The Vatican edition of the Sept. omits this name, but inserts five names in this passage between ‘Eshtemoa’ and ‘the Jerahmeelites.’ The only one of these which has any similarity to Rachal is Carmel, which would suit very well as far as position goes; but it is impossible to consider the two as identical without further evidence’ *SEE DAVID*.”

Racham, Rachamah

SEE GIER-EAGLE.

Rachel

SEE SHEEP.

Ra'chel

(Heb. *Rachel* , *l j e*; , a “ewe” or “sheep,” as in ^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 31:38; 32:14; Cant. 6:6; ^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Isaiah 53:7; Sept. and New Test. ^ⲓΡαχήλ, Josephus ^ⲓΡαχήλας), the younger daughter of the Aramean grazier Laban (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 29:16), whom Jacob, her near blood-relation, earned for his wife, as wages for a second seven-years’ service (ver. 18 sq.). B.C. 1920. *SEE LEAH*. After a long period of unfruitfulness, she bore him a son (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 29:31), Joseph (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 30:22 sq.). She went with him to Canaan, on which occasion she stole the household gods of her father and hid them artfully (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 31:19, 34), and finally died on the journey, after the birth of Benjamin, not far from Ephrath (^{ⲁⲒⲓⲃ}Genesis 35:16 sq.). *SEE RACHELS TOMB*.

“The story of Jacob and Rachel has always had a peculiar interest: there is that in it which appeals to some of the deepest feelings of the human heart. The beauty of Rachel, the deep love with which she was loved by Jacob from their first meeting by the well of Haran, when he showed to her the simple courtesies of the desert life, and kissed her and told her he was Rebekah’s son; the long servitude with which he patiently served for her, in which the seven years ‘seemed to him but a few days, for the love he had to her;’ their marriage at last, after the cruel disappointment through the

fraud which substituted the elder sister in the place of the younger; and the death of Rachel at the very time when, in giving birth to another son, her own long-delayed hopes were accomplished, and she had become still more endeared to her husband; his deep grief and ever-living regrets for her loss (~~(OR)~~Genesis 48:7) — these things make up a touching tale of personal and domestic history which has kept alive the memory of Rachel — the beautiful, the beloved, the untimely-taken-away — and has preserved to this day a reverence for her tomb; the very infidel invaders of the Holy Land having respected the traditions of the site, and erected over the spot a small, rude shrine, which conceals whatever remains may have once been found of the pillar first set up by her mourning husband over her grave. Yet, from what is related to us concerning Rachel's character, there does not seem much to claim any high degree of admiration and esteem. The discontent and fretful impatience shown in her grief at being for a time childless, moved even her fond husband to anger (~~(OR)~~Genesis 30:1, 2). She appears, moreover, to have shared all the duplicity and falsehood of her family, of which we have such painful instances in Rebekah, in Laban, and, not least, in her sister Leah, who consented to bear her part in the deception practiced upon Jacob. See, for instance, Rachel's stealing her father's images, and the ready dexterity and presence of mind with which she concealed her theft (ch. 31): we seem to detect here an apt scholar in her father's school of untruth. From this incident we may also infer (though this is rather the misfortune of her position and circumstances) that she was not altogether free from the superstitions and idolatry which prevailed in the land whence Abraham had been called (~~(OR)~~Joshua 24:2, 14), and which still to some degree infected even those families among whom the true God was known. The events which preceded the death of Rachel are of much interest and worthy of a brief consideration. The presence in his household of these idolatrous images, which Rachel, and probably others also, had brought from the East, seems to have been either unknown to or connived at by Jacob for some years after his return from Haran; till, on being reminded by the Lord of the vow which he had made at Bethel when he fled from the face of Esau, and being bidden by him to erect an altar to the God who appeared to him there, Jacob felt the glaring impiety of thus solemnly appearing before God with the taint of impiety cleaving to him or his, and 'said to his household and all that were with him, Put away the strange gods from among you' (~~(OR)~~Genesis 35:2). After thus casting out the polluting thing from his house. Jacob journeyed to Bethel, where, amid the associations of a spot consecrated by the memories of the past, he

received from God an emphatic promise and blessing, and, the name of the Supplanter being laid aside, he had given to him instead the holy name of Israel. Then it was, after his spirit had been there purified and strengthened by communion with God, by the assurance of the divine love and favor, by the consciousness of evil put away and duties performed — then it was, as he journeyed away from Bethel, that the chastening blow fell and Rachel died. These circumstances are alluded to here not so much for their bearing upon the spiritual discipline of Jacob, but rather with reference to Rachel herself, as suggesting the hope that they may have had their effect in bringing her to a higher sense of her relations to that Great Jehovah in whom her husband, with all his faults of character, so firmly believed.” The character of Rachel cannot certainly be drawn from the few features given in the history; yet Niemeyer (*Charak.* ii, 315) thinks that sufficient ground exists for preferring the disposition of Leah to that of her sister. Those who take an interest in such interpretations may find the whole story of Rachel and Leah allegorized by St. Augustine (*Contra Faustum Manichoeum*, 22:51-58, vol. 8, 432, etc., ed. Migne) and Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 134, p. 360; see also Archer, *Rachel a Type of the Church* [Lond. 1843]). **SEE JACOB.**

In ^{<3815>}Jeremiah 31:15, 16, the prophet refers to the historical event of the exile of the ten tribes (represented by “Ephraim”) under Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and the sorrow occasioned by their dispersion (^{<4273>}2 Kings 17:20), under the symbol of Rachel (q.v.), i.e. Rachel, the maternal ancestor of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, bewailing the fate of her children. This lamentation was a *type* or symbol of another connected with the early history of our Lord, which met with its *fulfilment* in the mournful scene at Bethlehem and its vicinity, when so many infants were slaughtered under the barbarous edict of Herod (^{<4126>}Matthew 2:16–18).

Rachel's Tomb

Picture for Rachel's Tomb

(**I heAtrbη**) *Kibrath Rachel*; Sept. in gen. for the former half of the title **μνημεῖον**, but in ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 48:7, and ^{<1259>}2 Kings 5:19, **Χαβραθά**. This seems to have been accepted as the name of the spot [Demetrius in Eus. *Pr. Ev.* 9:21], and to have been actually encountered there by a traveller in the 12th century [Burchard de Strasburg, by Saint-Genois, p. 35], who gives the Arabic name of Rachel's tomb as *Cabrata*, or *Cabata*. The

present name is *Kubbet Rahil*, i.e. “Rachel’s grave”). “Rachel died and was buried in the way Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel’s grave unto this day” (²³¹⁵Genesis 35:19, 20). As Rachel is the first related instance of death in child-bearing, so this pillar over her grave is the first recorded example of the setting-up of a sepulchral monument; caves having been up to this time spoken of as the usual places of burial. The spot was well known in the time of Samuel and Saul (^{901D}1 Samuel 10:2); and the prophet Jeremiah, by a poetic figure of great force and beauty, represents the buried Rachel weeping for the loss and captivity of her children, as the bands of the exiles, led away on their road to Babylon, passed near her tomb (²³¹⁵Jeremiah 31:15–17). ⁴⁰¹⁷Matthew 2:17, 18 applies this to the slaughter by Herod of the infants at Bethlehem. *SEE RACHEL*.

The position of the Ramah here spoken of is one of the disputed questions in the topography of Palestine, *SEE RAMAH*; but the site of Rachel’s tomb, “on the way to Bethlehem,” “a little way to come to Ephrath,” “in the border of Benjamin,” has never been questioned. It is about five miles south of Jerusalem, and half a mile north of Bethlehem. “It is one of the shrines which Moslems, Jews, and Christians agree in honoring, and concerning which their traditions are identical.” It was visited by Maundrell in 1697. The description given by Dr. Robinson (1:218) may serve as the representative of the many accounts, all agreeing with each other, which may be read in almost every book of Eastern travel. It is “merely an ordinary Moslem *wely*, or tomb of a holy person — a small square building of stone with a dome, and within it a tomb in the ordinary Mohammedan form, the whole plastered over with mortar. Of course the building is not ancient: in the 7th century there was here only a pyramid of stones. It is now neglected and falling to decay, though pilgrimages are still made to it by the Jews. The naked walls are covered with names in several languages, many of them in Hebrew. The general correctness of the tradition which has fixed upon this spot for the tomb Rachel cannot well be drawn in question, since it is fully supported by the circumstances of the Scriptural narrative. It is also mentioned by the *Itin. Hieros.*, A. D. 333, and by Jerome (Ep. 86, *ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Pauloe*) in the same century.” Since Robinson’s visit, it has been enlarged by the addition of a square court on the east side, with high walls and arches (*Later Researches*, p. 273). Schwarz (*Palest*, p. 109 sq.) strongly supports the identity of the true grave of Rachel with the monument which now bears that name (see also

Bibliotheca Sacra, 1830, p. 602; *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1864). This monument is particularly described by Hackett (*Illust. of Script.* P. 101 sq.). *SEE BETHLEHEM.*

Racine, Bonaventure

a French priest and historian, was born at Chauny, Nov. 25, 1708, and was the son of the most illustrious of French poets. He was educated at Paris, in the College Mazarin, and made remarkable progress in the languages and in theology. In 1729 he was placed at the head of the College de Rabasteins; but in 1731, becoming satisfied of the injustice done the Jansenists in the bull *Uligenitus*, *SEE JANSENISM*, he took ground against it, and thereby so displeased the powers that were at Rome and at Paris that he was displaced. The bishop of Montpellier, however, took his part, and gave him the presidency of the college at Lunel. But the Jesuits set the flames of opposition going, and Racine was obliged to quit Lunel in much haste. He went to Paris, and there supported himself by teaching as a private tutor after having been ousted, by order of the cardinal Fleury, from a minor position he had secured at a Paris college. Finally the bishop of Auxerre, M. de Caylus, took an interest in Racine, called him into his diocese, and gave him a canonicate in his cathedral. He died May 15, 1755. He wrote much. His principal work is an *Abrie de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique* (Paris, 1748-56, 13 vols. 4to), which clearly reveals the position of its author on the important ecclesiastical questions of his time, and is a valuable index to the Jansenistic proclivities of France in the 18th century. His *Reflexions sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique* (2 vols. 12mo) are not less valuable. See Feller, *Dict. Historique*, s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Radbertus

SEE PASCHASIUS.

Radbod

ST., a Dutch prelate of the Church of Rome, flourished in the second half of the 9th century. He was educated at Cologne, and, being of noble birth, was much at the court of Charles the Bald. In 899 he was placed over the church at Utrecht, and he ruled this episcopal charge with great devotion and honor. He died, according to Mabillon, in 918. For his writings, see *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, 6:158.

Rad'dai

(Heb. *Radday'*, *yDri* *transpling*; *Sept.* *Ραδδαί* v. r. *Ζαβδαί*), the fifth of the seven sons of Jesse, and an elder brother of king David (~~1~~1 Chronicles 2:14). B.C. 1068. He does not appear in the Bible elsewhere than in this list, unless he be, as Ewald conjectures (*Geschichte*, iii, 266, note), identical with Rei (q.v.).

Radegunda

ST., daughter of Berthar, a prince of Thuringia, flourished in the earlier part of the 6th century. Having been carried as a prisoner to France in the twelfth year of her age by Clothaire V, at that time king of the district whose capital is now called Soissons, she was educated in the Christian religion, and when she reached a maturer age was induced, very reluctantly, to become his wife. Her own wish having been to become a nun, her married life was in great measure given up to works of charity and religion, and Clothaire complained that he "had married a nun rather than a queen." Romanists delight in extolling her virtues, and many curious feats are reported to have been performed by her. Thus they tell that one day, as she walked in her garden, she heard the prisoners, who were only separated from her by a wall, weeping and imploring pity. She thought only of her own sorrows in the past, and she prayed earnestly for them, not knowing how else to aid them; and as she prayed, their fetters burst asunder, and they were freed from captivity. Eventually, about the year 553, Radegunda obtained the king's leave to retire to a monastery at Noyon, where she was consecrated a deaconess by the bishop Medard. Soon afterwards she founded a monastery at Poitiers, in which she lived as a simple sister, but which she endowed richly, not only with money and lands, but also with relics and other sacred objects obtained from the Holy Land and all the more eminent churches of the East and West. It was on the occasion of the translation to her church at Poitiers of a relic of the holy cross that the Christian poet Venantius Fortunatus composed the celebrated and truly magnificent Latin hymn, *Vexilla Regis Proderent*. Radegunda outlived him by more than a quarter of a century, during which she was regarded as a model of Christian virtue; and her life has formed the subject of many beautiful legends, still popular in Germany and France. Her monastery, before her death, which took place in 587, numbered no fewer than 200 nuns. Her feast is held on August 13, the anniversary of her death. In ecclesiastical paintings she is represented with the royal crown, and

beneath it a long veil. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Aug. 13; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, vol. ii, bk. vi; *Chambers's Encyclop.* s.v.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, vol. ii.

Rader, Matthaeus,

a learned German Jesuit, was born at Jeichingen, in the Tyrol, in 1561. He flourished for a while as a teacher of rhetoric at Augsburg, then joined the order, and was engaged in various important missions for the Jesuits. He died at Munich in 1634. He published several editions of classical and ecclesiastical writers, and wrote, among others, *Vita Camisii* (1614): — *Bavaria Sancta* (1615): — *Bavaria Pia* (1628): — *Viridiarium Sanctorum* (1604-12).

Radewin, Florentinus

a Roman Catholic of note, was born at Leyerdam, in Holland, about 1350, studied at Prague, and was for some time canon at Utrecht. He became associated with Gerard de Groot, and was one of the founders of the Brethren of the Common Life, and after De Groot's death (1384) was placed at the head of the brotherhood. He died about 1400. *He* was also the founder of the convent of the regular canons at Windesheim, near Zwolle, and of the frater-house at Deventer; he thus became, so to speak, the second founder of the Brethren of the Common Life. His *Life* was written by Thomas a Kempis. See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii, 81 sq.; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 3, 226 sq. (J. H. W.)

Radha Vallabhis

a Hindu sect which worships Krishna as Radha Vallabha, the lord or lover of Radha. This favorite mistress of Krishna is the object of adoration to all the sects who worship that deity, but the adoration of Radha is of very recent origin. The founder of this sect is alleged to have been a teacher named Hari Vans, who settled at Vrindavan, and established a *math* there, which in 1822, comprised between forty and fifty resident ascetics. He also erected a temple there which still exists.

Raey, John De

a Dutch theologian and philosopher, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, at Leyden. He was a devoted Cartesianist, and distinguished himself greatly as such in 1665 at public disputation. He was in favor of

complete alienation of philosophy from religion, and had a dangerous tendency to scepticism of the very worst character. See Spanheim, *Apistola*, in *Opp.* i, 959.

Raffaelle

SEE RAPHAEL.

Rafflenghen, Franz

a Dutch theologian of note, was born at Lancy, near Ryssel, in 1539. He was educated at Leyden University, and greatly distinguished himself in the Greek and Oriental languages. He was first made professor of the former at Cambridge, and later of the latter languages at his alma mater. He died in 1597. Rafflenghen corrected the Antwerp Polyglot, and wrote, *Lexicon Atab.* (Leyden, 1599): — *Dict. Chald.*: — *Gramm. Hebr.*, and other works.

Raffles, Thomas

D.D., LL.D., an English Independent divine of great celebrity as a pulpit orator and theologian, was born in London, May 17, 1788, of good parentage, and was connected with Sir Thomas S. Raffles. He pursued his theological studies at Hoinertol College, and in 1809 was settled as a Congregational minister at Hammersmith. In 1812 he accepted a call from the Great George Street Chapel in Liverpool, and remained sole pastor until 1858, when he was furnished a colleague as an assistant. In 1860 he resigned his charge, and withdrew from the responsibilities of the stated ministry altogether, his health having become inadequate to any considerable labor, yet he preached frequently after that at the opening of chapels and on other similar public occasions. He died Aug. 18, 1863. Probably no minister in the Congregational body in England has been more widely or more feavorably known during the last half century than Dr. Raffles. Besides being one of the most popular preachers in Great Britain, and being called abroad on occasions of public interest oftener, perhaps, than any other one, he has done good service to the cause both of literature and religion by his pen. In 1817 he published a highly interesting volume of *Letters during a Tour through Some Parts of France, Savoy, Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands*. Shortly after the commencement of his ministry he preached a sermon before the London Missionary Society, which attracted great attention and was very widely circulated; and several

other of his discourses have been given to the public and received with great favor. He was accustomed to celebrate the return of the new year by an appropriate piece of poetry, which was printed and sent forth among his friends as a most welcome remembrancer. He has, in addition to these pieces, written many beautiful hymns, some of which have found their way into some of the collections of sacred song. He is also the author of a *Memoir* of the life and ministry of his predecessor, the Rev. Thomas Spencer, a work which passed through many editions, and in America it has been several times reprinted. His *Lectures on Christian Faith and Practice*, though widely circulated, deserve to be better known than they are, being a clear and conclusive exposition and vindication of the Gospel and the rule and motives of morality. He published several separate sermons preached on various public occasions, and contributed frequently to periodicals. See *The Patriot* (Liverpool), Aug. 20, 1863; *N. Y. Observer*, Sept. 19, 1863; *Princeton Rev.* April, 1870, art. 3.

Raffles, Thomas Stamford

Sir, an English philanthropist, born July 5, 1781, was British governor of the island of Java from 1811 to 1816, and, after a visit home, returned to the East as resident at Bencoolen in Sumatra, and was instrumental in founding a college for the promotion of Anglo-Chinese literature. He died in England, July 4, 1826. He published a *History of Java*.

Rafin, Gaspard

a French Protestant minister, was born at Realmont (Tarn), in the first half of the 16th century. He was a devoted Huguenot, and his home was the rallying-place of French Protestants during the days of oppression and persecution.

Ra'gau

(Ὶ Ραγαῦ; Vulg. *Ragau*), the Greek form of the name of a place and of a person.

1. A place named only in the Apocrypha (Judith 1:5, 15). In the latter verse the "mountains of Ragau" are mentioned. It is probably identical with RAGES *SEE RAGES* (q.v.).

2. One of the ancestors of our Lord, son of Phalec (~~cf.~~ Luke 3:35). He is the same person with REU *SEE REU* (q.v.), son of Peleg; and the

difference in the name arises from our translators having followed the Greek form, in which the Hebrew [] was frequently expressed by γ , as is the case in Raguel (which once occurs for Reuel), Gomorrha, Gotholiah (for Atholiah), Phogor (for Peor), etc.

Ra'ges

(Ράγη, Ράγοι ; Vulg. *Rages, Ragau*) was an important city in north-eastern Media, where that country bordered upon Parthia. It is not mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, but occurs frequently in the book of Tobit (1:14; 5:5; 6:9, 12, etc.), and twice in Judith (“Ragau” [1:5,15]). According to Tobit, it was a place to which some of the Israelitish captives taken by Shalmaneser (Enemessar) had been transported, and thither the angel Raphael conducted the young Tobiah. In the book of Judith it is made the scene of the great battle between Nebuchodonosor and Arphaxad, wherein the latter is said to have been defeated and taken prisoner. Neither of these accounts can be regarded as historic, but the latter may conceal a fact of some importance in the history of the city.

Rages is a place mentioned by a great number of profane writers. The name is said to have been derived from the *chasms* (ῥαγάς) made in the vicinity by earthquakes (Strabo, i, 13). It appears as *Ragha* in the Zendavesta, in Isidore, and in Stephen; as *Raga* in the inscriptions of Darius; *Rhalce* in Duris of Samos (Fr. 25), Strabo (xi, 9, § 1), and Arrian (*Exp. Alex.* iii, 20); and *Rhagcoea* in Ptolemy (vi, 5). Properly speaking, Rages is a town, but the town gave name to a province, which is sometimes called Rages or Rhagae, sometimes Rhagiana. It appears from the Zendavesta that here was one of the earliest settlements of the Arians, who were mingled, in Rhagiana, with two other races, and were thus brought into contact with heretics (Bunsen, *Philosophy of Universal History*, iii, 485). Isidore calls Rages “the greatest city in Media” (p. 6), which may have been true in his day; but other writers commonly regard it as much inferior to Ecbatana. It was the place to which Frawartish (Phraortes), the Median rebel, fled when defeated by Darius Hystaspis, and at which he was made prisoner by one of Darius’s generals (*Beh. Inscs.* col. ii, par. 13). **SEE MEDIA**. This is probably the fact which the apocryphal writer of Judith had in his mind when he spoke of Arphaxad as having been captured at Ragau. When Darius Codomannus fled from Alexander, intending to make a final stand in Bactria, he must have passed through Rages on his way to the Caspian Gates; and so we find that Alexander arrived there, in pursuit of his enemy,

on the eleventh day after he quitted Ecbatana (Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* iii, 20). In the troubles which followed the death of Alexander, Rages appears to have gone to decay, but it was soon after rebuilt by Seleucus I (Nicator), who gave of the name of Europus (Strab. 11:13, § 6; Steph. Byz. ad voc.). When the Parthians took it, they called it *Arsacia*, after the Arsaces of the day; but it soon afterwards recovered its ancient appellation, as we see by Strabo and Isidore. That appellation it has ever since retained. with only a slight corruption, the ruins being still known by the name of *Rhey*. These ruins lie about five miles south-east of Teheran, and cover a space 4500 yards long by 3500 yards broad. The walls are well marked, and are of prodigious thickness; they appear to have been flanked by strong towers, and are connected with a lofty citadel at their north-eastern angle. The importance of the place consisted in its vicinity to the Caspian Gates, which, in a certain sense, it guarded. Owing to the barren and desolate character of the great salt desert of Iran, every army which seeks to pass from Bactria, India, and Afghanistan to Media and Mesopotamia, or *vice versa*, must skirt the range of mountains which runs along the southern shore of the Caspian. These mountains send out a rugged and precipitous spur in about long. 52° 25' E. from Greenwich, which runs far into the desert, and can only be rounded with the extremest difficulty. Across this spur is a single pass — the Pylae Caspiae of the ancients — and of this pass the possessors of Rhages must have at all times held the keys. The modern Teheran, built out of its ruins, has now superseded Rhey; and it is perhaps mainly from the importance of its position that it has become the Persian capital. For an account of the ruins of Rhey, see Ker Porter, *Travels*, i, 357-364; and compare Fraser, *Khorassan*, p. 286.

Ragged Schools

is the popular name for a voluntary agency providing education for destitute children, and so preventing them from falling into vagrancy and crime. Vagrant children, and those guilty of slight offences, are provided for in the English Certified Industrial School; but the two institutions are in Great Britain frequently combined. *SEE INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS*. The movement which established ragged schools was almost simultaneous with that which instituted reformatories. John Borgia, an unlettered laboring mason, established a “ragged school” towards the close of the last century, composed of thievish and vagrant children gathered from the streets and by-ways of Rome. A few years later, John Pounds, an uneducated cobbler, for twenty years, till his death in 1839, gathered into his shop the most

destitute and degraded children of Portsmouth, and thus instituted the first ragged school in England. Both wrought miracles among the juvenile *gamzins* of the street. The mental, industrial, moral, and religious training which they imparted to the juvenile generation of their time was a work most appropriately honored as “the beginning of the greatest of all social problems.” It saved thousands of children from beggary and vice, and raised multitudes from the verge of infamy to the rank of a useful and honored life. The first school in which education was accompanied by offer of food was opened by Sheriff Watson in Aberdeen in 1841, and from thence ragged feeding-schools spread over all the country. London had a ragged Sunday-school in 1838, which eventually became a free day-school. Field Lane followed in 1843. The Ragged School Union of London in 1864 numbered 201 day-schools, with 17,983 scholars (of these, 2849 were industrial); 180 Sunday-schools, with 23,360 scholars; and 205 night-schools, with 8325 scholars. The number of schools throughout the country cannot be ascertained, as they are not officially known. A Privy-council minute of 1856 allowed a capitation grant of £2 10s. to every child fed in the schools. This was withdrawn in 1859, as was also the grant of one third the cost of material used in industrial training. Many of the existing schools certified under the Act of 1857, as in Scotland under Mr. Dunllop’s Act of 1854; but these acts operated very slightly in changing the character of the schools, though introducing the principle of compulsory detention, more fully worked out under recent acts. In the present code of government education, ragged schools are left out. They can obtain grants on the same conditions as other schools—conditions to them often difficult and unnecessary. For industrial teaching, they receive nothing. The ragged school joined to the certified industrial is precluded from aid from any quarter. There are still, it is estimated, 25,000 ragged children in the streets of London. Schools for the instruction of poor colored children were established by the Friends of Philadelphia as early as 1770, and their benevolent care has not relaxed in this respect for an entire century. *SEE ALSO SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.*

Ragstatt, Frederic

of Weile, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born, of Jewish parents, at Metz in 1648. In the year 1671 he was baptized at Cleves in the faith of the Reformed Church; and his conversion and public confession of the divine truths of Christianity were not less remarkable. Shortly after his baptism, when scarcely twenty-three years of age, he published a Latin

apology: *Theatrum Lucidumn, exhibens Verum Messiam, Dominus nostrum Jesum Christum, ejusque Honorem Defendens contra Accusationes Judorum seu Rabinorum in Genere, speciatir R. Lipmanni Nizzachon* (Amst. 1671), in which the name of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, was gloriously maintained against the abominable Nizzachon of the famous Rabbi Lipmann (q.v.). Having studied at Groningen and Leyden, in 1680 he was called to the pastorate at Spyk, near Gorcum, in South Holland, where he labored with great blessing, bringing many of his former coreligionists to the foot of the cross. Besides his *Theatrum*, he published some other writings. See First, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 128 sq.; Jicher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v. "Von Weile;" Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* I, iii, 4 (Nuremb. 1850); Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, s.v.; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche*, p. 63 sq.; Delitzsch, *Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judenthum*, p. 138; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 561 sq. (B. P.)

Ragu'el

(Heb. **l a**⌘[r]) Sept. **Ῥαγουήλ**), a less correct Anglicism of the name REUEL *SEE REUEL* (q.v.).

1. A prince-priest of Midian, the father of Zipporah, according to Exodus ii, 21, and of Hobab according to ^{<0102>}Numbers 10:29. As the father-in-law of Moses is named Jethro in ^{<0103>}Exodus 3:1, and Hobab in ^{<0101>}Judges 4:11, and perhaps in ^{<0102>}Numbers 10:29 (though the latter passage admits of another sense), the *prima-facie* view would be that Raguel, Jethro, and Hobab were different names for the same individual. Such is probably the case with regard to the two first, at all events, if not with the third. *SEE HOBAB*. One of the names may represent an official title, but whether Jethro or Raguel is uncertain, both being appropriately significant (Jethro "pre-eminent," from **rty**, "to excel," and Raguel= "friend of God," from **l a**⌘[r]). Josephus was in favor of the former (**τουτο**, i.e. **Ἰεθεργλάιος, ην ἐπίκλημα τῷ Ῥαγουήλῳ**, *Ant.* ii, 12, 1), and this is not unlikely, as the name Reuel was not an uncommon one. The identity of Jethro and Reuel is supported by the indiscriminate use of the names in the Sept. (^{<0106>}Exodus 2:16, 18); and the application of more than one name to the same individual was a usage familiar to the Hebrews, as instanced in Jacob and Israel, Solomon anti Jedidiah, and other similar cases. Another solution of the difficulty has been sought in the loose use of terms of relationship among the Hebrews; as that *chothen* (**ῥῥῥῥ** in ^{<0103>}Exodus 3:1; 18:1;

Numbers 10:29, may signify any relation by marriage, and consequently that Jethro and Hobab were brothers-in-law of Moses; or that the terms arb (ba) and bath (tB) in Exodus 2:16, 21, mean *grandfather* and *granddaughter*. Neither of these assumptions is satisfactory, the former in the absence of any corroborative evidence, the latter because the omission of Jethro, the father's name, in so circumstantial a narrative as in Exodus ii, is inexplicable; nor can we conceive the indiscriminate use of the terms father and grandfather without good cause. Nevertheless, this view has a strong weight of authority in its favor, being supported by the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Michaelis, Winer, and others. *SEE JETHRO.*

2. Another transcription of the name REUEL, occurring in Tobit, where Raguel, a pious Jew of Ecbatane. a city of Media, is father of Sara, the wife of Tobias (Tobias 3:7, 17, etc.). The name was not uncommon. and in the book of Enoch it is applied to one of the great guardian angels of the universe, who was charged with the execution of the divine judgments on the (material) world and the stars (20:4; 23:4, ed. Dillmann).

Ragueneau, Frederic De

a French prelate who flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was of noble birth, and after taking holy orders, his uncle vacated the bishopric of Marseilles in order to make room for him. He became a zealous and devoted ecclesiastic, and in many instances displayed more than ordinary manliness. As he was suspected of a strong leaning towards Protestantism, the leaguists greatly annoyed him, and he finally quitted the country, as his life was threatened. He took refuge with Christina of Lorraine in Italy, until after the abjuration of Henry IV, when Ragueneau returned to France; but he paid for his trust in the change of the times by his life's blood. He was assassinated Sept. 26, 1603, in his castle. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, xli,473,474; *Arret do Parlenent de Province contre le utes uteus e l'Assassinat commis sur la Personne de F. de Ragueneau* (new ed. Marseilles, 1854, 8vo).

Ra'hab

the form, in the A. V., of two names quite different in the Hebrew.

I. (Heb. *Raechab'*, bj r; *wide*; Sept. ^{Ⲡⲱϭⲁⲃ} [and so in ^{Ⲡⲱⲕⲁⲃ} Matthew 1:5, "Rachab"], ^{Ⲡⲱϭⲁⲃ}; Josephus, ^{Ⲡⲱϭⲁⲃⲏⲥ}, *Ant.* v, 1, 2.) A woman of Jericho

at the time of the Eisode, whose name has become famous in that connection (Joshua 2) and in Jewish lineage (B.C. 1618). In the following account of her we chiefly follow the Biblical and other ancient authorities, with additions from modern sources. *SEE EXODE.*

1. Her History. — At the time of the arrival of the Israelites in Canaan she was a young unmarried woman, dwelling in a house of her own alone, though she had a father and mother, and brothers and sisters, living in Jericho. She was a “harlot,” and probably combined the trade of lodging-keeper for wayfaring men. She seems also to have been engaged in the manufacture of linen, and the art of dyeing, for which the Phoenicians were early famous; since we find the flat roof of her house covered with stalks of flax put there to dry, and a stock of scarlet or crimson (*ynæ, shani*) thread in her house — a circumstance which, coupled with the mention of Babylonish garments at 7:21 as among the spoils of Jericho, indicates the existence of a trade in such articles between Phoenicia and Mesopotamia. Her house was situated on the wall, probably near the town gate, so as to be convenient for persons coming in and going out of the city. Traders coming from Mesopotamia or Egypt to Phoenicia would frequently pass through Jericho, situated as it was near the fords of the Jordan; and of these many would resort to the house of Rahab. Rahab, therefore, had been well informed with regard to the events of the Exodus. She had heard of the passage through the Red Sea, of the utter destruction of Sihbon and Og, and of the irresistible progress of the Israelitish host. The effect upon her mind had been what one would not have expected in a person of her way of life: it led her to a firm faith in Jehovah as the true God, and to the conviction that he purposed to give the land of Canaan to the Israelites. When, therefore, the two spies sent by Joshua came to her house, they found themselves under the roof of one who, alone, probably, of the whole population, was friendly to their nation. Their coming, however, was quickly known; and the king of Jericho, having received information of it — while at supper, according to Josephus, that very evening, to require her to deliver them up. It is very likely that, her house being a public one, some one who resorted there may have seen and recognised the spies, and gone off at once to report the matter to the authorities. But not without awakening Rahab’s suspicions; for she immediately hid the men among the flax-stalks which were piled on the flat roof of her house, and, on the arrival of the officers sent to search her house, was ready with the story that two men — of what country she knew not — had, it was true,

been to her house, but had left it just before the gates were shut for the night. If they pursued them at once, she added, they would be sure to overtake them. Misled by the false information, the men started in pursuit to the fords of the Jordan, the gates having been opened to let them out, and immediately closed again. When all was quiet, and the people were gone to bed, Rahab stole up to the house-top, told the spies what had happened, and assured them of her faith in the God of Israel, and her confident expectation of the capture of the whole land by them — an expectation, she added, which was shared by her countrymen, and had produced a great panic among them. She then told them her plan for their escape: it was to let them down by a cord from the window of her house, which looked over the city wall, and that they should flee into the mountains which bounded the plains of Jericho, and lie hidden there for three days, by which time the pursuers would have returned, and the fords of the Jordan be open to them again. She asked, in return for her kindness to them, that they should swear by Jehovah that when their countrymen had taken the city, they would spare her life, and the lives of her father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all that belonged to them. The men readily consented; and it was agreed between them that she should hang out her scarlet line at the window from which they had escaped, and bring all her family under her roof. If any of her kindred went out-of-doors into the street, his blood would be upon his own head; and the Israelites, in that case, would be guiltless. The event proved the wisdom of her precautions. The pursuers returned to Jericho after a fruitless search, and the spies got safe back to the Israelitish camp. The news they brought of the terror of the Canaanites doubtless inspired Israel with fresh courage, and within three days of their return the passage of the Jordan was effected. In the utter destruction of Jericho which ensued, Joshua gave the strictest orders for the preservation of Rahab and her family; and, accordingly, before the city was burned, the two spies were sent to her house, and they brought out her, her father, and mother, and brothers, and kindred, and all that she had, and placed them in safety in the Israelitish camp. The narrator adds, “and she dwelleth in Israel unto this day;” not necessarily implying that she was alive at the time he wrote, but that the family of strangers of which she was reckoned the head continued to dwell among the children of Israel. May not the three hundred and forty-five “children of Jericho” mentioned in ^{<41234>}Ezra 2:34; ^{<41735>}Nehemiah 7:36, and “the men of Jericho” who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (^{<4182>}Nehemiah 3:2) have been their posterity? Their continued sojourn among the Israelites as a

distinct family would be exactly analogous to the cases of the Kenites, the house of Rechab, the Gibeonites, the house of Caleb, and perhaps others.
SEE JERICHO.

As regards Rahab herself, we learn from ^{<4015>}Matthew 1:5 that she became the wife of Salmon, the son of Nahshon, and the ancestress of Boaz, Jesse's grandfather. The suspicion naturally arises that Salmon may have been one of the spies whose life she saved, and that gratitude for so great a benefit led, in his case, to a more tender passion, and obliterated the memory of any past Disgrace attaching to her name. We are expressly told that the spies were "young men" (^{<4023>}Joshua 6:23) — Sept. **νεανίσκους**, 2, 1; and the example of the former spies who were sent from Kadesh-Barnea, who were all "heads of Israel" (^{<4033>}Numbers 13:3), as well as the importance of the service to be performed, would lead one to expect that they would be persons of high station. But, however this may be, it is certain, on the authority of Matthew, that Rahab became the mother of the line from which sprang David, and, eventually, Christ; and there can be little doubt that it was so stated in the public archives from which the evangelist extracted our Lord's genealogy, in which only four women are named — viz. Tamar, Rachab, Ruth, and Bathsheba — who were all, apparently, foreigners, and named for that reason; for that the Rachab mentioned by Matthew is Rahab the harlot is as certain as that David in the genealogy is the same person as David in the books of Samuel. The attempts that have been made to prove Rachab different from Rahab (chiefly by Outhov, a Dutch professor, in the *Biblioth. Bremens.* iii, 438: the earliest expression of any doubt is by Theophylact, in the 11th century) in order to get out of the chronological difficulty, are singularly absurd, and all the more so because, even if successful, they would not diminish the difficulty as long as Salmon remains as the son of Nahshon and the ancestor of Boaz. However, as there are still found those who follow Outhov in his opinion, or at least speak doubtfully (Valpy, *Greek Test.* with English notes, on *Matthew* i, 5; Burrington, *On the Genealogies*, i, 192-194, etc.; Kuinil, on *Matt.* i, 5; Olshausen, *ibid.*), it may be as well to call attention, with Dr. Mill (p. 131), to the exact coincidence in the age of Salmon, as the son of Nahshon, who was prince of the children of Judah in the wilderness, and that of Rahab the harlot. and to observe that the only conceivable reason for the mention of Rachab in Matthew's genealogy is that she was a remarkable and well-known person, as Tamar, Ruth, and Bathsheba were. The mention of an utterly unknown Rahab in the line

would be absurd. The allusions to “Rahab the harlot” in ^{<S13>}Hebrews 11:31; ^{<S12>}James 2:25, by classing her among those illustrious for their faith, make it still more impossible to suppose that Matthew was speaking of any one else. The four generations, Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, are, nevertheless, not necessarily all consecutive. *SEE DAVID*. There does not seem, however, to be any force in Bengel’s remark, adopted by Olshausen, that the article (ἐκ τῆς Ῥαχάβ) proves that Rahab of Jericho is meant, seeing that all the proper names in the genealogy which are in the oblique case have the article, though many of them occur nowhere else, and that it is omitted before Μαριάμ in ver. 16. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*.

The Jewish writers abound in praises of Rahab, on account of the great service she rendered their ancestors. Even those who do not deny that she was a harlot admit that she eventually became the wife of a prince of Israel, and that many great persons of their nation sprang from this union. The general statement is, that she was ten years of age at the time the Hebrews quitted Egypt; that she played the harlot during all the forty years they were in the wilderness: that she became a proselyte when the spies were received by her; and that, after the fall of Jericho, no less a personage than Joshua himself made her his wife. She is also counted as an ancestress of Jeremiah, Maaseiah, Hanameel, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel, Neriah, Serial, and Huldah the prophetess. See Talm. Babyl. *Megillah*, fol. 14. col. 2: *Yuchasin*, 10:1; *Shalshalet Hakabala*, 7:2; Abarbanel, Kimchi, etc., on ^{<S12>}Joshua 6:25; *Mitzvoth Toreh*, p. 112; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Matthew 1:4; Meuschen, *N.T. Talmud*, p. 40. *SEE JOSHUA*.

2. Rahab’s Character. — This has been a subject of deep interest and no little controversy. In the narrative of these transactions, Rahab is called ^{h̄n̄w̄} *zotih*, which our own, after the ancient versions, renders “Harlot.” The Jewish writers, however, being unwilling to entertain the idea of their ancestors being involved in a disreputable association at the commencement of their great undertaking, chose to interpret the word “hostess,” one who keeps a public-house, as if from ^{ʿwz}, “to nourish” (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1; ii and vii; comp. the Targum, and Kimchi and Jarchi on the text). Christian translators, also, are inclined to adopt this interpretation for the sake of the character of a woman of whom the apostle speaks well, and who would appear, from ^{<S12>}Matthew 1:4, to have become, by a subsequent marriage with Salmon, prince of Judah, an

ancestress of Jesus. But we must be content to take facts as they stand, and not strain them to meet difficulties; and it is now universally admitted by every sound Hebrew scholar that **הנחש** means “harlot,” and not “hostess.” It signifies “harlot” in every other text where it occurs, the idea of “hostess” not being represented by this or any other word in Hebrew, as the function represented by it did not exist. (See Frisch, *De Miuliere Peregrina tp. Heb.* [Lips. 1744].) There were no inns; and when certain substitutes for inns eventually came into use, they were never, in any Eastern country, kept by women. On the other hand, strangers from beyond the river might have repaired to the house of a harlot without suspicion or remark: the Bedawin from the desert constantly do so at this day in their visits to Cairo and Bagdad. The house of such a woman was also the only one to which they, as perfect strangers, could have had access, and certainly the only one in which they could calculate on obtaining the information they required without danger from male inmates. This concurrence of analogies in the word, in the thing, and in the probability of circumstances ought to settle the question. If we are concerned for the morality of Rahab, the best proof of her reformation is found in the fact of her subsequent marriage to Salmon: this implies her previous conversion to Judaism, for which, indeed, her discourse with the spies evinces that she was prepared. Dismissing, therefore, as inconsistent with truth and with the meaning of **הנחש** and **πόρνη**, the attempt to clear her character of stain by saying that she was only an innkeeper, and not a harlot **πανδοκευτρία**, Chrysostom and Chald. Vers.), we may yet notice that it is very possible that to a woman of her country and religion such a calling may have implied a far less deviation from the standard of morality than it does with us (“vitae genus vile magis quam flagitiosum:” Grotius), and, moreover, that with a purer faith she seems to have entered upon a pure life. *SEE HARLOT.*

As a case of casuistry, her conduct in deceiving the king of Jericho’s messengers with a false tale, and, above all, in taking part against her own countrymen, has been much discussed. With regard to the first, strict truth, either in Jew or heathen, was a virtue so utterly unknown before the promulgation of the Gospel that, so far as Rahab is concerned, the discussion is quite superfluous. The question, as regards ourselves, whether in any case a falsehood is allowable — say to save our own life or that of another — is different, but need not be argued here. The question, in reference both to Rahab and to Christians, is well discussed by

Augustine, *Contr. Mendacium* (*Opp.* 6:33, 34; comp. Bullinger, 3d *Dec. Serm.* iv). With regard to her taking part against her own countrymen, it can only be justified — but is fully justified — by the circumstance that fidelity to her country would, in her case, have been infidelity to God, and that the higher duty to her Maker eclipsed the lower duty to her native land. Her anxious provision for the safety of her father's house shows how alive she was to natural affections, and seems to prove that she was not influenced by a selfish insensibility, but by an enlightened preference for the service of the true God over the abominable pollutions of Canaanite idolatry. If her own life of shame was in any way connected with that idolatry, one can readily understand what a further stimulus this would give, now that her heart was purified by faith, to her desire for the overthrow of the nation to which she belonged by birth, and the establishment of that to which she wished to belong by a community of faith and hope. Anyhow, allowing for the difference of circumstances, her feelings and conduct were analogous to those of a Christian Jew in Paul's time, who should have preferred the triumph of the Gospel to the triumph of the old Judaism, or to those of a converted Hindu in our own days, who should side with Christian Englishmen against the attempts of his own countrymen to establish the supremacy either of Brahma or Mohammed.

This view of Rahab's conduct is fully borne out by the references to her in the N.T. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "by faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace" (^{<S13>}Hebrews 11:31); and James fortifies his doctrine of justification by works by asking, "Was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" (^{<S25>}James 2:25). In like manner Clement of Rome says, "Rahab the harlot was saved for her faith and hospitality" (*ad Corinth.* 12).

The fathers generally ("miro consensu:" Jacobson) consider the deliverance of Rahab as typical of salvation, and the scarlet line hung out at her window as typical of the blood of Jesus, in the same way as the ark of Noah and the blood of the paschal lamb were — a view which is borne out by the analogy of the deliverances, and by the language of ^{<S13>}Hebrews 11:31 (τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, "the disobedient"), compared with ^{<S13>}1 Peter 3:20 (ἀπειθησασίν ποτε). Clement (*ad Corinth.* 12) is the first to do so. He says that by the symbol of the scarlet line it was "made manifest that there shall be redemption through the blood of the Lord to all who believe

and trust in God,” and adds that Rahab in this was a prophetess as well as a believer — a sentiment in which he is followed by Origen (*in lib. Jes., Hon.* iii). Justin Martyr, in like manner, calls the scarlet line “the symbol of the blood of Christ, by which those of all nations who once were harlots and unrighteous are saved;” and in a like spirit Irenaeus draws from the story of Rahab the conversion of the Gentiles, and the admission of publicans and harlots into the kingdom of heaven through the symbol of the scarlet line, which he compares with the Passover and the Exodus. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine (who, like Jerome and Cyril, takes Psalm 87: 4 to refer to Rahab the harlot), and Theodoret, all follow in the same track; but Origen, as usual, carries the allegory still further. Irenaeus makes the singular mistake of calling the spies *three*, and makes them symbolical of the Trinity! The comparison of the scarlet line with the scarlet thread which was bound round the hand of Zarah is a favorite one with them. See Irenaeus, *Contr. Her.* 4:xx; Just. Mart. *Contr. Tryph.* p. 11; Jerome, *Adv. Jovin.* lib. i; *Epist. 34 ad Nepot.*; *Breviar. in Psalm 86*; Origen, *Comm. in Matt. 27*; Chrysost. *Hon. 3 in Matt.*, also *3 ins Ep. ad Roml.*; Eph. Syr. *Rhythm 1 and 7 on Nativ.*; *Rhythm 7 on the Faith*; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechet. Lect.* ii, 9; 10:11. Bullinger (*5th Dec. Sermon.* vi) views the line as a sign and seal of the covenant between the Israelites and Rahab.

The Jews, as above observed, are embarrassed as to what to say concerning Rahab. They praise her highly for her conduct; but some rabbins give out that she was not a Canaanite, but of some other Gentile race, and was only a sojourner in Jericho. The Gemara of Babylon mentions the above-noted tradition that she became the wife of Joshua — a tradition unknown to Jerome (*Adv. Jovin.*). Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1) describes her as an innkeeper, and her house as an inn (*τcαraywylov*), and never applies to her the epithet *wpovq*), which is the term used by the Sept.

See the *Critici Sacri, Thesaur.* Nov. i, 487; Simeon, *Works*, ii, 544; Gordon, *Christ as Made Known*, etc. ii, 268; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii, 246; Niemeyer, *Chara’k.* iii, 423 sq.; Abicht, *De Rachab Meretrice* (Lips. 1714); Caunter, *Hist. and Char. of Rahab* [insists that she could not have been a harlot] (Lond. 1850); Hocmann, *Rahab’s Erettung* (Berl. 1861).
SEE JOSHUA.

II. (Heb. *Ra’hab*, *bhri* strength; Sept. [†]Ραάβ, ^{<3870†}Psalm 87:4; τὸ κῆτος, ^{<1812}Job 16:12; ὑπερήφανος, ^{<3810†}Psalm 89:10; omits ^{<2510†}Isaiah 51:9). A

poetical name signifying “sea monster,” which is applied as an appellation to Egypt in ^{<97413>}Psalm 74:13, 14; 87:4; 89:10; ^{<25109>}Isaiah 51:9 (and sometimes to its king, ^{<23218>}Ezekiel 29:3; 33:3; comp. ^{<19831>}Psalm 68:31) — which metaphorical designation probably involves an allusion to the crocodiles, hippopotami, and other aquatic creatures of the Nile (q.v.). As the word, if Hebrew, radically denotes “fierceness, insolence, pride,” when applied to Egypt, it would indicate the national character of the inhabitants. Gesenius thinks it was probably of Egyptian origin. but accommodated to Hebrew, although no likely equivalent has been found in Coptic, or, we may add, in ancient Egyptian (*Thesaur.* s.v.). That the Hebrew meaning is alluded to in connection with the proper name does not seem to prove that the latter is Hebrew, but this is rendered very probable by its apposite character and its sole use in poetical books. *SEE BEHEMIOTH.*

The same word occurs in a passage in Job, where it is usually translated, as in the A. V., instead of being treated as a proper name. Yet many interpreters, comparing this passage with parallel ones, insist that it refers to the Exodus: “He divideth the sea with his power, *and* by his understanding he smiteth through the proud” [or “Rahab”] (26:12). The prophet Isaiah calls on the arm of the Lord, “[Art] not thou it that hath cut Rahab, [and] wounded the dragon? [Art] not thou. it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a wayn for the ransomed to pass over?” (51:99, 10; comp. 15). In Psalm 74 the division of the sea is mentioned in connection with breaking the heads of the dragons and the heads of Leviathan (ver. 13, 14). So, too, in Psalm 89 God’s power to subdue the sea is spoken of immediately before a mention of his having “broken Rahab in pieces” (ver. 9, 10). Rahab, as a name of Egypt, occurs once only without reference to the Exodus: this is in Psalm 87, where Rahab, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Cush are compared with Zion (ver. 4, 5). In one other passage the name is alluded to with reference to its Hebrew signification, where it is prophesied that the aid of the Egyptians should not avail those who sought it. and this sentence follows: **t̄b̄; p̄h̄b̄h̄r̄i** “Insolence (i. c. ‘the insolent’), they sit still” (^{<23107>}Isaiah 30:7), as Gesenius reads. considering it to be undoubtedly a proverbial expression. *SEE CROCODILE.*

Ra’ham

(Heb. *Rach’am*, **ṣ̄j r̄i** belly; Sept. ‘Paest), the son of Shema and father of Jorkoam, in the genealogy of the descendants of Caleb the son of Hezron,

of the tribe of Judah (~~1384~~1 Chronicles 2:44). B.C. post 1600. Rashi and the author of the *Quaest. in Paral.*, attributed to Jerome, regard Jorkoam as a place, of which Raham was founder and prince.

Rahauser, Frederick A.

a German Reformed minister, was born in York Co., Pa., in 1782, of humble but excellent parentage. He was brought up as a weaver, the profession of his father. His early educational advantages were very limited. At the age of twenty-one he went to Hanover, Pa., there studied with a Lutheran minister, and then determined to prepare for the work of the ministry. His brother Jonathan greatly aided him, and Frederick Rahausser pleased as a preacher as soon as he entered upon the ministerial task. He was ordained in 1808, and preached for nearly half a century. He served during this period several large and laborious charges, which are now among the most prosperous and prominent places in the Reformed Church. In those early days all ministers did hard work, for then the fields were large — and the laborers were yet fewer than now. His first settlement was at Emmettsburg, Md., in the summer of 1808. This charge, which he served with great acceptance for about eight years, then included Gettysburg, Taneytown, Apples, and other distant points. Some of the congregations were seven, ten, twelve, and even twenty miles apart. But during all his hard service his general health was good, so that he rarely failed to meet an appointment. In 1816 he accepted a call to the church at Harrisburg, Pa., to which he ministered till 1819, when he removed to Chambersburg, Pa. To this charge he gave his matured and most vigorous labors, and there faithfulness also was attended with success for a period of seventeen years. In 1836 he removed to Tiffin, O., and for four years was pastor of the German Reformed Church in that city. In 1840 he took charge of some country churches in Sandusky and Seneca counties, in a region called the Black Swamp. Here he continued the work of his ministry, till declining years and failing energies disabled him from the active duties of his holy office. He lived with his children until his death, July 15, 1865.

Ra'hel

a form originally adopted everywhere in the A. V. (in the edition of 1611) for the present familiar name RACHEL *SEE RACHEL* (q.v.), but retained

in our present Bible only in ~~2815~~ Jeremiah 31:15, apparently by a mere oversight of the later editors.

Rahu

is, in Indian mythology, the daemon who is imagined to be the cause of the eclipses of sun and moon. When, in consequence of the churning of the milk sea, the gods had obtained the amrita, or beverage of immortality, they endeavored to appropriate it to their exclusive use; and in this attempt they had also succeeded, after a long struggle with their rivals the Daityas, or daemons, when Rahu, one of the latter, insinuating himself among the gods, obtained a portion of the amrita. Being detected by the sun and moon, his head was cut off by Vishnu; but, the amrita having reached his throat, his head had already become immortal; and out of revenge against sun and moon, it now pursues them with implacable hatred, seizing them at intervals, and thus causing their eclipses. Such is the substance of the legend as told in the *Mahabharata* (q.v.). In the *Puranas* (q.v.), it is amplified by allowing both head and tail of the daemon to ascend to heaven, and produce the eclipses of sun and moon, when the head of the daemon is called *Rahu* and his tail *Ketu*, both, moreover, being represented in some *Puranas* as the sons of the daemon *Viprachitti* and his wife *Sinhika*. In the *VishnuPurana*, Rahu is also spoken of as the king of the meteors.

Rai Dasis

a Hindu, sect founded by Rai Das, a disciple of Ramanand. It is said to be confined to the *chamars*, or workers in hides and in leather, and among the very lowest of the Hindu mixed tribes. This circumstance, as Prof. H. H. Wilson thinks, renders it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether the sect still exists.

Raiford, Matthew

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson Co., Ga., July 12, 1789. He enjoyed the comfortable assurance of grace at or before the tenth year of his age, and joined the Church in his eleventh year. He was licensed to exhort March 28, 1818, and was licensed to preach Dec. 6. He entered the Georgia Conference at the ensuing session, and filled various appointments until 1842, when he ceased to be an effective preacher. He was sorely afflicted for several years before his death, but often spoke of it with calmness and Christian confidence. He

died in Monroe Co., Ga., April 16, 1849. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. of the M. E. Ch., South*, 1850, p. 25.

Raikes, Henry

an Anglican divine of considerable note, was born Sept. 24, 1782, and was the second son of Thomas Raikes, a gentleman distinguished in English civic life. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge University, where he graduated at St. John's College, in 1804, with second-class honors. The next three years were spent on the Continent in extensive travels. He enjoyed the society of the most cultured, and returned, in 1808, to enter the service of the Church with more than usual intellectual and social qualifications. He became curate of Betchworth, in Surrey, and later of Burnham, in Buckshire, whence he removed to Bognor, in Sussex; and finally enjoyed the distinction of holding the chancellorship of Chester for eighteen years. He refused, about 1829, the bishopric of Calcutta and a valuable preferment in the North of Ireland and in Lincolnshire. He was attached to his home, and loved the quiet and retirement of his parish. He died in February, 1854. Chancellor Raikes's varied and great learning was scarcely known by his most intimate friends. His was so unpretentious a nature that few were aware of his acquirements in Oriental learning and patristic subjects. His printed productions are his least valued efforts. Yet among these lesser works and contributions to the religious periodicals of the day, he published a volume of *Sermons* of a very original type, on the "Divine Attributes;" but this volume incurred the fate of most works adopted by a party as its manifesto in great temporary popularity and early oblivion. A far more important work, and one of vast influence on the Church, was his *Essay on Clerical Education*. It materially influenced the universities to the recognition of a higher truth, of a more precious learning than had, at that time, scarcely found a place in the extensive range of university studies and examinations. It is to be regretted that, besides the repeated publication of series of sermons, the productions of Chancellor Raikes are left in MS. form. He was so well qualified for original work, and did so much of it in certain unexplored fields, that it is to be hoped his writings will, some day, find their way to print in a complete edition. See *Gentleman's Mag.* (Lond.) 1855, i, 198 sq. (J. H. W.)

Railes, Richard

uncle of Henry, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and held a fellowship from that university. After taking holy orders, he was made prebendary of St. David's. He was a man of exact learning and of refinement of taste. He was the early teacher of Henry. The founder of Sunday-schools also received much help and encouragement from this divine; he himself published *Essays on Sunday-schools*. See *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.), 1855, p. 199.

Raikes, Robert

the noted English philanthropist who founded the modern Sunday-school (q.v.), was a native of Gloucester, England, where he was born Sept. 14, 1735. His ancestors were people of good rank, and some of them are distinguished as clergy and politicians. His father was a printer and an editor. He published the *Gloucester Journal*, a county Tory newspaper, and the first journal that attempted to give a report of parliamentary proceedings, which was considered, at the time, so great a breach of privilege that he was reprimanded at the bar of the House of Lords in the dark days of George I and under the partisanship of lord-chancellor King. Robert was brought up with a view of succeeding his father in business, and enjoyed, therefore, a liberal education. Having finally become proprietor of the *Journal*, he managed to give his paper a wide influence and respectful reading. He was a truly devout man, and carried his Christianity into every-day life. He was not only scrupulous about his church attendance on the Sabbath, but made it the rule to frequent early morning prayers on week-days at the Gloucester cathedral. A man who could thus devote the hours of a working-day to the glory of his God was likely to cherish an interest in his fellows also. Raikes was particularly interested in the lowly and the degraded. He visited prisons and went about the streets seeking to do good wherever there was need of aid or counsel. The improvements in prison discipline at the close of the last century in England are largely due to Robert Raikes. His newspaper was an important agency which he used freely, and thus powerfully affected public opinion in favor of the suffering and degraded classes of society. In 1781 his attention was directed to the children of the poor. He had, by frequent intercourse with the common people, learned of their low intellectual state and the absolute neglect suffered by the rising generations. He was struck,

as he himself tells us in one of his letters written in 1784, with the number of wretched children whom he found in the suburbs of Gloucester, chiefly in the neighborhood of a pin manufactory, where their parents were employed, wholly abandoned to themselves, half clothed, half fed, and growing up in the most degrading vices. The state of the streets was worse on Sunday, when the older children, who were employed in the factory on week-days, were joined to their younger associates; and all manner of excesses became the theme of complaint on the part of the shopmen and the property-owners generally. Even the farmers near there complained of the depredations frequently committed by juvenile offenders. Raikes determined to provide a remedy for this growing evil. He saw very clearly the surest result in education, and therefore sought the help of four excellent teachers and devoted Christian women, whom he paid a small allowance for their services, and, gathering the children on the Sabbath-day, attempted the kind of work which has given shape to the modern Sabbath-school. He procured the help of the clergy, and the enterprise begun in such an unpretending manner grew into proportions of which Raikes himself had not had the faintest idea. The instruction was at first confined to reading and writing. Instead of secular text-books, the Bible was the principal reading-book used, and so the children were made familiar with the Gospel's great benefits to man. How he got the children we will let him tell in his own language: "I went around," he says, "to remonstrate with numbers of the poor on the melancholy consequences that must ensue from a fatal neglect of their children's morals. I prevailed with some, and others soon followed; and the school began to prosper in numbers. The children were to come soon after ten in the morning and stay till twelve; they were then to go home and return at one, and, after reading a lesson, they were to be conducted to church. After church they were to be employed in repeating the catechism till half-past five, and then to be dismissed with an injunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street. With regard to the rules adopted, I only required that they come to the school on Sunday as clean as possible. Many were at first deterred because they wanted decent clothing, but I could not undertake to supply this defect. Although without shoes and in a ragged coat, I rejected none on that account; all that I required were clean hands, a clean face, and the hair combed. If they had no clean shirt, they were to come in that which they had on. The want of decent apparel at first kept great numbers at a distance, but they gradually became wiser, and all pressed to learn. I had the good luck to procure places for some that were

deserving, which was of great use. The children attending the school varied from six years old to twelve or fourteen. Little rewards were distributed among the most diligent this excited an emulation." The mode of procedure is thus described by himself: "Upon the Sunday afternoon the mistresses take their scholars to church, a place which neither they nor their ancestors ever entered with a view to the glory of God. They assemble at the house of one of the mistresses, and walk before her to church, two and two, in as much order as a company of soldiers. I am generally at church, and after service they all come round me to make their bow, and, if any animosities have arisen, to make their complaint. The great principle I inculcate is to be kind and good-natured to each other; not to provoke one another; to be dutiful to their parents; not to offend God by cursing and swearing, and such plain precepts as all may comprehend." Although other schemes may have been formed on a larger scale and excited a more romantic interest. none were ever so productive of more extensively beneficial results. The necessity, and the advantages to be derived from the establishment, of such schools seem to have occurred about the same time to several individuals in various parts of the country; and although Mr. Stoxe, in particular, the rector of St. John's, Gloucester, cordially co-operated in the erection and superintendence of the Sunday-schools in that city, yet, for the energetic development of the principle, for the carrying-out into practical details and bringing it in the most advantageous form before the country so as to render it a prolific source of public benefit, to Robert Raikes, beyond all dispute, belongs the honorable title of the Founder of Sunday-schools. Three years after the inauguration of the Gloucester institution, the inhabitants of an obscure district where he had fixed a school remarked that "the place had become quite a heaven upon Sundays compared to what it used to be." Schools of the same kind were, ere long, opened in most of the large towns in England. A Sunday-school Society was opened in London under the auspices of such men as Henry Thornton, bishops Barrington, Porteus, and other well-known Christians of the period; and, at a general meeting of that association, held on July 11, 1787, it was resolved unanimously that, in consideration of the zeal and merits of Robert Raikes, he be admitted an honorary member of the society. Within the sphere of his own immediate experience, Raikes had the satisfaction of seeing the happiest fruits spring from the institutions in Gloucester; for, out of all the thousands of poor children who were educated at those Sunday-schools, it was found, after a long series of years, that not one had ever been either in the city or county prisons.

Raikes died April 5, 1811. See *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lolll.), 1784-1831. pt. ii, 132, 294; *Sketch of the Life of Robt. Raikes, (and the History of Sunday Schools* (N. Y. 18mo); Cornell, *Life of Robert Raikes* (N. Y. 1864); Jamieson, *Christian Biography*, s.v.

Raikes, Timothy

the grandfather of Robert Raikes, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and of some note. He was born near the middle of the 17th century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders, he was vicar of Tickhill. He held the vicarate of Hesse, near Hull, at the time of his death, in 1722.

Raillon, Jacques

a French prelate, born at Bourgoin, July 17, 1762, was educated for the priesthood at the seminary in Lucon, in which he had been placed by bishop Mercy of that place. After graduation he was made a curate of Montaigu, but was obliged in the Revolutionary period to quit his parish, and lived for some time at Paris, where he took the defence of the priests in his *Appel au Peuple Catholique* (1792, 8vo). But he became only notorious, and, by the gravity of the situation, was forced from the country. He lived for a while at Soleur, in Switzerland, then at Venice, in Italy, and only returned to France in 1804. He at once became teacher in the house of Portalis, then minister of cultus, and by his influence Raillon was in 1809 made professor of pulpit oratory in the theological faculty at Paris, and titular canon of Notre Dame. In the latter capacity he pronounced the funeral orations upon marshal Lannes and other distinguished countrymen of his, and so markedly acquitted himself in this task that he was given the episcopacy of Orleans in 1810. The unpleasant relations then existing between the government of France and the papacy, however, prevented his confirmation, and in 1816 he went into retirement at Paris. The government, however, was unwilling to suffer the loss of such a faithful and efficient ecclesiastic, and in 1829 he was nominated bishop of Dijon and promptly confirmed as such. In 1830 he was made archbishop of Aix, and there he resided until his death, in 1835. On his departure from Dijon a medal was struck in his honor by his diocese, so greatly was he beloved. The recently expired Dupanloup (1878), who figured as bishop, and more recently as archbishop, of Orleans, at one time involved Raillon in controversy and took offensive ground; but Raillon was universally

supported by the French press and a majority of the French clergy, and for a while bishop Dupanloup lost much of his popularity on account of his conduct in this affair. His works are of a secular character, excepting the *Histoire de Saint-Ambrose* (which was to form four or five vols. in 8vo, but of which the MS. was lost). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Rails Of The Altar

(late from the time of bishop Andrewes, who calls them “wainscot banisters,” and Laud, who intended to preserve the altar from profanation by their use. They are, in fact, the *cancelli* moved eastward, resembling the medieval “reclinatorium,” and answer to the primitive altar-veils and Greek “iconostasis.” At Leamington Priors, St. German’s. and Wim. borne they are covered with a white linen cloth at the time of holy communion, a relic of the custom for communicants to hold the houselling-cloth (*dominicale*, for the Lord’s body) below their chin for the purpose of retaining upon it any portion of the sacrament which might fall during the administration. The custom was disused at the coronation of William IV. St. Augustine and Caesarius of Arles mention a linen cloth (*lintearmen*) used by women for the same purpose.

Raiment

SEE CLOTHING; SEE DRESS; SEE GARMENT.

Raimondi, Giovanni Battista

a celebrated Italian Orientalist, was born at Cremona in 1540, removed in his youth to Naples, where he studied at the university theology, philosophy, and mathematics, and then spent some time in Asia studying Eastern civilization and languages. Returning to Italy, he became engaged in various literary enterprises. and enjoyed the society of the great and the learned. He brought out an edition of the Gospels in Arabic with a Latin interlinear translation (1591), and wrote grammars of Syriac and Arabic. He was also engaged on a polyglot Bible more complete than that of Alcalá or of Antwerp, and only ceased labor when the death of pope Gregory XIII (1585) and the departure of cardinal Ferdinand de Medici (1587) deprived him of the necessary funds for such an enterprise. He died about 1610. He was engaged after 1587 in the compilation of Oriental MSS. and other like

labors. See Tiraboschi, *Della Litteratura Italiana*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raimondi, Marc Antonio

an Italian engraver who devoted himself to classical and sacred art, was born at Bologna in 1487. He was a student first of Francesco Francia, but perfected himself under Raphael, who favored him so greatly that Raimondi may be placed by the side of his great master. The two artists together exerted such a great influence upon this particular branch of art that the works of that time have never been excelled in drawing and clearness of outline, though much surpassed in gradation of tone and delicacy of modelling. It should be remembered that it was from the drawings, and not the finished pictures, of Raphael that Marc Antonio worked. He was especially remarkable for the exactness with which he copied; he seems to have been willing to lose himself entirely in the master he reproduced. His life may be said to have been devoted to multiplying the works of Raphael. He also executed a few plates after Michael Angelo, Mantegna, Bandinelli, and Giulio Romano. He was imprisoned on account of some plates after the designs of the latter, which were so indecent as to enrage Clement VII, and it was with difficulty that his release was obtained by some of the cardinals and Bandinelli. In 1527 Raimondi was in full favor in Rome, when he was driven away by the sacking of the Spaniards. He was plundered, and fled to Bologna. His last work was done in 1539, in which year he is said to have been killed by a nobleman of Rome, because he had engraved a second plate of the *Murder of the Innocents*, contrary to his agreement. His works are numerous, and in selecting them great attention should be paid to the different impressions, for some of the plates have been retouched by those who have had them, until they are greatly changed. The best impressions have no publisher's name. Heineken gives a complete catalogue of his prints. Very fine collections are in the Louvre and in the British Museum. At Venice Raimondi engraved, after Durer, two sets of prints — viz. those illustrating the life of the Virgin and the life and Passion of Christ. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rain

Heb. **רִמ**; *matar*, and also **גֶשֶׁם**, *geshem*, which, however, rather signifies a *shower* of more violent rain; it is also used as a generic term, including the early and Litter rain (**רִמ** Jeremiah 5:24; **גֶשֶׁם** Joel 2:23). Another word,

of a more poetical character, is **μυβοῦσθαι** *rebibmn* (a plural form, connected with *rab*, “many,” from the multitude of the drops), translated in our version “showers” (^{<4510>}Deuteronomy 32:2; ^{<2408>}Jeremiah 3:3; 14:22; ^{<3872>}Micah 5:7 [Hebrews 6]; ^{<4950>}Psalms 45:10 [Hebrews 11]; 72:6). The Hebrews have also the word a **μρζαελεμ**, expressing violent rain, storm, tempest, accompanied with hail — in ^{<1848>}Job 24:8, the heavy rain which comes down on mountains; and the word **ργρῆσι**, *sagrirs*, which occurs only in ^{<1275>}Proverbs 27:15, continuous and heavy rain (Sept. ἐν ἡμέρῳ χειμερινῇ).

Early Rain means the rains of the autumn, **hrw** *yoreh*, part. subst. from **hry**; “he scattered” (^{<6114>}Deuteronomy 11:14; ^{<2424>}Jeremiah 5:24); also the Hiphil part. **hrw**, *mor/h* (^{<2023>}Joel 2:23); Sept. ὑετὸς πρώιμος.

Latter Rain is the rain of spring, **צוקל יחי** *malkdsh*, (^{<1665>}Proverbs 16:15; ^{<1823>}Job 29:23; ^{<2408>}Jeremiah 3:3; Hos. 6:3; ^{<2023>}Joel 2:23; ^{<3801>}Zechariah 10:1); Sept. ὑετὸς ὄψιμος. The early and latter rains are mentioned together (^{<6114>}Deuteronomy 11:14; ^{<2424>}Jeremiah 5:24; ^{<2023>}Joel 2:23; ^{<2068>}Hosea 6:3; ^{<3872>}James 5:7).

In a country comprising so many varieties of elevation as Palestine, there must of necessity occur corresponding varieties of climate. An account that might correctly describe the peculiarities of the district of Lebanon would be in many respects inaccurate when applied to the deep depression and almost tropical climate of Jericho. In any general statement, therefore, allowance must be made for not inconsiderable local variations. Contrasted with the districts most familiar to the children of Israel before their settlement in the land of promise — Egypt and the Desert — rain might be spoken of as one of its distinguishing characteristics (^{<6110>}Deuteronomy 11:10, 11; Herodotus, 3:10). For six months in the year no rain falls, and the harvests are gathered in without any of the anxiety with which we are so familiar lest the work be interrupted by unseasonable storms. In this respect, at least, the climate has remained unchanged since the time when Boaz slept by his heap of corn; and the sending of thunder and rain in wheat harvest was a miracle which filled the people with fear and wonder (^{<9126>}1 Samuel 12:16-18); so that Solomon could speak of “rain in harvest” as the most forcible expression for conveying the idea of something utterly out of place and unnatural (^{<1801>}Proverbs 26:1). There are, however, very considerable. and perhaps more than compensating. disadvantages

occasioned by this long absence of rain: the whole land becomes dry, parched, and brown; the cisterns are empty; the springs and fountains fail; and the autumnal rains are eagerly looked for, to prepare the earth for the reception of the seed. These, the early rains, commence about the end of October or beginning of November, in Lebanon a month earlier not suddenly, but by degrees: the husbandman has thus the opportunity of sowing his fields of wheat and barley. The rains come mostly from the west or south-west (^{<1254>}Luke 12:54), continuing for two or three days at a time, and falling chiefly during the night. The wind then shifts round to the north or east, and several days of fine weather succeed (^{<1253>}Proverbs 25:23). During the months of November and December the rains continue to fall heavily, but at intervals; afterwards they return, only at longer intervals, and are less heavy; but at no period during the winter do they entirely cease. January and February are the coldest months, and snow falls, sometimes to the depth of a foot or more, at Jerusalem, but it does not lie long: it is very seldom seen along the coast and in the low plains. Thin ice occasionally covers the pools for a few days, and while Porter was writing his *Handbook*, the snow was eight inches deep at Damascus, and the ice a quarter of an inch thick, Rain continues to fall more or less during the month of March; it is very rare in April, and even in Lebanon the showers that occur are generally light. In the valley of the Jordan the barley harvest begins as early as the middle of April, and the wheat a fortnight later; in Lebanon the grain is seldom ripe before the middle of June. See Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, i, 429) and Porter (*Handbook*, ch. 48).
SEE PALESTINE.

With respect to the distinction between the early and the latter rains, Robinson observes that there, are not at the present day “any particular periods of rain or succession of showers which might be regarded as distinct rainy seasons. The whole period from October to March now constitutes only one continued season of rain, without any regularly intervening term of prolonged fine weather. Unless, therefore, there have been some change in the climate, the early and the latter rains for which the husbandman waited with longing seem rather to have implied the first showers of autumn which revived the parched and thirsty soil and prepared it for the seed; and the later showers of spring, which continued to refresh and forward both the ripening crops and the vernal products of the fields (^{<1257>}James 5:7; ^{<1265>}Proverbs 16:15). In April and May the sky is usually serene; showers occur occasionally, but they are mild and refreshing. On

May 1 Robinson experienced showers at Jerusalem, and “at evening there were thunder and lightning (which are frequent in winter), with pleasant and reviving rain. May 6 was also remarkable for thunder and for several showers, some of which were quite heavy. The rains of both these days extended far to the north,... but the occurrence of rain so late in the season was regarded as a very unusual circumstance” (*Biblical Researches*, i, 430; he is speaking of the year 1838]). In 1856, however, there was very heavy rain accompanied with thunder all over the region of Lebanon, extending to Beirut and Damascus, on May 28 and 29; but the oldest inhabitant had never seen the like before, and it created,” says Porter (*Handbook*, ch. xlviii), “almost as much astonishment as the thunder and rain which Samuel brought upon the Israelites during the time of wheat harvest.” During Dr. Robinson’s stay at Beiriut on his second visit to Palestine, in 1852, there were heavy rains in March, once for five days continuously, and the weather continued variable, with occasional heavy rain, till the close of the first week in April. The “latter rains” thus continued this season for nearly a month later than usual, and the result was afterwards seen in the very abundant crops of winter grain (Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, iii, 9). These details will, it is thought, better than any generalized statement, enable the reader to form his judgment on the “former” and “latter” rains of Scripture, and may serve to introduce a remark or two on the question, about which some interest has been felt, whether there have been any change in the frequency and abundance of the rain in Palestine, or in the periods of its supply. It is asked whether “these stony hills, these deserted valleys,” can be the land flowing with milk and honey; the land which God cared for; the land upon which were always the eyes of the Lord, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year (^(B112)Deuteronomy 11:12). So far as relates to the other considerations which may account for diminished fertility, such as the decrease of population and industry, the neglect of terrace-culture and irrigation, and husbanding the supply of water, it may suffice to refer to the article on AGRICULTURE *SEE AGRICULTURE*, and to Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 120-123). With respect to our more immediate subject, it is urged that the very expression “flowing with milk and honey” implies abundant rains to keep alive the grass for the pasture of the numerous herds supplying the milk, and to nourish the flowers clothing the now bare hill-sides, from whence the bees might gather their stores of honey. It is urged that the supply of rain in its due season seems to be promised as contingent upon the fidelity of the people (^(B113)Deuteronomy 11:13-15; ^(B114)Leviticus 26:3-5), and that as from time to time, to punish

the people for their transgressions, “the showers have been withholden, and there hath been no latter rain” (^{<2488>}Jeremiah 3:3; 1 Kings 17, 18), so now, in the great and long-continued apostasy of the children of Israel, there has come upon even the land of their forfeited inheritance a like long-continued withdrawal of the favor of God, who claims the sending of rain as one of his special prerogatives (^{<2442>}Jeremiah 14:22). *SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.*

The early rains, it is urged, are by comparison scanty and interrupted, the latter rains have altogether ceased, and hence, it is maintained, the curse has been fulfilled, “Thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust” (^{<8223>}Deuteronomy 28:23, 24; ^{<8269>}Leviticus 26:19). Without entering here into the consideration of the justness of the interpretation which would assume these predictions of the withholding of rain to be altogether different in the manner of their infliction from the other calamities denounced in these chapters of threatening, it would appear that, so far as the question of fact is concerned, there is scarcely sufficient reason to imagine that any great and marked changes with respect to the rains have taken place in Palestine. In early days, as now, rain was unknown for half the year; and if we may judge from the allusions in ^{<2165>}Proverbs 16:15; ^{<8223>}Job 29:23, the latter rain was even then, while greatly desired and longed for, that which was somewhat precarious, by no means to be absolutely counted on as a matter of course. If we are to take as correct our translation of ^{<2123>}Joel 2:23, “The latter rain in the first (month),” i.e. Nisan or Abib, answering to the latter part of March and the early part of April, the times of the latter rain in the days of the prophets would coincide with those in which it falls now. The same conclusion would be arrived at from ^{<3107>}Amos 4:7, “I have withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months to the harvest.” The rain here spoken of is the latter rain, and an interval of three months between the ending of the rain and the beginning of harvest would seem to be in an average year as exceptional now as it was when Amos noted it as a judgment of God. We may infer also from the Song of Solomon, 2:11-13, where is given a poetical description of the bursting-forth of vegetation in the spring, that “when the “winter” was past, the rain also was over and gone. We can hardly, by any extension of the term “winter,” bring it down to a later period than that during which the rains still fall.

It may be added that travellers have, perhaps unconsciously, exaggerated the barrenness of the land, from confining themselves too closely to the

southern portion of Palestine; the northern portion, Galilee, of such peculiar interest to the readers of the Gospels, is fertile and beautiful (see Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, ch. 10, and Van de Velde, there quoted), and in his description of the valley of Nablus, the ancient Shechem, Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii, 275) becomes almost enthusiastic: "Here a scene of luxuriant and almost unparalleled verdure bursts upon our view. The whole valley was filled with gardens of vegetables and orchards of all kinds of fruits, watered by several fountains, which burst forth in various parts and flow westward in refreshing streams. It came upon us suddenly, like a scene of fairy enchantment. We saw nothing like it in all Palestine." The account given by a recent lady traveller (*Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines*, by Miss Beautort) of the luxuriant fruit-trees and vegetables which she saw at Meshullan's farm in the valley of Urtas, a little south of Bethlehem (possibly the site of Solomon's gardens, ^{<2104>}Ecclesiastes 2:4-6), may serve to prove how much now, as ever, may be effected by irrigation (q.v.). Rain frequently furnishes the writers of the Old Test with forcible and appropriate metaphors, varying in their character according as they regard it as the beneficent and fertilizing shower, or the destructive storm pouring down the mountain-side and sweeping away the labor of years. Thus ^{<1808>}Proverbs 28:3, of the poor man that oppresses the poor; ^{<1822>}Ezekiel 38:22, of the just punishments and righteous vengeance of God (comp. ^{<1916>}Psalms 11:6; ^{<1823>}Job 20:23). On the other hand, we have it used of speech wise and fitting, refreshing the souls of men; of words earnestly waited for and heedfully listened to (^{<1532>}Deuteronomy 32:2; ^{<1823>}Job 29:23); of the cheering favor of the Lord coming down once more upon the penitent soul; of the gracious presence and influence for good of the righteous king among his people; of the blessings, gifts, and graces of the reign of the Messiah (^{<2016>}Hosea 6:3; ^{<1204>}2 Samuel 23:4; ^{<1916>}Psalms 72:6).

Rain Dragon

THE, a Chinese deity, from whose capacious mouth it is believed the waters are spouted forth which descend upon the earth in the form of rain. This god is worshipped by those who cultivate the soil, only, however, when his power is felt either by the absence of rain or by too abundant a supply. Sometimes the farmers earnestly implore him to give them more rain and sometimes less. In cases of drought each family keeps erected at the front door of the house a tablet on which is inscribed, "To the Dragon King of the Five Lakes and the Four Seas." Before this tablet, on an altar of incense, they lay out their sacrificial offerings to propitiate the gods.

Processions are also got up, among the farmers particularly, to attract the favor of the gods. On these occasions there may sometimes be seen a huge figure of a dragon made of paper or of cloth, which is carried through the streets with sound of gongs and trumpets.

Rainald Of Citeaux,

a mediaeval ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 12th century. he was son of Milon, and had St. Bernard for teacher. In 1113, on the death of St. Stephen, he became abbot of Citeaux, and here he gave shelter to Abclard, and became the mediator for the restoration of that great mediaval philosopher and theologian to papal favor. In 1148 Rainald was president of a general chapter of his order. He died Dec. 13, 1151. He published a *Recueil* (in eighty-seven chapters) on divers chapters of the Order of Citeaux, etc. See *Gallia Christiana*, vol. 4:col. 985; *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, 12:418; Kelmusat, *Vie de Abelard*, i, 251. — Hoefler, *Nouvo. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rainaldi, Francesco

an Italian Jesuit, was born at Matelica, in the Ancona marshes, in 1600. At twenty-two he entered the Order of the Jesuits, and passed his life at Rome in the house of the Society of Jesus. He died in 1677. We mention of his writings, *Lumen Ilonzinis Devoti* (Rome, 1633. 24mo): — *Cibo dell' Aninza* (ibid. 1637, 12mo): — *Vita J. Lainez* (ibid. 1672, 8vo). See Southwell, *Bibl. Soc. Jesu*, p. 246. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rainaldi, Theophilus.

SEE RAYNAUD.

Rainbow

(Heb. **tvq**, *keseth*, i.e. a bow with which to shoot arrows, ^{Q9B}Genesis 9:13-16; Ezekiel i, 28; Sept. **τόξον**, so Ecclesiasticus 43:11; Vulg. *arcus*. In the New Test. [^{Q9B}Revelation 4:3; 10:11, **ιρις**), the token of the covenant which God made with Noah when he came forth from the ark that the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. With respect to the covenant itself, as a charter of *natural* blessings and mercies (“the world’s covenant, not the Church’s”), re-establishing the peace and order of physical nature, which in the flood had undergone so great a convulsion, see Davidson, *On Prophecy*, lect. iii, p. 76-80. With respect to

the token of the covenant, the right interpretation of ^{<0093>}Genesis 9:13 seems to be that God took the rainbow, which had hitherto been but a beautiful object shining in the heavens when the sun's rays fell on falling rain, and consecrated it as the sign of his love and the witness of his promise. The bow in the cloud, seen by every nation under heaven, is an un failing witness to the truth of God. Was the rainbow, then, we ask, never seen before the flood? Was this "sign in the heavens" beheld for the first time by the eight dwellers in the ark when, after their long imprisonment, they stood again upon the green earth, and saw the clark, humid clouds spanned by its glorious arch? Such seems to be the meaning of the narrator. Yet this implies that there was no rain before the flood, and that the laws of nature were changed, at least in that part of the globe, by that event. There is no reason to suppose that in the world at large there has been such a change in meteorological phenomena as here implied. That a certain portion of the earth should never have been visited by rain is quite conceivable. Egypt, though not absolutely without rain, very rarely sees it. But the country of Noah and the ark was a mountainous country; and the ordinary atmospherical conditions must have been suspended, or a new law must have come into operation after the flood, if the rain then first fell, and if the rainbow had consequently never before been painted on the clouds. Hence, many writers have supposed that the meaning of the passage is, not that the rainbow now appeared for the first time, but that it was now for the first time invested with the sanctity of a sign; that not a new phenomenon was visible, but that a new meaning was given to a phenomenon already existing. The following passages, ^{<0448>}Numbers 14:4; 1 Samuel 12:10; ^{<1025>}1 Kings 2:35, are instances in which [^] ^{tñ}; *nathan*, literally "give" — the word used in ^{<0093>}Genesis 9:13, "I do *set my* bow in the cloud" — is employed in the sense off "constitute," "appoint." Accordingly there is no reason for concluding that ignorance of the natural cause of the rainbow occasioned the account given of its institution in the book of Genesis. *SEE NOAH.*

The rainbow is frequently seen in Palestine in the rainy season, and thus it furnishes a common image to the sacred writers. There is a reference to the rainbow, though not named, in ^{<2540>}Isaiah 54:10; and it is mentioned in other passages. "As the appearance of the bow which is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about" (^{<3028>}Ezekiel 1:28). "And there was a rainbow round about the throne in sight like unto an emerald" (^{<6143>}Revelation 4:3). "And I saw another

mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow was upon his head" (~~600~~ Revelation 10:1). These three passages correspond with and reflect light upon each other. The rainbow in all of them is the designed token of God's covenant and mercy, and of his faithful remembrance of his promise. "Look upon the rainbow," says the son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus 43:11, 12), "and praise him that made it: very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof; it compasseth the heaven about with a glorious circle, and the hands of the Most High have bended it." Among the Greeks and Romans, the personified rainbow, Iris, became the messenger of the gods, and the natural rainbow seems to have been conceived as the passage-way on which Iris came down to men (Serv. on Virgil's *AEn.* v, 610). The Indian mythology made a yet nearer approach to the Biblical view (Von Bohlen, *India*, i, 237); but the Edda represents the rainbow as a bridge connecting heaven and earth (see, in general, Menzel, *Mythol. Forsch.* p. 235 sq.). On the physical views of the ancients with regard to the rainbow. see Forbiger, *Handb. d. alt. Geog.* i, 596 sq. See Schlichter, *Lie Iride ejusque Emblem.* (Hal. 1739); Ausfeld, *De Iride Diluvii non redituri Signo* (Giess. 1756). **SEE BOW.**

Scientifically considered, the rainbow is a natural phenomenon which is formed by rays of light from the sun (occasionally the moon) striking drops of falling rain, being refracted in entering them, reflected back, in part, from the opposite side of the drops, and refracted again on leaving them, so as to produce prismatic colors, some of which meet the eye. In the inner or primary bow, the light is refracted downwards, and undergoes but one reflection; while in the outer or secondary bow the light, striking the lower side of the drop, is first refracted upwards, and reflected twice within the drop before leaving it; hence its light is fainter. Both present the colors of the prismatic spectrum; but in the primary bow the tints gradually ascend from the violet to the red, while in the outer the violet is more elevated. The colors of the rainbow are the result of the decomposition of white light in its passage through the globular drops of water forming a shower of rain.

Rainbow, Edward, D.D.,

an English prelate, was born at Bliton, Lincolnshire, in 1608, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Magdalen College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders and filling minor appointments, was made master of Magdalen College in 1642. In 1650 he was deprived on account

of nonconformity, but in 1660 was restored. In 1661 he was appointed to the deanery of Peterborough, and in the following year became vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In 1664 he was elevated to the episcopacy by being made bishop of Carlisle. He died in 1684. He published three separate *Sermons* (1634, 1649, 1677). See *Athenoe Oxon.; Life*, by Jonathan Banks (Lond. 1688, 8vo); *Funeral Sermon*, by the Rev. Thomas Tully (1688, 12mo).

Raine, James

an English divine, was born at Lovington in 1791, and, after receiving full educational advantages at the University of Cambridge, took holy orders, and finally became rector of Meldon, and librarian to the dean and chapter of Durham. He died in 1858. Dr. Raine devoted himself largely to antiquarian studies, and published several valuable works on English ecclesiology and Church antiquities. We have room here to mention only *Saint Cuthbert* (Durham, 1828, 4to). See, for further details, the excellent article in Allibone. *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1725.

Raine, Matthew

another English divine, brother of the preceding, was born in 1760, and was educated at the University of Cambridge, in Trinity College, of which he became a fellow in 1783. In 1791 He was made schoolmaster of the Charter House, in 1809 preacher of Gray's Inn, and in 1810 rector of Little Hallingbury, Essex, but died shortly after. He published *Sermons* (1786, 1789).

Rainerio, Saccioni

an Italian ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was a native of Piacenza. He was originally a Catharist, but abandoned his brethren, entered the Church of Rome, became a Dominican monk, and when made inquisitor became one of the worst persecutors of his former co-religionists. In 1252 a conspiracy against him was discovered in time to prevent his murder, but he was never restful after that time, and when Pallavicino gained the upper hand at Milan, Rainerio was driven from the city. He died in 1259. He wrote much, and wielded a powerful pen, for he was a man of much learning. His *Summa de Catharis et Leonistis*, written for the information of the Inquisition, is the principal source of information regarding the Catharists. The best edition of this work is by Gretser

(Ingolstadt, 1613). See Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* i, 598; and his *De Rainerii Summa* (Gott. 1834); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, v, 61-66; Piper, *Monumental Theol.* § 140. (J. H.W.)

Raines, John

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Hull, England, Jan. 14, 1818. He came to the United States while yet a child, and at the age of nineteen years professed conversion, and united with the Church. Four years later he became a local preacher, and in 1845 was received on trial in the Genesee Conference. He gave to the Church twenty-six years of uninterrupted labor, when he was seized with blindness. He died in Canandaigua, N. Y., Sept. 4, 1877. He was a man of strong convictions, earnest and uncompromising piety, and devoted to his work. *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church*, 1877, p. 149.

Rain-makers

are, in Kaffreland, a class of crafty and designing men who profess to have supernatural influence and powers. When no rain has fallen upon the land for several months, and the ground is parched and dry, and both grass and water are becoming exceedingly scarce, the people apply to the rain-maker, who immediately exerts himself on their behalf, if they bring him satisfactory presents. A large gathering of the people now takes place, an ox is slaughtered, and a large quantity of Kaffre beer is imbibed; and when the rain-maker has become sufficiently animated by the part he takes in the feast, he commences his incantations. He dances round the camp-fire, and exerts himself with such violent gesticulations that the perspiration streams down his naked body. He then commands the people to go and look towards the western horizon for the appearance of the rain-clouds. If no indication of coming showers is seen, the wily rain-maker tells the deluded natives that the presents which they have brought him are not sufficient. They then go to bring more, the feast is renewed, and the heathen ceremonies are repeated to gain time; and if the foolish exercises are continued till a shower actually falls, the rain-makers triumph in their success. The presence of Christian missionaries in Kaffreland has of late years greatly impaired the power and influence of the rain-makers, and bids fair to annihilate the gross deception altogether.

Rainold(e)s

(also written *Raynolds*, *Reynolds*, and occasionally in the Latin *Reginaldus*), JOHN, was a celebrated English divine of the second half of the 16th century. He was born at Pinhoe, Devonshire, in 1549; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and Corpus Christi College, of the same university; and was chosen probationer fellow in 1566. He finally took holy orders, and in 1593 was promoted to the deanery of Lincoln. In 1598 he was offered a bishopric, and at the same time was called to the presidency of Corpus Christi College. He cared less for distinctions than for scholarly tasks, and therefore gave the preference to the offer of his alma mater. In this new position he became famous beyond seas, as well as in England. His learning and readiness of application gave him a reputation second to none in England; and the king, who prided himself on his own reputation for scholarship, and desired above all things to maintain this reputation, leaned greatly on this distinguished divine, and always favored his projects. It is thus that we owe to Rainolds the King James Version of the Scriptures, for it is well known that Rainolds urged the king to the undertaking, and demonstrated its necessity. He was a great Hebraist, and made translations of small portions at first, and, reading these to the king in his private chamber, convinced his royal master of the want, and the good likely to be accomplished as well as the renown to be gained. **SEE ENGLISH VERSIONS.** Rainolds died in 1607. Bishop Hall speaks of Rainolds as being near to a miracle in his prodigious treasury of knowledge; John Milton refers to him always as “our famous Dr. Raynolds;” and Wood, in his *Athenae Oxon.* (ii, 13), calls him “the very treasury of erudition.” Hallam, in his *Constitutional Hist. of England*, calls him “nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England” (i, 297), and in his *Literary Hist. of Europe* (i, 560), “the most eminently learned man of the queen’s reign.” He published a number of separate sermons, treatises against the Church of Rome, and some other theological productions, of which there is a complete list in Wood (*Athenae Oxon.* ii, 11-19). We have room here to mention only, *Sex Theses de S. Scripture et Ecclesia* (Lond. 1580; Ruppelae, 1586; Lond. 1602, 8vo; in English, 1598, 12mo; 1609, 4to): — *The Summe of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart touching the Read and Faith of the Church*, etc. (1584, 1588, 1598, 1609, 4to; Latin, Oxon. 1619, fol.): — *Orationes duce in Ceoll. Co. Cphristi* (Oxon. 1587, 8vo): — *De Romance Ecclesie Idololatria in Cultu Sanctorum Reliquiarum, Imaginunae, Aque, Salis,*

Olei, etc. (1596, 4to): — *The Overthrow of Stage Playes, by the Way of Controversie betwixt D. Gager and D. Rainoldes*, etc. (1599, 4to; Middleburgh, 1600, 4to; Oxf. 1629, 4to); see Collier, *Hist. of Dramatic Poetry*, iii, 201, and his *Bibl. Account of Early English Literature* (1865), s.v. "Rainoldes;" *Anchceolo* Nov. 1841, p. 114: — *Defence of the Judgement of the Reformed Churches that a Man may lawfullie not only put awaie his Wife fir her Adulterie, but also marrie Another*, etc. (1609-10, 4to): — *Censutra Librorumn Apocryphorum Veteris Testameenti* (Oppenheim, 1611, 2 vols. 4to; very rare); not only in this work, but in the Hampton Court Conference also (where, by the way, he sided with the Puritans), Rainolds protested against the reading of apocryphal lessons in the public service of the Church: *The Prophecie of Obadiah*, sermons (Oxon. 1613, 4to): — *Orationes duodecim* [including *The Summe of the Conference*, etc.] in *Coll. Corp. Christi* (1614, 1628, 8vo); the first oration was published in an English transl. by J. Leicester (Lond. 1638, 12mo): — *The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans* (1641, 4to): — *Judgment concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's Ordinance* (Lond. 1641, 4to): — *Prophecie of Haggai*, fifteen sermons (1649, 4to). See the literature quoted in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Middleton, *Ertangel. Biog.* vol. ii; Soames, *Hist. of the Church of England in the Elizabethan Reign* (see Index); Froude, *Hist. of Eng.* (see Index in vol. 11).

Rainor, Menzies

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church near the opening of our century, was admitted to the work of the itinerancy in 1790) and travelled in Dutchess (N. Y.) Circuit with Peter Morriarty, under the superintendence of Freeborn Garrettson (q.v.). In 1791 he was colleague of Lemuel Smith at Hartford, Conn. In 1792 he labored at Lynn. Subsequently he travelled the Elizabethtown (N. J.) and Middletown (Conn.) circuits. In 1795 he withdrew from the conference. and afterwards from the Church. He was a young man of promise, and acceptable among the people as a preacher. After his withdrawal from the Methodist Church, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and afterwards became a Universalist. See Stevens, *Memorials of New Eng. Methodism*, p. 127.

Rainssant, Jean Firmin

a noted French Benedictine monk, was born at Suippes, near Chalons-sur-Marne, in 1596, and took the monastic vow in 1613 at Verdun. In 1627 he became prior of Breuil, in the diocese of Rheims, and so distinguished himself by austerity and purity that he was by cardinal Richelieu selected in 1630 as one of the thirty who were to reform the Clugny Congregation. In 1633 he became prior of Ferrieres, in Gatinais; but after the union of the Clugniacs and Maurists ceased in 1644, he gave the preference to the last congregation. In 1645 he was elected prior of the abbey of St. — Germain-des-Pres, at Paris. In 1651 he was elected visitor of the province of Bretagne. On his very first journey in the country he fell from his saddle and broke a leg; from the injuries thus sustained he sickened and died, Nov. 8, 1651, in the convent of Lehon, near Dinan. He contributed largely to the literature on monasticism in later mediaeval times; and whatever he wrote is valuable to the student of this subject, because Rainssant freely confessed the failings of the ascetics of the Church of Rome, and earnestly sought their reform. We have not room here to insert a list of his writings, but refer to Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, xli, 497, and Le Cerf, *Biblioth. des Auteurs de la Congregation de St. Maur*.

Raisins

(**מִיֶּזֶב** **מִיֶּזֶב**, **sim mukim**, **1 Samuel 25:18; 30:20; 2 Samuel 16:1; 1 Chronicles 12:20**) signifies dried grapes, or rather cakes made of them, such as the Italians still call *sim maki*. Grapes are often thus preserved for food (**מִיֶּזֶב** Numbers 6:3). **SEE GRAPE; SEE VINE.**

Raisse, Arnold

a French theologian, was born at Douai near the opening of the 17th century. He was canon of the Church of St. Peter, and as such had ample opportunity to explore the vast treasures of this church and neighboring churches and monasteries for the ecclesiastical history of the Low Countries. He died in 1644, leaving a large material for the history of the saints in the Netherlands, and its stores have not yet been fully exhausted. His other writings are of no special interest now. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ra'kem

(~~1376~~ 1 Chronicles 7:16). *SEE REKEM.*

Rak'kath

(Heb. *Rakkath'*, תִּקְרִי *shore*; Sept. ^ϛΡακκάθ v. r. Δακέθ), a fortified city in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned only in ~~1375~~ Joshua 19:35, where it is grouped between Hammath and Chinnereth. We may hence infer that it lay on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, not far distant from the warm baths of Tiberias, which are on the site of the ancient Hammath (q.v.). According to the rabbins (*Megillah*, 6 a), Rakkath stood upon the spot where the city of Tiberias was afterwards built (see Lightfoot, *opp.* ii, 223). *SEE CINNERETH.* Rakkath appears to have fallen to ruin at an early period, or at least it was not a place of sufficient note to be mentioned in history, and the name passed away altogether when Tiberias was founded. The statement of Josephus that ancient tombs had to be removed to make room for the buildings of Tiberias does not, as Dr. Robinson supposes, make it impossible that the city stood on the site of Rakkath (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:2, 3; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 389). Rakkath may have stood close on the shore where there were no tombs; while Tiberias, being much larger, extended some distance up the adjoining rocky hill-sides, in which the tombs may still be seen. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 66) identifies Hammath with the Emmaus of Josephus (*Ant.* 18:2, 3), and supposes Rakkath to be the same name with the Arab *Keralk*, at the mouth of the Jordan; but this latter rather represents the ancient Tarichlla (q.v.). The enumeration of the towns in the connection requires us to understand this to be the same with the name preceding, i.e. Hammath-Rakkath. *SEE NAPHTALI, TRIBE OF.*

Rak'kon

(Heb. *ha-Rakkon'*, הַרְקֹן; with the article; the *temple* [of the head], Gesen.; a *well-watered* place, First; Sept. ^ϛΙεράκων, Vulg. *Arecon*), one of the towns in the inheritance of Dan (Joshua xix. 46), apparently not far distant from Joppa. As it is mentioned between Me-jarkon and Japho, the site is possibly that of the village *Kheibeh* or *Kutbeibeh*, marked on the maps as lying north of the Nahr Rubin, west of Akir (Elron).

Rakshas, Or Rakshasa

is, in Hindu mythology, the name of a class of evil spirits or demons, who are sometimes imagined as attendants on Kuvera, the god of riches, and guardians of his treasures, but more frequently as mischievous, cruel, and hideous monsters, haunting cemeteries, devouring human beings, and ever ready to oppose the gods and to disturb pious people. They have the power of assuming any shape at will, and their strength increases towards the evening twilight. Several of them are described as having many heads and arms, *SEE RAVANA*, large teeth, red hair, and, in general, as being of repulsive appearance; others, however, especially the females of this class, could also take beautiful forms in order to allure their victims. In the legends of the *Ikahabhdra*, *Ramdyana*, and the Puranas, they play an important part, embodying, as it were, at the period of these compositions, the evil principle on earth, as opposed to all that is physically or morally good. In the Puranas, they are sometimes mentioned as the offspring of the patriarch Pulastya, at other times as the sons of the patriarch Kasyapa. Another account of their origin, given in the *Vishnu-Purana*, where, treating of the creation of the world (bk. i, ch. v), is the following; "Next, from Brahma, in a form composed of the quality of foulness, was produced hunger, of whom anger was born; and the god put forth in darkness beings emaciated with hunger, of hideous aspects, and with long beards. Those beings hastened to the deity. Such of them as exclaimed, 'Not so; oh! let him be saved,' were named Rakshasa (from 'raksh, save); others who cried out, 'Let us eat,' were denominated, from that expression, Yaksha (from *yaksh*, for *jaksh*, eat)." This popular etymology of the name, however, would be at variance with the cruel nature of these beings, and it seems, therefore, to have been improved upon in the *Bhayavata-Purana*, where it is related that Brahma transformed himself into night, invested with a body; this the Yakshas and Rakshasas seized upon, exclaiming, "Do not spare it — devour it!" when Brahma cried out, "Don't devour me (*tuad munin jctkshata*) — spare me! (*rakshaftt*)." (See F. E. Hall's note to Wilson's *Vishnu-Purana*, i, 82.) The more probable origin of the word Rakshas — kindred with the German *Recke* or *Riese* — is that from a radical *rish*, "hurt," or "destroy," with an affix *sas*; hence, literally, the destructive being.

Rakusians

is the name of a Christian sect whom Mohammedan writers speak of as having existed among them in Arabia. Nothing is definitely known about them. Their tenets appear to have been those of the *Mendaeans* (q.v.) or *Sabians* (q.v.), still further corrupted by Ebionite influences. See Sprenger, *Mohammed*, i, 41; ii, 155; iii, 387. 395; Weil, *Mohammed*, p. 249, 386; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 1, 409.

Ralbag

so called by Jews from the initial letters of his name, $\hat{y}crg \hat{b} ywl \ r = R. Levi ben-Gesshon$, and known by Christian writers by the name *Magistr Leo de Bannolis* or *Gersonides*, was born in 1288 at Bafiolas, not far from Gerona, and died about 1345. Little is known about the personal history of this remarkable Hebrew beyond the fact that, by virtue of his residence in Orange and Anignon, he was providentially exempted from the fearful sufferings inflicted upon his brethren in 1306, by the cruel government of Philip the Fair and his successors, and that he was thus enabled quietly to consecrate his extraordinary powers to the elucidation of the Scriptures, as well as to the advancement of science. His principal work, and perhaps the greatest on religious philosophy, is his $\mu\phi\eta \ twmj \ l \ m \ s$, *The Wars of God* (Riva di Trento, 1560; Leipsic, 1866). In this work Gersonides had the audacity to confess the eternity of matter, so that it was ironically called "The Wars with (against) God." But as free as God's sun, he uttered his convictions, careless of consequences, and without fear of offending this or that man, sect, or established opinions. He believed in the progressive nature of thoughts, and added his to those of his predecessors, leaving the consequence in the hand of God, and believing that "time develops truth." "Truth," he says, "must be brought to light even if it contradicts the revealed law most emphatically; as the Bible is no tyrannical law which intends to impose untruth for truth, but its design is to lead us to true knowledge" (introd. p. 2 b, sect. 6 p. 69 a). This great philosophical work treats:

1. Of the immortality of the soul (on which there are fourteen chapters);
2. On dreams and prophecy (eight chapters);

3. On the omniscience of God and the conflict between philosophy and religion (six chapters);
4. On Providence; viewed from the philosophical and religious standpoints (seven chapters).

The remaining portion of the work is a cosmogony designed to show the harmony between the statements of the Bible and the phenomena of the universe. That part of his work which treats on astronomy, and which describes an astronomical instrument invented by Gersonides to facilitate observations, was so much appreciated that pope Clement VI, in 1342, had it translated into Latin; and Kepler, as he says in a letter to John Remus, took much trouble to get the book of Rabbi Levi, as he calls him (*utinam apud Rabbinos invenire posses tractatum R. Levi quintum defensionum Dei*). The same was done by Pico de Mirandola and the great Reuchlin, who quotes largely from Gersonides. Though he began his authorship with philosophical and scientific productions when about thirty (1318), yet he published no exegetical work till he was thirty-seven years of age, from which time he unremittingly devoted himself to the exposition of the Bible. His first commentary is on the book of Job, and was finished in 1325. Twelve months later (1326) he published a commentary on the Song of Songs, and in 1328 a commentary on Coheleth, or Ecclesiastes. About the same time Ralbag finished his commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating on the hexahemeron, and shortly after issued an exposition of Esther (1329). The Pentateuch now engaged his attention, and after laboring on it eight years (1329-1337), he completed the interpretation of this difficult part of the Old Test. In 1338 he finished a commentary on the earlier prophets — i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings — together with his comments on Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The following are the editions of his exegetical works: **hrwth I [çwryp**, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (first printed at Mantua before 1480, then by Corn. Adelkind, Venice, 1547, and then again in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible, Amst. 1724-1727): — **µyaybn I [çwryp µynwçar**, *Commentary on the Earlier Prophets* (Leira, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles; latest edition, Kinigsberg, 1860: — excerpts of the commentaries on the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets, entitled **twyl [wt**, *Utility*, were published in 1550, and a Jewish-German version of them is given in Jekutiel's German translation of the Bible [Amst. 1676-78]): — — **yl çm I [çwryp**, *Commentary on Proverbs* (Leira, 1492, and in all the Rabbinic

Bibles); a Latin translation was published by Ghiggeho (Milan, 1620): — —' **bwya I [ɕwryp**, *Commentary on Job* (Ferrara, 1477, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles); a Latin translation of ch. i-v was published by L. H. d' Aquine (Paris, 1623), and of ch. iv-viii by Chr. Ludovicus (Leipsic, 1700): — **ryç I [ɕwryp twrw tl hq rtsa µyryçh**, *Commentary on Song of Songs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth*, with an introduction by Jacob Morkaria (Riva, 1560): — — **I [ɕwryp I aynd**, *Commentary on Daniel*, published in Italy before 1480, in Pratensis's Rabbinic Bible, and in Frankfurter's. The commentaries on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which he finished in 1338, are still in MS., Cod. MSS. Opp. 288 Q. and Mich. 623. "As to his mode of interpretation, Ralbag first gives an explanation of the words (**twl mh rwayb**) in each section, then propounds the meaning according to the context (**ɕwryph rwayb**), and finally gives the utility or application of the passage (**twyl [wt]**)." See Furst, *Bibliotheca Judacica*, i, 82-84; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 1607-1615; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Isebr.* i, 726, etc.; 4:892; Ginsburg. in Kitto, s.v.; Joel, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 9:223, etc. (Leips. 1860), 10:41-60, 93-111, 137-14~ 297-312, 333-344, 11:20-31, 65-75, 101-114; (riitz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 7:345-352 (Leips. 1873); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 83; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 261 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 114 sq. (Germ. transl.); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 673; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 421; Prantl, *Gesch. d. Logik*, ii, 394-396; Margoliouth, *Modern Judaism Investigated*, p. 253 (LondoL, 1843); Levy, *Die Exegese bei den franzus. Israeliten*, etc., p. 34 sq. (Leips. 1873). (B. P.)

Rale (Rasle, Or Rasles), Sebastian

a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born in 1657 or 1658, in the province of Franche-Comte. Having entered the Order of the Jesuits, he was despatched to the foreign work in 1689. He arrived at Quebec in the fall of that year, and labored faithfully among the Indians for their conversion, and for a time with much show of success. But his venturesome spirit led him into dangerous paths: he frequently went far beyond the territory of those savages friendly to him, and he finally paid for his daring with his life. He was killed in 1724, while out on an expedition with Indians; but not by the savages — he fell pierced with English bullets. He had been guilty of great cruelty to Englishmen who had fallen into the

hands of Indians, and this was only a revenge for his treachery to the whites. His death was a loss not only to Roman Catholics, but to the world of learning. Rale was a superior linguist, and had made himself master of the aboriginal languages and compiled a dictionary of the Abnaki language — of which the MS. is in the Harvard Library — which was published at the express wish of great savants. A monument was erected to his memory by bishop Fenwick, Aug. 29, 1833. See *Memoir*, by C. Francis, D.D., in Sparks, *Amer. Biog.* 2d series, vol. vii. (J. H. W.)

Raleigh, Walter, Sir

the distinguished English soldier, navigator, and writer of the Elizabethan age, deserves a place here on account of his contributions to sacred song. He was born at Haves, near the coast of Devonshire, in 1552, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1569 — about a year after graduation he entered the volunteer corps which, under Champernon, went to France to fight for the Huguenots. Subsequently he fought, under the prince of Orange, in the Netherlands, against the Spanish. In 1579 he made his first venture in navigation, which through life continued, at intervals, to attract him. He then sailed, in conjunction with his half-brother, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with the purpose of founding a colony in North America. But the expedition proved unsuccessful; and during the year following he held a captain's commission in Ireland, where, in operations against the rebels, he distinguished himself by his courage and conduct. He attracted the notice of queen Elizabeth; and, for some years afterwards, he was constant in his attendance upon the queen, who distinguished him by employing him, from time to time, in various delicate offices of trust, and by substantial marks of her favor. The spirit of enterprise was, however, restless in the man, and in 1584, a patent having been granted him to take possession of lands to be discovered by him on the continent of North America, he fitted out two ships at his own expense, and shortly achieved the discovery and occupation of the territory known as Virginia — a name chosen as containing an allusion to the "virgin queen" herself. Elizabeth also conferred on Raleigh the honor of knighthood. If we except the questionable benefit — with which his name remains connected of the introduction of tobacco into Europe, no immediate good came of the colony; and, after some years of struggle, during which he sent out several auxiliary expeditions, he was forced to relinquish his connection with it. In 1587-88, the country being menaced by a Spanish invasion, Raleigh was actively and responsibly occupied in organizing a resistance, and held

command of the queen's forces in Cornwall. In the latter year he shared, with new access of honor, in the series of actions which ended in the defeat and dispersion of the great Armada, and was thanked and rewarded for his services. His private marriage with Elizabeth Throckmorton, one of the queen's maids of honor, incurred her Majesty's severe displeasure, and he was banished from court. He now recurred to those schemes of conquest and adventure in the New World which formed one main dream of his life, and in 1595 headed an expedition to Guiana, having for its object the discovery of the fabled El Dorado, a city of gold and gems, the existence of which in these regions was then generally believed in. Of this brilliant but fruitless adventure, on returning, he published an account. Having regained the royal favor, he was made, in 1596, admiral in the expedition against Cadiz, commanded by Howard and the earl of Essex, and was admittedly the main instrument of its success. Also, in the year following, he took part in the attack on the Azores made by the same commanders. In the court intrigues which ended in the downfall of the earl of Essex, he, after this, became deeply involved; and certain points of his conduct — as, notably, the sale of his good offices with the queen in behalf of such of the earl's adherents as would buy them—though easily regarded by the current morality of the time, have fixed somewhat of a stain on a fame otherwise so splendid. With the death of Elizabeth, in 1603, ends his brilliant and successful career. Her successor, James, from the first regarded him with suspicion and dislike. He had, besides, made powerful enemies; and, when accused of complicity in a plot against the king, though no jot of evidence of his being any way concerned in it was produced at his trial, a verdict was readily procured finding him guilty of high-treason. The language of the prosecutor, attorney-general Coke, was outrageously abusive. He called Raleigh “a damnable atheist,” “a spider of hell,” a “viperous traitor,” etc. Sentence of death was passed, but James did not venture to execute him; and he was sent to the Tower, where, for thirteen years, he remained a prisoner, his estates being confiscated, and made over to the king's favorite, Carr, subsequently earl of Somerset. During his imprisonment, Raleigh devoted himself to literary and scientific pursuits, his chief monument in this kind being his *History of the World*, a noble fragment, still notable to the student as one of the finest models of quaint and stately old English style. Certain of his poetical pieces, giving hint of a genius at once elegant and sententious, also continue to be esteemed. In 1615 he procured his release, and once more sailed for Guiana. The expedition, from which great results were expected, failed miserably. He himself, in

consequence of severe illness, was unable to accompany it inland; and nothing but disaster ensued. To add to his grief and disappointment, his eldest and favorite son was killed in the storming of the Spanish town of St. Thomas. He returned to England, broken in spirit and in fortunes, only to die. On the morning of Oct. 29, 1618, he was infamously executed, nominally on the sentence passed on him sixteen years before, but really, there is reason to suppose, in base compliance, on James's part, with the urgencies of the king of Spain, who resented his persistent hostility.

Raleigh was a man of noble presence, of versatile and commanding genius, unquestionably one of the most splendid figures in a time unusually prolific of all splendid developments of humanity. In the art *and finesse* of the courtier, the politic wisdom of the statesman, and the skilful daring of the warrior, he was almost alike pre-eminent. The moral elevation of the man shone out eminently in the darkness which beset his later fortunes; and the calm and manly dignity with which he fronted adverse fate conciliated even those whom his haughtiness in prosperity had offended. Raleigh's *Life* has been written by Oldys, Cayley (Lond. 1806, 2 vols.), and P. F. Tytler (Edin. 1833). His poems were collected and published by Sir E. Brydges (Lond. 1814); his *Miscellaneous Writings*, by Dr. Birch (1751, 2 vols.); and his *Complete Works*, at Oxford (1829, 8 vols.).

Rale(i)gh, Walter

D.D., nephew of the foregoing, was born in 1586, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and finally became, in 1620, rector of Chedzoy, Somersetshire. In 1630 he was made chaplain to the king, and won much favor from Charles I. In 1634 he was made prebend of Wells, in 1641 was promoted to the deanery of Wells, and later became rector of Streat, with the chapel of Walton, Wiltshire. During the rebellion, he fell under suspicion, and was imprisoned in his house. While thus confined, he was stabbed, one day (1646), in an encounter with the guard, from whose impertinent curiosity he was determined to hide a private letter. England lost in this divine an eloquent preacher and a scholarly man. Chillingworth said of him that he was the best disputant he ever met with. His works are *Reliquie Raleighance*; being discourses and sermons on several subjects, with an account of the author by bishop Patrick (Lond. 1679, 4to; 1689, 4to): — *Certain Queries Proposed by Roman Catholics, and Answered by Dr. Watlter Raleigh* (pub. by Howell, 1719, 8vo). See Wood, *Athenza Oxon.*; *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.), 1857, ii, 643; 1858, i, 82.

Ralston, Samuel, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in the county of Donegal, Ireland, in 1756; studied at the University of Glasgow; and, after entering the ministry, emigrated to this country in the spring of 1794. After itinerating about two years in Eastern Pennsylvania, he went West, and in 1796 became pastor of the united congregations of Mingo Creek and Williamsport (now Monongahela City), where he remained for the rest of his life, being pastor of the latter branch thirty-five years, and of the former forty years. In 1822 he was made D.D. by Washington College, Pa., and died in Washington County, Pa., Sept. 25, 1851. As a preacher, he was eminently didactic and distinctive, clear, copious, and profound in the exposition and defence of truth. His published works are mostly of a controversial character; among them we find — *The Curry-comb* (1805): — a work on baptism, comprising a review of Campbell's debate with Walker, and letters in reply to his attack upon this review: — *A Brief Examination of the Principal Prophecies of Daniel and John*: — *A Defence of Evangelical Psalmody*. Sprague, *Annals*, 4:146.

Ram

(Heb. **רַם**; *high*), the name of three men in Scripture.

1. (Sept. **Ἀράμ**, v. r. **Ἀρράν** and **Ὀράμ**; Vul. *Aran*.) The son of Hezron and father of Amminadab, B.C. cir. 1780. He was born in Egypt after Jacob's migration there, as his name is not mentioned in ^{<0404>}Genesis 46:4. He first appears in ^{<0809>}Ruth 4:19. The genealogy in ^{<0109>}1 Chronicles 2:9, 10 adds no further information concerning him, except that he was the *second* son of Hezron, Jerahmeel being the first-born (ver. 25). He appears in the New Test. only in the two lists of the ancestry of Christ (^{<0103>}Matthew 1:3, 4; ^{<0133>}Luke 3:33), where he is called ARAM.

2. (Sept. **ῚΡάμ**, v. r. **ῚΡάν**, **Ἀράμ**, 'Apait; Vulg. *Ram*.) The first-born of Jerahmeel, and therefore nephew of the preceding (^{<0125>}1 Chronicles 2:25, 27). B.C. post 1780. He had three sons — Maaz, Jamin, and Eker.

3. (Sept. **ῚΡάμ**, v. r. **Ἀράμ**; Vulg. *Ram*.) Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, is described as "of the kindred of Ram" (^{<0332>}Job 32:2). Rashi's note on the passage is curious: 'of the family of Ram,' Abraham; for it is said, 'the greatest man among the Anakim' (Joshua 14); this [is] Abraham.'" Ewald identifies Ram with Aram, mentioned in ^{<0221>}Genesis 22:21 in

connection with Huz and Buz (*Gesch.* i, 414). Elihu would thus be a collateral descendant of Abraham, and this may have suggested the extraordinary explanation given by Rashli. **SEE ARAM.**

Ram

(*l yaï*; *dyl*; κριός). As this animal, fattened, was a favorite article of food (^{<0338>}Genesis 31:38; ^{<2708>}Ezekiel 39:18), it was considered, when offered as sacrifice, of higher value than sheep and lambs (^{<0159>}Genesis 15:9, ^{<0175>}Numbers 15:5, 6; 23:1 sq.; 28:11 sq., 28 sq.; ^{<3067>}Micah 6:7), and the legal ritual gave exact directions on the sacrifice of them. The rams were sometimes burnt-offerings (^{<0808>}Leviticus 8:18, 21; 9:2; 16:3; 29:18; ^{<0715>}Numbers 7:15; ^{<0401>}Psalms 46:15; ^{<2011>}Isaiah 1:11; ^{<2623>}Ezekiel 45:23, etc.), sometimes thank-offerings (^{<0804>}Leviticus 9:4, 18; ^{<0464>}Numbers 6:14, 17; 7:17; 28:11, etc.), sometimes trespass-offerings (^{<0815>}Leviticus 5:15, 18, 25; 6:6; comp. ^{<0821>}Leviticus 19:21; ^{<0108>}Numbers 5:8; ^{<1509>}Ezra 10:19, etc.). The ram, too, appears not only in public and private offerings in general, but especially in the purifying sacrifices of the Nazarite (^{<0464>}Numbers 6:14) and the sacrifices of Priestly Consecration. It was not used as a sin-offering. In ^{<0321>}2 Chronicles 29:21 only *the seven he-goats* belong to *the sin-offering*, as ver. 23 shows; the rams, with the other animals, forming the burnt-offering. The use of the ram as thank- and trespass-offering is pointed out in ^{<0222>}Exodus 29:22 (comp. ^{<0816>}Leviticus 8:16; 9:19; ^{<2346>}Isaiah 34:6). The Greeks and Romans used rams for sacrifice only exceptionally; yet comp. Pliny, *H. N.* 34:19, 19. In Egypt this was more frequent (Wilkinson, v, 191 sq.); only in the Thebais it was prohibited, save at the great annual festival of Amman (Herod. ii, 42). On the symbolic use of the ram in Daniel to signify the Persian empire, **SEE CATTLE**, No. II; and on the **SEE BATTERING-RAM**, see s.v. The use of ram's skins for covering is alluded to in ^{<0215>}Exodus 25:5; 26:14; 36:19; 39:34, and is still common in Palestine, where they are also "*dyed red*" (^{<0215>}Exodus 25:5) for the use of the shoemakers (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 139). **SEE SHEEP.**

Ram, Battering

(*rK*; Sept. βελόστασις χάραξ; Vulg. aries). This instrument of ancient siege operations is twice mentioned in the Old Test. (^{<2042>}Ezekiel 4:2; 21:22 [27]); and as both references are to the battering-rams in use among the Assyrians and Babylonians, it will only be necessary to describe those which are known from the monuments to have been employed in their

sieges. With regard to the meaning of the Hebrew word there is but little doubt. It denotes an engine of war which was called a *ram*, either because it had an iron head shaped like that of a ram, or because, when used for battering down a wall, the movement was like the butting action of a ram

In attacking the walls of a fort or city, the first step appears to have been to form an inclined plane or bank of earth (comp. ~~AND~~ Ezekiel 4:2 — "cast a mount against it"), by which the besiegers could bring their battering-rams and other engines to the foot of the walls. "The battering-rams," says Mr. Layard, "were of several kinds. Some were joined to movable towers which held warriors and armed men. The whole then formed one great temporary building, the top of which is represented in sculptures as on a level with the walls, and even turrets, of the besieged city. In some bas-reliefs the battering-ram is without wheels; it was then, perhaps, constructed upon the spot, and was not intended to be moved. The movable tower was probably sometimes unprovided with the ram, but I have not met with it so represented in the sculptures. When the machine containing the battering-ram was a simple framework and did not form an artificial tower, a cloth or some kind of drapery, edged with fringes and otherwise ornamented, appears to have been occasionally thrown over it. Sometimes it may have been covered with hides. It moved either on four or on six wheels, and was provided with one ram or with two. The mode of working the rams cannot be determined from the Assyrian sculptures. It may be presumed, from the representations in the bas-reliefs, that they were partly suspended by a rope fastened to the outside of the machine, and that men directed and impelled them from within. Such was the plan adopted by the Egyptians in whose paintings the warriors working the ram may be seen through the frame. Sometimes this engine was ornamented by a carved or painted figure of the presiding divinity kneeling on one knee and drawing a bow. The artificial tower was usually occupied by two warriors: one discharged his arrows against the besieged, whom he was able, from his lofty position, to harass more effectually than if he had been below; the other held up a shield for his companion's defence. Warriors are not unfrequently represented as stepping from the machine to the battlements. Archers on the walls hurled stones from slings and discharged their arrows against the warriors in the artificial towers; while the rest of the besieged were no less active in endeavoring to frustrate the attempts of the assailants to make breaches in their walls. By dropping a double chain or rope from the battlements they caught the ram, and could either destroy

its efficacy altogether, or break the force of its blows. Those below, however, by placing hooks over the engine and throwing their whole weight upon them, struggled to retain it in its place. The besieged, if unable to displace the battering-ram, sought to destroy it by fire, and threw lighted torches or firebrands upon it; but water was poured upon the flames through pipes attached to the artificial tower" (*Nineveh and its Remains*, ii, 367-370). *SEE BATTERING-RAM.*

Ram, Pierre Francois Xavier De,

a Belgian historian and theologian was born at Louvain, Sept. 2, 1804, studied at Malines, and in 1823 was made professor in a seminary of the same place, and taught there until its suppression, in 1825. He was then made archivist to the archbishop of the diocese of Malines. In 1827 he took holy orders, and two years after was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history and philosophy in the theological seminary at Malines, of which, when (in 1834) enlarged to a university, he was made rector. In 1835 he was transferred to Louvain, and there taught until his death, in 1862. He was a learned man and greatly revered by his countrymen. His writings were very numerous. Besides his biography of the principal saints and celebrated persons of the Low Countries--a work in which he freely used the writings of Raine--Ram published the following works of interest to us: *Synodicum Belgicum, sive Acta omnium Ecclesiarum Belgii a Concilio Tridentino usque ad 1801* (Mal. 1828-58); *Historia Philosophite* (Louv. 1832-34, 8vo); *Vie des Saints de Godescard* (Louv. 1828-35, 22 vols. 8vo, and often); *Documents relatifs aux Troubles du Pays de Liege, sous les Princes-evesques Louis de Bourbon et Jean de Horn, 1455-1585* (Brux. 1844, 4to), a most important chapter from a Romanist on a noteworthy period of the ante-reformation movement in the Low Countries, etc. See Querard, *La France Litteraire*, vol. 11:for full bibliography.

Ra'ma

Ραμᾶ, the Greek form of *Ramah*. found in ^{<412B>}Matthew 2:18, referring to ^{<241B>}Jeremiah 31:15. The original passage alludes to a massacre of Benjamites or Eph-raimites (comp. vers. 9, 18) at the Ramah in Benjamin or in Mount Ephraim. This is seized by the evangelist and turned into a touching reference to the slaughter of the innocents at Bethlehem, near to which was (and is) the sepulchre of Rachel. The name of Rama is alleged to have been lately discovered attached to a spot close to the sepulchre. If

it existed there in Matthew's day, it may have prompted his allusion, though it is not necessary to suppose this, since the point of the quotation does not lie in the name Ramah, but in the lamentation of Rachel for the children, as is shown by the change of the *ῥοις* of the original to *τέκνα*. The allusion is doubtless to Ramah, one of the leading cities of Benjamin, and not, as many have supposed, to some place of that name near Bethlehem. The passage is a difficult one, but the difficulty may be solved by a careful examination of the topography of the district. The difficulties are these:

1. Why is Rachel, the mother of Benjamin, represented as weeping for her children, seeing that Bethlehem was in *Judah* and not in *Benjamin*? The reply is, Rachel died and was buried near Bethlehem (⁽¹³⁵⁾Genesis 35:19); the border of the tribe of Benjamin reached to her sepulchre (⁽¹³⁶⁾1 Samuel 10:2); not only were the children of Bethlehem slain, but also those "in all the coast thereof," thus including part of Benjamin. The spirit of the departed Rachel is then represented as rising from the tomb and mourning her slaughtered children.

2. But why was the voice of lamentation heard in Ramah nearly ten miles distant? The answer is now easy. So deep was the impression made by the cruel massacre, that the cry of distress went through the whole land of Benjamin, reaching to the capital of the tribe.

Rama

is, in Hindu mythology, the name common to three incarnations of Vishnu, of Parasurhama, Ramachandra, and Balarama. *SEE VISHNU.*

Ramadan

the ninth month in the Mohammedan year. In it Mohammed received his first revelation, and every believer is therefore enjoined to keep a strict fast throughout its entire course, from the dawn — when a white thread can be distinguished from a black thread — to sunset. Eating, drinking, smoking, bathing, smelling perfumes, and other bodily enjoyments, even swallowing one's spittle, are strictly prohibited during that period. Even when obliged to take medicine, the Moslem must make some kind of amends for it, such as spending a certain sum of money upon the poor. During the night, however, the most necessary wants may be satisfied — a permission which, practically, is interpreted by a profuse indulgence in all sorts of enjoyments.

The fast of Ramadan, now much less observed than in former times, is sometimes a very severe affliction upon the orthodox, particularly when the month — the year being lunar — happens to fall in the long and hot days of midsummer. The sick, travellers, and soldiers in time of war, are temporarily released from this duty, but they have to fast an equal number of days at a subsequent period, when this impediment is removed. Nurses, pregnant women, and those to whom it might prove really injurious, are expressly exempt from fasting. We may add that according to some traditions (Al-Beidlihi), not only Mohammed, but also Abraham, Moses, and Jesus received their respective revelations during this month. The principal passages treating of the fast of Ramadan are found in the second Surah of the Koran, called “The Cow.” See Wellsted, *City of the Calilphs*, ii, 245.

Ra'mah

(Heb. *Rannah'*, *hmr*) signifies *a height*, or *a high place*, from the root *מר*, *to be high*; and thus it is used in ^{<0624>}Ezekiel 16:24. Very many of the ancient cities and villages of Palestine were built on the tops of hills, so as to be more secure, and hence, as was natural, such of them as were especially conspicuous were called by way of distinction, *hmrh*; (with the article), *the height*; and this in the course of time came to be used as a proper name. We find no less than five Ramahs mentioned in Scripture by this simple name, besides several compounds, and in modern Palestine the equivalent Arabic name is of very frequent occurrence. With regard to most of them the traveller can still see how appropriate the appellation was. In the A. V. we have various forms of the word — *Rumdath* (*tmr*), the *status constructus* (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:26), *Ramoth* (*t/mr*; and *tmō*), the plural (^{<0623>}Joshua 21:36; ^{<0617>}1 Samuel 30:27); and *Reamathacimz* (*mytmr*), a dual form (^{<0600>}1 Samuel 1:1). *Remaeth* (*tme*) appears to be only another form of the same word. In later Hebrew. *ramtha* is a recognised word for a hill, and as such is employed in the Jewish versions of the Pentateuch for the rendering of Pisgah. **SEE ARIMATHAEA**. In the following account we largely follow the usual geographical authorities, with important additions from other sources.

1. RAMAH OF BENJAMIN (*Sept.* ^{<0604>}Ραμά and ^{<0604>}Άραμά, v. r. ^{<0604>}Ίαμά, ^{<0604>}Ραμμά, ^{<0604>}Ραμμάν, ^{<0604>}Βαμά, Vulg. *Ramah*), frequently mentioned in Scripture; Joshua, in enumerating the towens of Benjamin, groups Ramah between Gibeon

and Beeroth (18:25). This position suits the present Ram-Allah, but the considerations named in the text make it very difficult to identify any other site with it than er-Ram. It is probably this place which is mentioned in the story of Deborah, "She dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Iethel in Mount Ephraim" (^{<0045>}Judges 4:5). The Targum on this passage substitutes for the Palm of Deborah, Ataroth-Deborah, no doubt referring to the town of Ataroth. This has everything in its favor, since Atara is still found on the left hand of the north road, very nearly midway between er-Ram and *Beitin*. Its position is clearly indicated in the distressing narrative of the Levite recorded in Judges 19. He left Bethlehem for his home in Mount Ephraim in the afternoon. Passing Jerusalem, he journeyed northward, and, crossing the ridge, came in sight of Gibeah and Bainalh, each standing *on* the top of its hill; and he said to his servant, "Come and let us draw near to one of these places to lodge all night, in Gibeah or in Ramah" (ver. 13). The towns were near the road on the right, and about two miles apart. The position of these two ancient towns explains another statement of Scripture. It is said of Saul (^{<0216>}1 Samuel 22:6) that "he abode in (Gibeah under a tree in Ramah." The meaning appears to be that the site of his standing: *camp* was in some commanding spot on the borders of the two territories of Gibeah and Ramah. When Israel was divided, Ramah lay between the rival kingdoms, and appears to have been destroyed at the outbreak of the revolt; for we read that "Baasha, king of Israel, went up against Judah, and *built* Ramah" (^{<1157>}1 Kings 15:17). It was a strong position, and commanded the great road from the north to Jerusalem. The king of Judah was alarmed at the erection of a fortress in such close proximity to his capital, and he stopped the work by bribing the Syrians to invade northern Palestine (vers. 18-21), and then carried off all the building materials (ver. 22). There is a precise specification of its position in the catalogue of the places north of Jerusalem which are enumerated by Isaiah as disturbed by the gradual approach of the king of Assyria (^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:28-32). At Michmash he crosses the ravine; and then successively dislodges or alarms Geba, Ramah, and Gibeah of Saul. Each of these may be recognised with almost absolute certainty at the present *day*. Geba is Jeba, on the south brink of the great valley; and a mile and a half beyond it, directly between it and the main road to the city, is er-Ram, on the elevation which its ancient name implies. Ramah was intimately connected with one of the saddest epochs of Jewish history. The full story is not told, but the outline is sketched in the words of Jeremiah. In the final invasion of Judea by the Babylonians,

Nebuchadnezzar established his headquarters on the plain of Hamath, at Riblah (^{289f}Jeremiah 39:5). Thence he sent his generals, who captured Jerusalem. The principal inhabitants who escaped the sword were seized, bound, and placed under a guard at Ramah, while the conquerors were employed in pillaging and burning the temple and palace, and levelling the ramparts. Among the captives was Jeremiah himself (^{240f}Jeremiah 40:1, 5, with 39:8-12). Perhaps there was also a slaughter of such of the captives as, from age, weakness, or poverty, were not worth the long transport across the desert to Babylon. There, in that heart-rending scene of captives in chains wailing over slaughtered kindred and desolated sanctuaries, was fulfilled the first phase of the prophecy uttered only a few years before: "A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children because they were not" (^{281f}Jeremiah 31:15). That mourning was typical of another which took place six centuries later, when the infants of Bethlehem were murdered, and the second phase of the prophecy was fulfilled (^{412f}Matthew 2:17). As Ramah was in Benjamin, the prophet introduces Rachel, the mother of that tribe, bewailing the captivity of her descendants.

SEE RAMA.

Ramah was rebuilt and reoccupied by the descendants of its old inhabitants after the captivity (^{452f}Ezra 2:26; ^{467f}Nehemiah 7:30). The Ramah in ^{613f}Nehemiah 11:33 is thought by some to occupy a different position in the list, and may be a distinct place situated farther west, nearer the plain. (This, and ^{281f}Jeremiah 31:15, are the only passages in which the name appears without the article.) The Sept. finds an allusion to Ramah in ^{341f}Zechariah 14:1, where it renders the words which are translated in the A.V. "and shall be lifted up (*hmarj*; '), and inhabited in her place," by "Ramah shall remain upon her place." According to Josephus (who calls it ⁴*Ραμαθών*), it was forty stadia distant from Jerusalem (*Ant.* 8:12, 3); and Eusebius and Jerome place it in the sixth mile north of the holy city (*Ononast.* s.v. "Rama;" but in his commentary on ^{288f}Hosea 5:8, Jerome says *in septizmo lapide*); and the latter states that in his day it was a small village (*ad Sophoniam*, i, 15).

Modern travellers are right in identifying Ramah of Benjamin with the village of *er-Ram* (Brocardus, vii; Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i, 576); though Maundrell and a few others have located it at Neby Samwil. Er-Ram is five miles north of Jerusalem and four south of Bethel. The site of Gibeah of Saul lies two miles southward, and Geba about the same distance eastward.

Ramah is a small, miserable village; but in the walls and foundations of the houses are many large hewn stones, and in the lanes and fields broken columns and other remains of the ancient capital. The situation is commanding, on the top of a conical hill, half a mile east of the great northern road, and overlooking the broad summit of the ridge; the eastern view is intercepted by bare ridges and hill-tops. The whole country round Ramah has an aspect of stern and even painful desolation; but this is almost forgotten in the great events which the surrounding heights and ruins recall to memory. On the identity of this Ramah with that of Samuel, *SEE RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM*.

2. RAMAH OF ASHER (Sept. ^ῚΡαμά; Vulg. *ITorma*), a town mentioned only in ^{<1682>}Joshua 19:29, in the description of the boundaries of Asher. It would appear to have been situated near the sea-coast, and not far from Tyre, towards the north or north-east. Eusebius and Jerome mention this place, but in such a way as shows they knew nothing of it further than what is stated by Joshua. In the Vulgate Jerome calls it *Horma*, making the Hebrew article **h** a part of the word; this, however, is plainly an error (*Onomast.* s.v. “Rama;” and note by Bonfrere). Robinson visited a village called *Rameh*, situated on the western declivity of the mountain-range, about seventeen miles south-east of Tyre. It “stands upon an isolated hill in the midst of a basin with green fields, surrounded by higher hills.” In the rocks are numerous ancient sarcophagi, and the village itself has some remains of antiquity. He says “there is no room for question but that this village represents the ancient Ramah of Asher” (*Bibl. Res.* iii, 64). Its position, however, notwithstanding the assertion of so high an authority, does not at all correspond with the notice in Scripture, and the name Ramah was too common to indicate identity with any degree of certainty. Another Rameh has been discovered on a little tell, two miles south-east of modern Tyre, and about one mile northeast of Ras-el-Ain, the site of ancient Tyre (Van de Velde, *Map and Memoir*, p. 342). In position this village answers in all respects to the Ramah of Asher.

3. RAMAH OF GILEAD (^{<1189>}2 Kings 8:29; ^{<4216>}2 Chronicles 22:6), identical with Ramoth-Gilead (q.v.).

4. RAMAH OF NAPHTALI (Sept. Ἀράηλ v. r. ^ῚΡαμά; Vulg. *Arania*), one of the strong cities of the tribe, mentioned only in ^{<1686>}Joshua 19:36, and situated apparently to the south of Hazor, between that city and the Sea of Galilee. Reland seems inclined to identify it with the Ramah of Asher; but

they are evidently distinct cities, as indicated both by ancient geographers and the sacred writer (*Paloest.* p. 963). Eusebius and Jerome record the name, though they appear to have known nothing of the place (*Onomast.* s.v. "Rama"). *Beth-Rimah* (*hmyræyBē*), a place in Galilee on a mountain, and famous for its wine, according to the Talmud (*Menachoth*, 8:6), is thought by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 178) to be the Ramah of Naphtali. About six miles west by south of Safed, on the leading road to Akka, is a large modern village called *Rameh*. It stands on the declivity of the mountain, surrounded by olive-groves, and overlooking a fertile plain. It contains no visible traces of antiquity; but the name and the situation render it highly probable that it occupies the site of Ramah of Naphtali. It was visited by Schultz in 1847 (*Ritter, Pal. und Syr.* iii, 772), and by Robinson in 1852 (*Bib. Res.* iii, 79). See also Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 240; Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 515. **SEE RAMATHITE.**

5. RAMAH OF SAMUEL, the birthplace and home of that prophet (^{<0019>}1 Samuel 1:19; 2:11, etc.), and the city elsewhere called RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM.

6. RAMAH OF THE SOUTH

SEE RAMATH-NEGEB.

7. A place mentioned in the catalogue of towns reinhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the captivity (^{<613>}Nehemiah 11:33). It may be the Ramah of Benjamin (above, No. 1), or the Ramah of Samuel, but its position in the list (remote from Geba, Michmash, Bethel, ver. 31; comp. ^{<1026>}Ezra 2:26, 28) seems to remove it farther west, to the neighborhood of Lod, Hadid, and Ono. There is no further notice in the Bible of a Ramah in this direction; but Eusebius and Jerome allude to one, though they may be at fault in identifying it with Ramathaim and Arimathlaea (*Onomast.* s.v. "Armatha Sophim;") and the remarks of Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* ii, 239). The situation of the modern *Ramleh* agrees very well with this, a town too important and too well placed not to have existed in the ancient times. The consideration that *Ramleh* signifies "sand," and Ramah "a height," is not a valid argument against the one being the legitimate successor of the other, if so, half the identifications of modern travellers must be reversed. Beit-fir can no longer be the representative of Beth-horon, because *ur* means "eye," while *horon* means "caves;" nor Beitlahm, of Bethlehem, because *lahm* is "flesh," and *lehm*

“bread;” nor el-Aal, of Elealeh, because *el* is in Arabic the article, and in Hebrew the name of God. In these cases the tendency of language is to retain the sound at the expense of the meaning.

8. RAMAH NEAR HEBRON, called *Er-Ramzeh*, or *Ramet el-Khalil* — *Ramah* of Hebron, or *Ramah* of the Friend, i.e. *Ramah* of Abraham, or the High-place of Abraham the Friend of God. It lies about two miles north of Hebron, a little to the right or east of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem, on an eminence, the top and southern slope of which are covered with ancient foundations, the principal of which are those of a large building, apparently a Christian church. The ruins are described by Wolcott (*Biblioth. Sac.* i, 45), and by Dr. Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*, i, 382). The top commands a fine view of the Mediterranean through a gap in the mountains towards the north-west. This *Ramah* the Jews call the “House of Abraham,” where, they say, Abraham lived when he dwelt at Mamre. But the “*plains* of Mamre,” with the great *Sindian*, or evergreen oak in the middle of it (if not the same, the offspring, most probably, of the tree), under which Abraham entertained the angels, would seem to have anciently lain to the west of Hebron, as Machpelah, which is at Hebron, is said to be *before*, i.e. to the east of, Mamre. It is very possible, however, that Abraham may have had his habitation or tent at *Ramah* for a part of the time he was at Mamre or near Hebron, or, which is still more probable, the altar which he erected (¹¹³⁸Genesis 13:18), his high-place, or place of worship, may have been at *er-Rameh*, or *Ramet el-Khalil*, “the high-place of the Friend,” i.e. of Abraham the friend of God, while he dwelt or had his tent in the plain of Mamre.

Some suppose that this *Ramah* may be the *Ramah* of Samuel and the place where Saul was anointed. Wolcott and Van de Velde contend for this. But this place is far too distant from Rachel’s tomb to admit of the supposition, not to speak of other insuperable difficulties. The place where Samuel was when he anointed Saul was evidently near or not far from Rachel’s tomb (¹¹³⁹1 Samuel 10:1-11). It is much more probable that Bethlehem, or the high-place at or near Bethlehem, was the place where Samuel anointed Saul. The name of *Ramet el-Khalil* implies that that place had to do with Abraham the friend of God, and not with Samuel.

Ramanandis

a Hindiu sect which addressed its devotions particularly to Ramachandra, and the divine manifestations connected with Vishnu in that incarnation.

The originator of this sect was Raminand, who is calculated by Prof. H. H. Wilson to have flourished in the end of the 14th or beginning of the 15th century. he resided at Benares, where a *math*, or, monastery, of his followers is said to have formerly existed, but to have been destroyed by some of the Mussulman princes. The Ramanandis reverence all the incarnations of Vishnu, but they maintain the superiority of Rima in the present age or *Kali-Yug*, though they vary considerably as to the exclusive or collective worship of the male and female members of this incarnation. The ascetic and mendicant followers of Ranmanand are by far the most numerous sectaries in Gangetic India. In Bengal they are comparatively few; beyond this province, as far as to Allahabad, they are probably the most numerous, though they yield in influence and wealth to the Saiva branches. From this point they are so abundant as almost to engross the whole of the country along the Ganges and Jumna. In the district of Agra they constitute seven tenths of the ascetic population. ‘The numerous votaries of the Ramanandis belong chiefly to the poorer classes, with the exception of the Rajputs and military Brahmins. Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Ramatha'im-zo'phim

(Heb. with tme art. *ha-Ramathayim Tsophim'* ~~μυρῶν~~ ~~μυτῆρ~~ ~~ῆ~~; *the two heights, watchers*; Sept. Ἀρμαθαῖμ Σιφά, v. r. Ἀρμαθαῖμ Σωφίμ, making the art. **h** part of the word; Vulg. *Ramathayim Tsophim'*), the birthplace of the prophet Samuel (^{<0019>}1 Samuel 1:19), his own permanent and official residence (^{<0077>}1 Samuel 7:17; 8:4), and the place of his sepulture (^{<0201>}1 Samuel 25:1). It was in Mount Ephraim (^{<0001>}1 Samuel 1:1). It had apparently attached to it a place called Naioth, at which the “company” (or “school,” as it is called in modern times) of the sons of the prophets was maintained (^{<0098>}1 Samuel 19:18, etc.; 20:1); and it had also in its neighborhood (probably between it and Gibeah of Saul) a great well, known as the well of Has-Sechu (^{<0092>}1 Samuel 19:22). **SEE SECHU**. This is all we know of it with any degree of certainty.

Ramathaim, if interpreted as a Hebrew word, is dual — “the double eminence.” This may point to a peculiarity in the shape or nature of the place, or may be an instance of the tendency, familiar to all students, which exists in language to force an archaic or foreign name into an intelligible form. It is given in its complete shape in the Hebrew text and A. V. but once (^{<0001>}1 Samuel 1:1). Elsewhere (^{<0019>}1 Samuel 1:19; 2:11; 7:17; 8:4;

15:34; 16:13; 19:18, 19, 22, 23; 20:1; 25:1; 28:3) it occurs in the shorter form of Ramah (q.v.). The Sept., however (in both MSS.), gives it throughout as Armathaim, and inserts it in 1:3 after the words “his city,” where it is wanting in the Hebrew and A. V. Gesenius questions the identity of Ramathaim-zophim and Ramah (*Thesaurus*, p. 127); but a comparison of ^{<000>}1 Samuel 1:1 with ver. 19 shows without doubt that the same place is referred to. It is implied by Josephus, and affirmed by Eusebius and Jerome in the *Onomasticon* (“Armathem Seipha”); nor would it ever have been questioned had there not been other Ramahs mentioned in the sacred history. Of the force of “Zophim” no feasible explanation has been given. It was an ancient name on the east of Jordan (^{<0234>}Numbers 23:14), and there, as here, was attached to an eminence. In the Targum of Jonathan, Ramathaim-zophim is rendered “Ramatha of the scholars of the prophets;” but this is evidently a late interpretation, arrived at by regarding the prophets as watchmen (the root of *zophim*, also that of *nizpeh*, having the force of looking out afar), coupled with the fact that at Naioth in Ramah there was a school of prophets. The most natural explanation appears to be that Zuph, one of Samuel’s ancestors, had migrated from his home in Ephratah (^{<000>}1 Samuel 1:1; ^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 6:35), and settled in a district to which he gave his own name, and which was afterwards called *the land of Zuph* (^{<005>}1 Samuel 9:5). Ramah, or Ramathaim, was the chief town of this district, and was hence called Ramathaim-Zophim, that is, “Ramah of the Zuphites” (see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 7). **SEE ZOPHIM.**

The position of Ramathaim-zophim is regarded by many scholars as one of the puzzles of Biblical geography. As the city is one of great interest, it may be well to give the principal theories as to its site, and then to state the data on which alone the site can be determined.

(1.) Eusebius and Jerome locate it near Diospolis or Lydda (*Onomasts.* s.v. “Armatha Sophim”), and identify it with the Arimathma of the N.T. (^{<1257>}Matthew 27:57). Jerome’s words are: “Armathem Seipha: the city of Helkana and Samuel. It lies near (πλησίον) Diospolis: thence came Joseph, in the Gospels said to be from Arimathaea.” Diospolis is Lydda, the modern Ludd; and the reference is, no doubt, to Ramleh, the wellknown modern town, two miles from Ludd. Jerome agrees with Eusebius in his translation of this passage; but in the *Epitaphium Pauloe* (Epist. 108) he connects Ramleh with Arimathba only, and places it *haud procul a Lyddu*. This last identification may be correct; for the Sept. Ἀρμαθαίμ seems to be the same name as the New-Test. Ἀριμαθαία, and

represents the Hebrew **רַמְתֵּיחַ**, with the article. There is no doubt there was a city called Armatha or Ramathem on the plain near Lydda at an early period; and its modern representative may be Ramleh, as suggested by Reland and others (Reland, *Palœst.* p. 580, 959; see, however, Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 238). But Ramah of Samuel could not have been so far distant from Gibeah of Saul; and there is a fatal obstacle to this identification in the fact that Ramleh (“the sandy”) lies on the open face of the maritime plain, and cannot in any sense be said to be in Mount Ephraim or any other mountain district. Eusebius possibly refers to another Ramah named in ¹⁰¹³Nehemiah 11:33.

(2.) Some would identify this city with Ramah of Benjamin (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1275; Winer, *Real Worterb.* s.v. “Rama”); but this Ramah seems too close to Saul’s residence at Gibeah to suit the requirements of the sacred narrative in ¹⁰¹⁸1 Samuel 19:18. (Yet see below.)

(3.) Robinson has suggested that the site of Ramah may be that now occupied by the village of Soba, which stands on a lofty and conspicuous hill-top, about six miles west of Jerusalem. Soba, he thinks, may be a corruption of the old name *Zuph*. Its elevation would answer well to the designation *Ramah*. It might be regarded as included in the mountains of Ephraim, or, at least, as a natural extension of them; and a not very wide detour would take the traveller from Solba to Gibeah by the tomb of Rachel (*Bib. Res.* ii, 7-9). The arguments are plausible, but not convincing; and it must be admitted that even Robinson’s remarkable geographical knowledge has failed to throw light on the site of Ramathaim-zophim.

(4.) Wolcott, seeing on the spot the difficulties attending Robinson’s theory, and finding a remarkable ruin, called *Ramet el-Khulil*, near Hebron, concluded that this was the site of Samuel’s city. A summary of his reasons is given by Robinson in the *Biblical Cabinet* (43:51; see also *Bib. Res.* iii. 279). They are not more convincing than those advanced in favor of Soba, yet they have been adopted and expanded by Van de Velde (*Narrat.* ii, 48-54; *Memoir*, p. 341). This is also supported by Stewart (*Tent and Khan*, p. 247).

(5.) Gesenius thinks that *Jebel Fureidis*, or, as it is usually called. *Frank Mountain*, the conspicuous conical hill three miles south-east of Bethlehem, is the true site of Ramah (*Thesaurus*, p. 1276). This, however, is pure conjecture, without any evidence to support it.

(6.) Ewald is in favor of the little village of *Ram-Allah*, a mile west of Beerothl (*Geschichte*, ii, 550, *mote*). It is doubtless situated in Mount Ephraim, retains the old name, and the name *Allah*, "God," might be an indication of some old, peculiar sanctity; but it is open to the same objections as all others north of Rachel's tomb. Lieut. Conder inclines to this position (*Tent Work in Palestine*, ii, 116), remarking that near it is a ruined village called Sueikeh, perhaps the Sechu of ⁽¹⁸¹²⁾1 Samuel 19:22. (7.) One of the most ancient, and certainly one of the most plausible, theories is that which locates Ramathaim-zophim at *Neby Samwil*. It is most probably to this place Procopius alludes in the statement that Justinian caused a well and a wall to be erected for the convent of St. Samuel (*De Edific. Just.* v, 9; comp. Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 459). From the 7th century, when Adamnanus described Palestine, and spoke of "the city of Samuel, which is called Ramatha" (*Early Travels* [Bo]hn, p. 5), down through the Middle Ages to the present day, the name of the prophet has been connected with this spot; and the uniform tradition of Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans has made it the place of his birth and burial (see authorities cited in Robinson, *l.c.*). The Crusaders built a church over the alleged tomb, which, after the fall of the Latin kingdom, was converted into a mosque; and its walls and tall minaret are still visible from afar (Quaresmius, ii, 727; Pococke, ii, 48). Neby Samwil is unquestionably the site of a very ancient city; its position on the summit of a high conical hill would give it a just title to the name Ramah; it probably lay within the region termed the "Mountains of Ephraim;" and it would form an appropriate residence for the great judge of Israel. It is near this place that the great well of Sechu, to which Saul came on his way to Ramah, now called Samuel's fountain, near Beit Iska, or Beit Isku, is thought by some to be found; and near Neby Samwil is Beit Haninah, supposed to be Naioth, the College of Prophets, or "the House of Instruction" of the Jewish Targum, which was connected with Ramah of Samuel (⁽¹⁸¹⁸⁾1 Samuel 19:18-24). **SEE NAIOTH.** Yet there are very formidable objections to its identification with Ramathaim-zophim. It appears to be too near Gibeah, the capital of Saul's kingdom, to form a safe refuge for David when he fled from that monarch: it is not an hour's ride distant, and it is in full view. It has been shown, besides, that Neby Samwil is most probably the site of Alizpah (q.v.).

(8.) Bonar (*Land of Promise*, p. 178, 554) adopts *er-Ram*, which he places a short distance north of Bethlehem, east of Rachel's sepulchre. Eusebius

(*Onomast.* s.v. Ῥαβεδέ) says that “Rama of Benjamin” is near (περί) Bethlehem, where the “voice in Rama was heard;” and in our times the name is mentioned, besides Bonar, by Prokesch and Salzbacher (cited in Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 8, *note*); but this cannot be regarded as certain, and Stewart has pointed out that it is too close to Rachel’s monument to suit the case.

(9.) Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 152-158), starting from Gibeah of Saul as the home of Kish, fixes upon *Rameh*, north of Samaria and west of Sanur, which he supposes also to be Ramoth, or Jarmuth, the Levitical city of Issachar. All that is directly said as to its situation is that it was in Mount Ephraim (1 Samuel 1:1); and this would naturally lead us to seek it in the neighborhood of Shechem. But the whole tenor of the narrative of the public life of Samuel (in connection with which alone this Ramah is mentioned) is so restricted to the region of the tribe of Benjamin, and to the neighborhood of Gibeah, the residence of Saul, that it seems impossible not to look for Samuel’s city in the same locality. It appears, from 1 Samuel 7:17, that his annual functions as prophet and judge were confined to the narrow round of Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh — the first on the north boundary of Benjamin; the second near Jericho at its eastern end; and the third on the ridge in more modern times known as Scopus, overlooking Jerusalem, and therefore near the southern confines of Benjamin. In the centre of these was Gibeah of Saul, the royal residence during the reign of the first king, and the centre of his operations. It would be doing a violence to the whole of this part of the history to look for Samuel’s residence outside these narrow limits.

Those Scriptural allusions which tend to indicate the position of Ramathaim-zophim are the following, and they are our only trustworthy guides. The statements of Eusebius and later writers can have little weight; and, indeed, it appears that all knowledge of the city was lost before their time.

(a.) In I Samuel 1:1 we read, “There was a certain man of Ramathaim-zophim, of Mount Ephraim.” From this it would appear, at first sight, that Ramathaim was situated in the district called Mount Ephraim. The construction of the Hebrew, however, does not make this quite certain. The phrase $\mu\upsilon\rho\omega\chi \mu\upsilon\tau\mu\rho\eta\text{A}\omega\mu \mu\upsilon\rho\alpha \text{rhm}$ might possibly mean, not that Ramathaim was *in* Mount Ephraim (which would be expressed rather by rhb), but that Elkanah was in some way *of* Mount Ephraim (the

Hebrew is *rahm*), though residing in Ramathaim. The statement of the sacred writer, therefore, does not form an insuperable objection to a theory that would locate Ramathaim beyond the bounds of Mount Ephraim. Besides, the extent of the region called Mount Ephraim is nowhere defined. It may mean that section of mountain allotted to the tribe of Ephraim, or it may have extended so as to include part, or even the whole, of Benjamin. In the mouth of an ancient Hebrew, the expression would mean that portion of the mountainous district which was, at the time of speaking, in the possession of the tribe of Ephraim. "Little Benjamin" was for so long in close alliance with, and dependence on, its more powerful kinsman, that nothing is more probable than that the name of Ephraim may have been extended over the mountainous region which was allotted to the younger son of Rachel. Of this there are not wanting indications. The palm-tree of Deborah was "in Mount Ephraim," between Bethel and Ramah, and is identified with great plausibility by the author of the Targum on ^{<0045>}Judges 4:5 with Ataroth, one of the landmarks on the south boundary of Ephraim, which still survives in Amra, two and a half miles north of Ramah of Benjamin (er-Ram). Bethel itself, though in the catalogue of the cities of Benjamin (^{<0022>}Joshua 18:22), was appropriated by Jeroboam as one of his idol sanctuaries, and is one of the "cities of Mount Ephraim" which were taken from him by Baasha and restored by Asa (^{<0039>}2 Chronicles 13:19; 15:8). Jeremiah (ch. 31) connects Ramah of Benjamin with Mount Ephraim (ver. 6, 9, 15, 18). It could scarcely have embraced any portion of Judah, since the two tribes were rivals for sovereignty. The allusions to Mount Ephraim in ^{<0004>}1 Samuel 9:4; ^{<0075>}Joshua 17:15; ^{<0070>}Judges 17:1, appear to confine the name to the territory of the tribe.

(b.) Ramah would appear to have been at some considerable distance from the residence of Saul at Gibeah. Such, at least, is the conclusion one would naturally draw from the following passages: ^{<0034>}1 Samuel 15:34, 35; 19:18-23. But in neither of these passages is it clearly asserted nor certainly implied. In another passage the immediate proximity of Gibeah and Ramah seems to be directly stated (^{<0026>}1 Samuel 22:6). This passage, it is true, may either be translated (with Junins, Michaelis, De Wette, and Bunsen), "Saul abode in Gibeah under the tamarisk *on the height*" (in which case it will add one to the scaly number of instances in which the word is used otherwise than as a proper name); or it may imply that Ramah was included within the precincts of the king's city. The Sept. reads Bama for Ramah, and renders the words "on the hill under the field in Bama." Eusebius, in

his *Onomasticon*, (s.v. ^ϚΡαμᾶ), characterizes Ramah as the “city of Saul.” In any case, there seems to be no insuperable objection against the identity of Ramah of Saul with Ramah of Benjamin.

(c.) It is usually assumed that the city in which Saul was anointed by Samuel (¹1 Samuel 9:10) was Samuel’s own city, Ramah. Josephus certainly (*Ant.* 6:4, 1) does give the name of the city as Armathem, and, in his version of the occurrence, implies that the prophet was at the time in his own house; but neither the Hebrew nor the Sept. contains any statement which confirms this, if we except the slender fact that the “land of Zuph” (¹1 Samuel 9:5) may be connected with the Zophim of Ramathaim-zophim. Robinson admits that the answer of the maidens (¹1 Samuel 9:11, 12) would, perhaps, rather imply that Samuel had just arrived, possibly on one of his yearly circuits in which he judged Israel in various cities” (*Bib. Res.* ii, 10). It cannot be questioned, indeed, that, apart from all theories, the whole course of the narrative leaves the impression that Samuel was in his own house in Ramah when Saul visited him. He was there when the Lord informed him, apparently on the preceding day (comp. ¹1 Samuel 8:4, 22; 9:15, 16), of his intention to appoint a king. The words of Saul’s servant, too, convey the same impression: “When they were come to the land of Zuph, Saul said, Let us return;” but the servant said, “Behold now, there is *in this city* a man of God... let us go thither” (¹1 Samuel 9:5, 6). This would scarcely apply to a place in which Samuel was but a casual visitor. But, on the other hand, the place of the interview could not have been within the tribe of Benjamin, because [1] the Lord, in foretelling to Samuel the coming of Saul, said, “To-morrow, about this time, I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin” (¹1 Samuel 9:16); and [2] Saul, when in search of the asses, “passed through Mount Ephraim, and passed through the land of Shalisha; then through the land of Shalim; and he passed through the land of the Benjamites” (ver. 6). Then they came “to the land of Zuph.” The land of Zuph was consequently south of Benjamin. So, in returning home (apparently to Gibeah) from the place of the interview, Saul’s way led past Rachel’s tomb, the site of which is well known, near Bethlehem. It follows, from the minute specification of Saul’s route in ¹1 Samuel 10:2, that the city in which the interview took place was near the sepulchre of Rachel, which, by ¹Genesis 35:16, 19, and other reasons, appears to be fixed with certainty as close to Bethlehem. This supplies a strong argument against its being Ramathaim-zophim, since, while Mount Ephraim, as we have endeavored already to show,

extended to within a few miles north of Jerusalem, there is nothing to warrant the supposition that it ever reached so far south as the neighborhood of Bethlehem. Saul's route will be most conveniently discussed under the head of SAUL; but the question of both his outward and his homeward journey, minutely as they are detailed, is beset with difficulties, which have been increased by the assumptions of the commentators. For instance, it is usually taken for granted that his father's house-and therefore the starting-point of his wanderings was Gibeah. True, Saul himself, after he was king, lived at Gibeah; but the residence of Kish would appear to have been at Zela, where his family sepulchre was (^{<Q114>}2 Samuel 21:14); and of Zela no trace has yet been found. The A. V. has added to the difficulty by introducing the word "meet" in 10:3 as the translation of the term which is more accurately rendered "find" in the preceding verse. Again, where was the "hill of God," the *gibath-Eloim*, with the *netsib* of the Philistines? A *netsib* of the Philistines is mentioned later in Saul's history (^{<Q115>}1 Samuel 13:3) as at Geba, opposite Michmash; but this is three miles north of Gibeah of Saul, and does not at all agree with a situation near Bethlehem for the anointing of Saul. The Targum interprets the "hill of God" "as the place where the ark of God was," meaning Kirjath-jearim. There is no necessity whatever for supposing that Samuel was at Ramah when he anointed Saul. The name of the place where Samuel was at the time is not given in the sacred narrative, the language of which rather implies that it was not his regular abode; for it says that he had come that day into the city to attend a sacrifice or a feast of the people (^{<Q116>}1 Samuel 9:11, 12). The city was most probably Bethlehem, with the inhabitants of which Samuel was connected, being a descendant of Zuph, an Ephrathite, and was likely to have been invited to their feast; and the land of Zuph, into which Saul had come, must have been the region of Bethlehem. That Samuel was in the habit of visiting Bethlehem for the purpose of sacrificing is certain from ^{<Q117>}1 Samuel 16:1-5 (comp. 20:29). We may therefore conclude that he had come at this time thither from Ramah of Benjamin.

On the whole, Ramathaim-zophim is as likely to have been the Ramah of Benjamin as any other.

Ra'mathem

(Ὶ Ραμαθέμ v. r. Ὶ Ραθαμείν; Josephus, Ὶ Ραμαθά [Ant. 13:4, 9]; Vulg. *Ramathan*), one of the three "governments" (νομοί and τοπαρχίαι (*lt*))

which were added to Judtea by king Demetrius Nicator out of the country of Samaria (1 Macc. 11:34); the others were Aphmerema and Lydda. It no doubt derived its name from a town of the name of Ramathaim, probably that renowned as the birthplace of Samuel the prophet. — Smith.

Ra' mathite

(Heb. *Ramathi'*, *ytæ*; *al inhubit(nt of Ramab*; Sept. ὁ Ραμαθαῖος), all epithet of the Shimei (q.v.) who was over the vineyards of king David (^{<1377>}1 Chronicles 27:27). The name implies that he was native of a place called Ramah, but of the various Ramahs mentioned none is said to have been remarkable for vines; nor is there any tradition or other clue by which the particular Ramahi to which this worthy belonged can be identified. *SEE RAMAH.*

Ra' math-le'hi

(Heb. *tRamath' Lechi'*, *yj bæ tmr*; *craggy height* [see below]; Sept. Ἀνάρσεις σιαγόνοϋ; Vulg. *Ramathlechi, quod intienp etatur elevatio maxilloe*). The origin of this name, which occurs only in ^{<17157>}Judges 15:17, forms one of the most romantic episodes in Scripture history. Samson, having been bound with two new cords, was given up to the Philistines at a place called *Lehi*, a name which signifies “jawbone.” When the enemy attacked him, he burst his bonds, seized the jawbone (*lehi*) of an ass that lay upon the ground, and with this odd weapon slew a thousand of them. Then he threw away the jawbone, and, as a memorial of the event, and by a characteristic play upon the old name, he called the place *Ramath-lehi* that is, the lifting (or wielding?) of the jawbone; and so it is interpreted in the Vulgate and in the Sept. *SEE SAMSON.* But Gesenius has pointed out (*Thesaur.* p. 752 *a*) that to be consistent with this the vowel-points should be altered, and the words become *yj bæ tmr* and that as they at present stand they are exactly parallel to Ramath-mizpeh and Ramath-negeb, and mean the “height of Lechi.” If we met with a similar account in ordinary history, we should say that the name had already been Ramath-lehi, and that the writer of the narrative, with that fondness for paronomasia which distinguishes these ancient records, had indulged himself in connecting the name with a possible exclamation of his hero. But the fact of the positive statement in this case may make us hesitate in coming to such a conclusion in less authoritative records. For the topography of the place, *SEE LEHI.*

Ra'math - miz'peh

(Heb. *Ramath' ham- Aitspeh'*, *hPχMæ tmiṛ*; *high-place of the watch-tower*; Sept. Ἀραβὼθ κατὰ τὴν Μασσηφά, v. r. Ῥαμῶθ κατὰ τὴν Μασφά; Vulg. *Ramath Masphe*). In defining the boundaries of the tribe of Gad, Joshua states that Moses gave them inheritance... : “from Heshbon unto Ramath-mizpeh, and Betonim” (^{<6135>}Joshua 13:26). This place is nowhere else mentioned; and it appears to have constituted one of the landmarks on the northern border of the tribe, which ran from the banks of the Jabbok, in the parallel of Jerash, to the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. It was in this region Jacob and Laban had their remarkable interview and entered into the covenant. The place where they vowed to each other was marked by a heap of stones, and called both *Galeed* and *Mizpah* (^{<6148>}Genesis 31:48, 49). This would seem to suggest the identity of the Mizpah of Jacob and Ramath-Mizpeh. *SEE GAD; SEE JEGAR-SAHADUTHA*. There was a Mizpeh in Gilead, on the north-east border of Gad, and close to the territory of the Ammonites. In later times the latter became the great gatheringplace of Israel east of the Jordan. *SEE RAMOTH-GILEAD*. It apparently was the same as Ramath-mizpeh. In the books of Maccabees it probably appears in the garb of *Masphal* (1 Maccabees 5:35), but no information is afforded us in either Old Test. or Apocrypha as to its position. The lists of places in the districts north of es-Salt, collected by Dr. Eli Smith, and given by Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 1st ed. App. to vol. iii), contain several names which may retain a trace of Ramath, viz. *Ruṭmeimin* (167 b), *Reimunzzu* (166 at), *Rumrud 7 a* (165 t); but the situation of these places is not accurately known.

Ra'math-ne'geb

or RAMATH OF THE SOUTH (Heb. *Ramath' Ne'geb*, *bgn, tmiṛ*; Sept. Βαμὲθ κατὰ λίβα, v. r. Ἰαμὲθ κατὰ λίβα; Vulg. *Ranath contra australem plagam*), a place apparently on the extreme southern border of Simeon. In this form it is only mentioned in ^{<6108>}Joshua 19:8; and, from the peculiarity of the construction, there being no copulative, it would seem to be only another name for BAALATH-BEER, as suggested by Reland (*Palaest.* p. 964), and interpreted by Keil (ad loc.); yet the Sept. makes the places distinct. Be this as it may, Negeb is manifestly the name of a district, and not a general term, signifying “south.” *SEE NEGEB*. Ramah is not mentioned in the list of Judah (comp. ^{<6152>}Joshua 15:21-32), nor in that of

Simeon in ~~1~~1 Chronicles 4:28-33; nor is it mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 342) takes it as identical with Ramath-lehi, which he finds at Tell el-Lekiyeh; but this appears to be so far south as to be out of the circle of Samson's adventures, and, at any rate, must wait for further evidence.

In ~~1~~1 Samuel 30:27, SOUTH RAMOTH (בגנאֲתוֹס; in the plural; Sept. Ῥαμὰ νότου, v. r. Ῥαμὰθ νότου Vulg. *Ramuoth ad nzeridien*) is mentioned as one of the cities to which David sent portions of the spoils of the Amalekites. Doubtless, it is the same place called by Joshua Ramath-negeb. The name should be written *Ramoth-negeb*. The site is unknown, and the region where it stood is, in a great measure, unexplored.

Ramayana

is the name of one of the two great epic poems of ancient India (for the other, *SEE MAHA-BHARATA*). Its subject-matter is the history of Rama, one of the incarnations of Vishnu (q.v., and *SEE RAMA*), and its reputed author is Valmiki, who is said to have taught his poem to the two sons of Rama, the hero of the history; and, according to this legend, would have been a contemporary of Rama himself. But though this latter account is open to much doubt, it seems certain that Valmiki — unlike Vyassa (q.v.), the supposed compiler of the *Mahabharata* — was a real personage; and, moreover, that the *Ramayana* was the work of one single poet-not like the *Mahabharata*, the creation of various epochs and different minds. As a poetical composition, the *Ramayana* is therefore far superior to the *Mahabharata*; and it may be called the best great poem of ancient India, fairly claiming a rank in the literature of the world equal to that of the epic poetry of Homer. Whereas the character of the *Mahabharata* is cyclopoetical, its main subject-matter overgrown by episodes of the most diversified nature, its diction differing in merit, both from a poetical and grammatical point of view, according to the ages that worked at its completion — the *Ramayana* has but one object in view, the history of Rama. Its episodes are rare, and restricted to the early portion of the work, and its poetical diction betrays throughout the same finish and the same poetical genius. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the relative ages of both poems, provided that we look upon the *Mahabharata* in the form in which it is preserved as a whole. Whether we apply as a test the aspect of the religious life, or the geographical and other knowledge displayed in the one and the other work, the *Ramayana* appears as the

older of the two. Since it is the chief source whence our information of the Rama incarnation of Vishnu is derived, its contents may be gathered from that portion of the article VISHNU *SEE VISHNU* which relates to *Ramachandra*. The *Ramayana* contains (professedly) 24,000 epic verses, or *slokats*, in seven books, or *kandas*, called the *Bdla-Ay-odlhya-*, *Aranyac-*, *Kishkindhad-*, *Sundara-*, *Yuddha-* (or *Lankca-*), and *Uttara-kanda*. The text which has come down to us exhibits, in different sets of manuscripts, such considerable discrepancies that it becomes necessary to speak of two recensions in which it now exists. This remarkable fact was first made known by A. W. von Schlegel, who, in Europe, was the first to attempt a critical edition of this poem; it is now fully corroborated by a comparison that may be made between the printed editions of both texts. The one is more concise in its diction, and has less tendency than the other to that kind of descriptive enlargement of facts and sentiments which characterizes the later poetry of India; it often also exhibits grammatical forms and peculiarities of an archaic stamp, where the other studiously avoids that which must have appeared to its editors in the light of a grammatical difficulty. In short, there can be little doubt that the former is the older and more genuine, and the latter the more recent, and in some respects more spurious, text. A complete edition of the older text, with two commentaries, was published at Madras in 1856 (in the Telugu characters, vol. i-iii); another edition of the same text, with a short commentary, appeared at Calcutta in two volumes (1860), and a more careful and elegant one at Bombay (1861). Of the later edition, Gaspare Gorresio has edited the first six books (vol. i-v, Paris, 1843-50) without a commentary, but with an Italian, somewhat free, translation in poetical prose (vol. i-x, Paris, 1847-58). Former attempts at an edition and translation of the *Ramayana* remained unfortunately incomplete. The earliest was that made by William Carey and Joshua Marshman, who edited the first two books, and added to the text a prose translation in English and explanatory notes (vol. i-iii, Serampore, 1806-10; and vol. i, containing the first book, Dunstable, 1808). Another edition, of an eclectic nature, is that by A. W. von Schlegel; it contains the first two books of the text, and an excellent Latin translation of the first book and twenty chapters of the second (vol. i, pts. i and ii, and vol. ii, pt. i, Bonn, 1846). Various episodes from the *Ramayana*, it may also be added, have at various times occupied sundry editors and translators.

Rambach, August Jakob

was born May 28, 1777, at Quedlinburg. Having completed his studies at Halle, he was appointed on May 2, 1802, deacon of St. Peter's at Hamburg. On Dec. 20, 1818, he succeeded his father as pastor of St. Michael's. In the year 1827 the Marburg University honored him with the degree of doctor of divinity, and in 1834 he was made senior of the ministry at Hamburg. In 1846 bodily infirmities obliged him to resign the pastorate, and he retired to his country-seat in Ottensen, where he died Sept. 7, 1851. His main study was that of hymnology, and his library contained 2200 volumes on that subject. He wrote, *Supplenzete zu Richter's biogr. Lexicon geistl. Liederndichter* (Hamburg, 1804): — *Luther's Verdienst um den Kirchengesang* (ibid. 1813). But his greatest work is *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus der alten und mittleren Zeit* (Altona, 1816-33. 6 vols.); a very valuable collection of Greek, Latin, and German hymns. Comp. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, 7:36, 70; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1026; Petersen, *In Memoriam A. J. Rambachii*, etc. (Hamburg, 1856). (B. P.)

Rambach, Johann Jakob

was born at Halle Feb. 24, 1693, and died April 19, 1735, at Giessen, where he was professor of theology and first superintendent. During his comparatively short life he devoted himself to sacred studies, and produced some valuable works. Besides assisting Michaelis in the preparation of his Hebrew Bible, and of his *Adnotationes Uberiores in Hagiographa*, he was the author of *Institutiones Hermeneuticoe Sacrae*, of which the eighth edition appeared in 1764: — *Exercitationes Hermen.*, sive *p. Institute Hermen.* (Jena, 1728; 2d ed. 1741): — *Comment. Hermen. de Sensus Mystici Criteriis* (ibid. 1728, 1731). His other works are dogmatical and polemical.

Rambarn

SEE MAIMONIDES.

Ramban

SEE NACHMIANIDES.

Rambour, Abraham

a French Protestant theologian, was born at Sedan, the seat of French evangelical Christianity, about 1590, studied at the academy in that place, and closed his career there by his thesis *De Potestate Ecclesice* (1608, 8vo). After ordination, he became pastor of the parish of Francheval. In 1616 he was called to Sedan, and preached there until 1620, when he was made a professor in his alma mater. He held the chair of theology and Hebrew, and so greatly distinguished himself that he was four times honored with the rectorate of that excellent Protestant seminary of divinity. He died in 1651, and left his colleagues to mourn the loss of a great and good man. All his writings give proof of profound scholarship, and a more than usual mastery of ancient Bible lore. He was an excellent polemic, and what he wrote as such the Romanists always found unanswerable. We note here, of his writings of this character, *De Clahisto Redemptore* (Sedan, 1620, 4to), and *Tracite l'Adoration des Images* (ibid. 1635, 8vo). His sixty-one theses on different Biblical subjects have been inserted in the *Thesaurus Theologicæ Sedanensis*, vol. ii. See Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. Hoefe, . *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rameau, Jean-Philippe

a very celebrated French musician who cultivated sacred music and was a noted organist, was a native of Dijon. He was born in 1683. His father was also a musician, and was, at the time of Jean-Philippe's birth, organist in the Sainte-Chapelle of Dijon. He was an enthusiast in his love for music, and taught his children the classical works long before they knew their letters. After travelling for some time creating everywhere great sensation by his wonderful musical genius, Jean-Philippe settled as organist of the cathedral at Clermont, in Auvergne. In middle life he removed to Paris, and became organist; of Sainte-Croix de la Bretonnerie. In 1722 he published his *Traite de l' Harmonize*, which laid the basis of his future renown. He died in 1764. His compositions were mostly of a secular character. One of his operas, *Samson*, was never permitted to be put on the stage, because, as it was argued, it prostituted sacred music. Voltaire and D'Alembert were personal friends and warm admirers of Rameau. See Hoef, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ramenghi, Bartolomeo

an Italian artist of note, usually called *Il Bagnacavallo*, from the place of his birth (Bagnacavallo, on the road from Ravenna to Lugo), which took place in 1484, was a pupil of Raphael, and one of his principal assistants in the Vatican, and, after the death of his great master, carried the principles of his style to Bologna, and assisted to enlarge the character of that school. Raphael was his model and test of excellence, and he did not attempt to look beyond him. 'Though possessing less vigor than Giulio Romano or Perino del Vaga, Bagnacavallo acquired more of the peculiar grace of Raphael's style, especially in his infants, and his works were much studied by the great scholars of the Caracci. There are, or rather were, works by Bagnacavallo in the churches of San Michele in Bosco, San Martino, Santa Maria Maggiore, and Saut' Agostino agli Scopettini in Bologna. He died at Bologna in 1542. See Lanzi, *Lives of Painters; English Cyclop.* s.v.; Spooner, *Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Ram'es

(Heb. *Rameses*', **ssm̄l̄r̄**; Sept. Ῥαμεσοῦ v. r. Ῥαμεσοῦς), or Raam'ses (Heb. *Raamses*', **ssm̄l̄r̄**; only in ^{<0011>}Exodus 1:11; Sept. Ῥαμεσοῦ), the name of a city (^{<0011>}Exodus 1:11; 12:37; ^{<0033>}Numbers 33:3, 5) and district (^{<0471>}Genesis 47:11) in Lower Egypt. There can be no reasonable doubt that the same city is designated by the Rameses and Raamses of the Hebrew text, and that this was the chief place of the land of Rameses, all the passages referring to the same region. The name is Egyptian, the same as that of several kings of the empire, of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties. In Egyptian it is written *Rameses* or *Ramses*, it being doubtful whether the short vowel understood occurs twice or once: the first vowel is represented by a sign which usually corresponds to the Hebrew in Egyptian transcriptions of Hebrew names, and Hebrew of Egyptian. The name means *Son of the Sun*, such titles being common with the ancient kings of Egypt, one of whom was probably the founder of the city. **SEE EGYPT.**

The first mention of Rameses is in the narrative of the settling by Joseph of his father and brethren int. Egypt, where it is related that a possession was *given* them "in the land of Rameses" (^{<0471>}Genesis 47:11). This land of Rameses (**ssm̄l̄r̄/ra**) either corresponds to the land of Goshen, or was a district of it, more probably the former, as appears from a comparison of

a par-allel passage (ver. 6). The name next occurs as that of one of the two cities built for the Pharaoh who first oppressed the children of Israel. “And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities ($\tau\omega\beta\epsilon\iota\eta\alpha\rho\epsilon$), Pithom and Ramses” (⁽⁻⁰⁰¹¹⁾Exodus 1:11). So in the A.V. The Sept, however, reads $\acute{\rho}\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\omicron}\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, and the Vulg. *turbes tabernaculorum*, as if the root had been $\acute{\kappa}\iota\upsilon$; The signification of the word $\tau\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ decided by its use for storehouses of corn, wine, and oil, which Hezekiah had (⁽⁻¹⁴⁰²⁸⁾2 Chronicles 32:28). We should therefore here read store-cities, which may have been the meaning of our translators. The name of Pithom indicates the region near Heliopolis, and therefore the neighborhood of Goshen, or that tract itself; and there can therefore be no doubt that Raamses is “Rameses in the land of Goshen. “In the narrative of the Exode we read of Rameses at the starting-point of the journey (⁽⁻⁰²²³⁷⁾Exodus 12:37; see also ⁽⁻⁰³³³⁾Numbers 33:3, 5). *SEE GOSHEN*.

If, then, we suppose Rameses or Ramses to have been the chief town of the land of Rameses, either Goshen itself or a district of it, we have to endeavor to determine its situation. Lepsius supposes that *Abu-Kesheid* is on the site of Rameses. His reasons are that: in the Sept. Heroopolis is placed in the land of Rameses ($\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}$ $\text{Ἡρώων πόλιν, ἐν γῆ Ῥαμεσσή, or εἰς γῆν Ῥαμεσσή}$), in a passage where the Hebrew only mentions “the land of Goshen” (⁽⁻⁰⁴⁵³⁾Genesis 46:28), and that there is a monolithic group at Abu-Kesheid representing Tum and Ra, and between them Rameses II, who was probably there worshipped. There would seem, therefore, to be an indication of the situation of the district and city from this mention of Heroipolis, and the statue of Rameses might mark a place named after that king. It must, however, be remembered

(a) that the situation of Heroopolis is a matter of great doubt, and that therefore we can scarcely take any proposed situation as an indication of that of Rameses;

(b) that the land of Rameses may be that of Goshen, as already remarked, in which case the passage would not afford any more precise indication of the position of the city Rameses than that it was in Goshen, as is evident from the account of the Exodus; and

(c) that the mention of Heroipolis in the Sept. would seem to be a gloss. It is also necessary to consider the evidence in the Biblical narrative of the position of Rameses, which seems to point to the western part of the land

of Goshen, since two full marches, and part at least of a third, brolught the Israelites from this town to the Red Sea; and the narrative appears to indicate a route for the chief part directly towards the sea. After the second day's journey they "encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness" (⁽¹²³⁰⁾Exodus 13:20), and on the third day they appear to have turned. If, however, Rameses was where Lepsius places it, the route would have been almost wholly through the wilderness, and mainly along the tract bordering the Red Sea in a southerly direction, so that they would have turned almost at once. Even could it be proved that it was anciently called Rameses, the case would not be made out, for there is good reason to suppose that many cities in Egypt bore this name. Apart from the ancient evidence, we may mention that there is now a place called "Remsees" or "Ramsecs" in the Boheireh (the great province on the west of the Rosetta branch of the Nile), mentioned in the list of towns and villages of Egypt in De Sacy's *Abd-allatif*; p. 664. It gave to its district the name of "Hof-Remsees" or "Ramsees." This "Hof" must not be confounded with the "Hof" commonly known, which was in the district of Belbeis. — Smith. Of the old translators, only Saadias and Pseudo-Jonathan point out a place for Rameses; the rest all preserve the name from the Hebrew (comp. Arab. of Erpen, *On* ⁽¹⁰¹¹⁾*Exodus* 1:11). Saadias gives *Heliopolis*; Jonathan, *Pelusiom*. The latter is certainly wrong; the former is supported by Jablonski (*Opusc.* ii, 136), on the ground of a Coptic etymology. But Heliopolis, which Tischendorf also (*Reis.* i, 175, and *Dissert. cde Isr. per Matre Rub. Trans.* p. 15 sq.) makes to be Raamses, is elsewhere always called On (q.v.), and is expressly distinguished from Rameses by the Sept. (⁽¹⁰¹¹⁾Exodus 1:11; here the Cod. Mediolan. reads indeed ἡ καὶ Ὠν, but this amounts to nothing against the Hebrew text). Others (as Hengstenberg, *Moses*, p. 48 sq.; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 52 sq.; Forbiger, *Handb.* ii, 784) understand *Heroopolis* (comp. Sept. at ⁽¹⁴⁴⁸⁾Genesis 46:28; where, however, the region of Raamses is spoken of, as above, and it is only asserted that Heroopolis lay in this district). To the same purpose is the view of Clericus, Lakemacher (*Observ. Philol.* 6:321 sq.), and Muller (*Satur. Observ. Philol.* p. 189) that Rameses is *Avaris* (Gr. *Avaplt*, "*Ataplt*"), in the Saitic (or, according to Bernard's plausible emendation, the Sethrotic) district (Ptolemy, 4:5, 53), a place fortified by Salatis, the king of the Hyksos (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 14, 26; comp. Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 2261). For *Avaris* (according to Manetho, in Josephus, *Apion*, i, 26) is the city of Typhon, and this is probably Heroopolis itself (comp. Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* iii, 261; Ewald, ii, 53) — Winer. The location of Rameses is doubtless indicated by

the present *Tell Ramsis*, a quadrangular mound near Belbeis. *SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.*

An argument for determining under what dynasty the Exode happened has been founded on the name Rameses, which has been supposed to indicate a royal buidél. *SEE PHARAOH.* We need only say that the highest date to which Rameses I can be reasonably assigned (B.C. 1302) is inconsistent with the true date of the Exode (B.C. 1658), although we find a prince of the same name two centuries earlier, so that the place might have taken its name either from this prince, or a yet earlier king or prince Rameses. That the last supposition is the true one seems to be established by the occurrence of the name in ^{<1471>}Genesis 47:11, as early as the time of Joseph (B.C. 1874). *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

Rames'se

(Ῥαμεσση), the Greek form (Judith 1:9) of the name of the land of RAMESES *SEE RAMESES* (q.v.).

Rami'ah

(Heb. *Ramyah'*, *hymḥi*, *fixed of Jehovah* Sept. Ῥαμία), an Israelite of the sons of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife under the influence of Ezra (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25). B.C. 458.

Ramirez, Francisco

a Roman Catholic prelate of Mexico, was born in the city of Mexico in 1823. He early decided upon the priesthood, and was educated at home and in Europe, where he became a great favorite with many distinguished ecclesiastics, and therefore enjoyed rapid promotion in office. After holding various positions of responsibility, he became identified with the opposition against Juarez in politics, and prepared the way for the imperial rule under Maximilian. He was then bishop of Caradro. When the empire had been established, Ramirez became the emperor's almoner, and subsequently cabinet councillor. He was also made vicar apostolic of Tamaulipas, Mexico. With the downfall of Maximilian, Ramirez's stay in Mexico became an impossibility. He escaped to Texas, and lived in obscurity and want at Brazos Santiago until July 18, 1869.

Ramists

the followers of Peter Ramus, a French logician in the 16th century, who distinguished himself by his opposition to the philosophy of Aristotle. From the high estimation in which the Stagyrte was at that time held, it was accounted a heinous crime to controvert his opinions; and Ramus, accordingly, was tried and condemned as being guilty of subverting sound morality and religion. The sole ground of his offence was that he had framed a system of logic at variance with that of Aristotle. "The attack which Ramus made," says the elder M'Crie, in his *Life of Melville*, "on the Peripatetic philosophy was direct, avowed, powerful, persevering, and irresistible. He possessed an acute mind, acquaintance with ancient learning, an ardent love of truth, and invincible courage in maintaining it. He had applied himself with avidity to the study of the logic of Aristotle; and the result as a conviction that it was an instrument utterly unfit for discovering truth in any of the sciences, and answering no other purpose than that of scholastic wrangling and digladiation. His conviction he communicated to the public; and, in spite of all the resistance made by ignorance and prejudice, he succeeded in bringing over a great part of the learned world to his views. What Luther was in the Church, Ramus was in the schools. He overthrew the infallibility of the Stagyrte, and proclaimed the right of mankind to think for themselves in matters of philosophy — a right which he maintained with the most undaunted fortitude, and which he sealed with his blood. If Ramus had not shaken the authority of the long-venerated *Organon* of Aristotle, the world might not have seen the *Novum Organum* of Bacon. The faults of the Ramean system of dialectics have long been acknowledged. It proceeded upon the radical principles of the logic of Aristotle; its distinctions often turned more upon words than things; and the artificial method and uniform partitions which it prescribed in treating every subject were unnatural, and calculated to fetter, instead of forwarding, the mind in the discovery of truth. But it discarded many of the useless speculations and much of the unmeaning jargon respecting predicables, predicaments, and topics which made so great a figure in the ancient logic. It inculcated upon its disciples the necessity of accuracy and order in arranging their own ideas and in analyzing those of others. And as it advanced no claim to infallibility, submitted all its rules to the test of practical usefulness, and set the only legitimate end of the whole logical apparatus constantly before the eye of the student, its faults were soon

discovered, and yielded readily to a more improved method of reasoning and investigation.”

After the death of Ramus his logic found very extensive favor and acceptance in various countries of Europe. He defined logic to be “ars bene disserendi,” and like Cicero considered rhetoric an essential branch of it. It was introduced by Melancthon into Germany; it had supporters also in Italy; and even in France itself, where the logic of the Stagyrite was held in veneration, the Ramean system was largely favored. Andrew Melville taught the doctrines of Ramus at Glasgow, and his work on logic passed through various editions in England before 1600. The same system was also known at this time in Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark. The most noteworthy Ramists were, among others, Andomar Talaeus (Talon) and his two disciples, Thomasius Frigius, of Fribourg, and Franciscus Fabricius; Fr. Benchus, Wilh. Ad. Scribonius, and Gaspar Pfaffrad. There was also a class of eclectics who tried to unite the method of Ramus with the Aristotelian logic of Melancthon. Among these, most noteworthy is Rudolph Goclenius, who was of service to psychology, and whose pupil, Otto Cassman, prosecuted his researches into psychological anthropology. To these may be added the poet John Milton. See Waddington, *Ramus* (Paris, 1855, 8vo), where a catalogue of Ramist works is given; Desmaze, *Ramus* (1864); and Cantor, in Gelzer’s *Protest. Monatsblätter*, Aug. 2, 1867.

Rammohun Roy

a celebrated Hindu convert to Western civilization and a liberal Christianity, is noted especially as the founder of a theistic school of thought among the Hindus, and in a certain sense may be pronounced the forerunner of Sen. Rammohun Roy was born about 1774 at Bordnan, in the province of Bengal, of Brahminic parentage of high caste. Reared like other youths of India, he enjoyed his elementary training at home, and was then placed under the care of the great masters of the Vedas and the Shastras, and, both at Patna and afterwards at Benares, acquired great proficiency in the sacred writings of Hinduism. His familiarity with the Arabic, Persian, and Sanscrit languages led him to an examination of the religious doctrines of the various sects of India, and finally to those of the West. He had evinced a sceptical turn of mind while yet a youth; and, once led away into these inquiries, he was soon forced to abandon the ground of his ancestry. But instead of accepting the inspired religion of the Christians,

he sought the engrafting of its ethics upon the old faith of India, and the restoration of Hinduism in its ancient purity, as the first step to this accomplishment. His parents unyieldingly opposed his purpose. His father sent him away and disinherited him. His mother conceded the superstitious basis of her faith, but pleaded for its observance on the ground of duty towards her people and race. "You are right," she said to him, when she was about to set out on a pilgrimage to Juggernaut; "but I am a woman, and cannot give up observances which are a comfort to me." A wanderer from home, he spent two or three years in Thibet, where he excited general anger by denying that the Lama (q.v.) was the creator and preserver of the world. He was finally recalled by his father and restored to paternal favor. But in a short time, as he tells us himself, "my continued controversies with the Brahmins on the subject of their idolatry and superstition, and my interference with their custom of burning widows, and other pernicious practices, revived and increased their animosity against me; and, through their influence with my family, my father was again obliged to withdraw his countenance openly, though his limited pecuniary support was still continued to me." His father died in 1803, and he then published various books and pamphlets against the errors of the Brahmins, in the native and foreign languages. He says: "The ground which I took in all my controversies was, not that of opposition to Brahminism, but to a perversion of it; and I endeavored to show that the idolatry of the Brahmins was contrary to the practice of their ancestors and to the principles of the ancient books and authorities which they professed to revere and obey." In order to deprive him of caste, the Brahmins commenced a suit against him, which, after many years of litigation, was decided in his favor. Of the body of Hindu theology comprised in the Vedas there is an ancient extract called the *Vedant*, or the Resolution of all the Veds, written in Sanscrit. Rammohun Roy translated it into Bengalee and Hindostanee, and afterwards published an abridgment of it for gratuitous circulation; of this abridgment he published an English translation in 1816. He afterwards published some of the principal chapters of the Vedas in Bengalee and English. He was at different times the proprietor or publisher of newspapers in the native languages, in which he expressed his opinion freely against abuses, political as well as religious, especially the burning of widows. He was also, in conjunction with other liberal Hindius, proprietor of the *Bengal Herald*, an English newspaper. His intimate association with the English, and the constant interchange with European thought and familiarity with the West generally, led him at

last to abandon the old ground entirely, and he brought before his countrymen the excellence of the moral theories of Christianity in 1820 in a work which he entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*. It was written in English, Sanscrit, and Bengalee, and consists, besides selections from the New Test., of such commentaries as a Hindu apostate who abandoned heathenism for bald theism would be likely to produce. The divinity of Christ is ignored, the miracles are rejected, and many other portions of the Gospel held to be fundamental in orthodox Christianity; and the simple morality of Jesus is held up as “a guide to happiness and peace.” The position taken in this work not only encountered the opposition of his abandoned friends; his new associates also felt grieved and disappointed, and, in the first hour of disappointment, severely rebuked his false theology. He was replied to, and a controversy opened on the great question of the Trinity. His *Appeal*, published not under his own name, but as coming from a “friend of truth,” and, later, his treatise on the unity of God, entitled *One Supreme Being*, greatly modified his first position, and showed that he took, at least, the advanced ground of a Unitarian of the Old School, and recognised in Jesus Christ the “Son of God, by whom God made the world and all things.” In April, 1831, Rammohun Roy visited England, and he associated generally with the Unitarians, whose chapels he visited as a worshipper. He also took great interest in the political questions of the day. The great question of parliamentary reform was then agitating the country. Of the Reform Bill he wrote that it “would, in its consequences, promote the welfare of England and her dependencies — nay, of the whole world.” His society was universally courted in England. He was oppressed with invitations to attend social parties and political and ecclesiastical meetings. His anxiety to see everything and to please all led him to overtask himself to such an extent that his health, long failing, at last broke down. He died at Bristol, Sept. 27, 1833. The adverse circumstances of his birth were such as might easily have enslaved even his powerful understanding, or, still more easily, might have perverted it to selfish ends; but he won his high position by an inflexible honesty of purpose and energy of will, and had he lived he might have become an important factor in the propagation of Christianity in the East. See sketch of his life, written by himself, in the *Athenaeum*, No. 310, Oct. 5, 1833; *Chambers’s Edinburgh Journal*, Aug. 2, 1834; Carpenter, *Review of Labors, Opinions, and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy*; Pauthier, in the *Revue Encyclopedique*, 1833; *Asiatic Journal*, vol. xii; *Theol. Eclectic*, June, 1869; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Rammok

SEE DROMEDARY.

Ramoth

SEE CORAL.

Ra'moth

(Heb. *Ramoth'*, **רָמוֹת**; [but **רָמוֹת**; in ^{<6048>}Deuteronomy 4:43; ^{<6018>}Joshua 20:8; ^{<1363>}1 Chronicles 6:73, 80], *heights*, plur. of Ramah [q.v.]; Sept. usually **Ραμώθ**), but **Ρημώθ** in ^{<1509>}Ezra 10:29, **Ραμμώθ** in ^{<4802>}2 Chronicles 18:2, 3, 5, etc.), the name of three towns in Palestine, and also of one man.

1. (Sept. **ῥ ῥαμώθ**.) One of the four Levitical cities of Issachar according to the catalogue in ^{<1363>}1 Chronicles 6:73. In the parallel list in ^{<6028>}Joshua 21:28, 29, among other variations, JARIMUTH SEE *JARIMUTH* (q.v.) appears in place of Ramoth. It seems impossible to decide which is the correct reading; or whether, again, REMETH SEE *REMETH* (q.v.), a town of Issachar, is distinct from them, or one and the same.

2. A city in the tribe of Gad (^{<6048>}Deuteronomy 4:43; ^{<6018>}Joshua 20:8; 21:38; ^{<1380>}1 Chronicles 6:80), elsewhere called RAMOTH-GILEAD SEE *RAMOTH-GILEAD* (q.v.).

3. (Sept. **ῥ ραμᾶ**.) A city in the tribe of Simeon (“South Ramoth,” ^{<0807>}1 Samuel 30:27). SEE *RAMATH-NEGEB*.

4. (Heb. text *Yirmoth'*, **רָמוֹת**; marg. *ve-Ramoth'*, **רָמוֹת** and *Ramoth*; Sept. **Ρημώθ** v. r. **Μημών**.) An Israelitish layman of the sons of Bani, who renounced his strange wife at Ezra's instigation (^{<1509>}Ezra 10:29). B.C. 458.

Ramoth-gilead

Picture for Ramoth-gilead

(Heb. *Ramoth' Gilad'*, **רָמוֹת גִּלְעָד**; Sept. **ῥεμμᾶθ**, **ῥεμμώθ**, and **ῥαμώθ Γαλαάδ**; *Ἐρεμαθαλααδ* v. r. **ῥαμμώθ**; Josephus, *Ἀραμαθά*; Vulg. *Ramoth Galaad*), the “heights of Gilead;” or RAMOTH IN GILEAD (**רָמוֹת גִּלְעָד**; Sept. **ῥ ῥαμώθ ἐν Γαλαάθ**, *Ἀρημώθ*, **ῥεμμᾶθ Γαλαάδ**, v. r. **ῥαμμώθ**, **ῥαμώθ**; Vulg. *Ramoth in Galaad*,

Deuteronomy 4:43; Joshua 20:8; 21:38 1 Kings 22:3 [in the A.V. only], also written *plen*, *twor*; in 2 Chronicles 22:5; and simply RAMAH, *hmr*; in 2 Kings 8:29, and 2 Chronicles 22:6), one of the chief cities of the tribe of Gad, on the east side of the Jordan. It was allotted to the Levites, and appointed a city of refuge (Deuteronomy 4:43; Joshua 20:8). The latter fact would seem to indicate that it occupied a central position in the tribe, and also probably in the country assigned to the Israelites east of the Jordan. Ramoth played for a time an important part in Israelitish history, and was the scene of many a hard struggle. It was apparently a strong fortress, and considered the key of the country. Hence, when taken by the Syrians, the kings of Israel and Judah regarded it as a national loss, affecting both kingdoms, and they combined to drive out the common enemy (1 Kings 22:4 sq.). The united attack was unsuccessful, and the king of Israel was mortally wounded in the battle (22:34-37). At a later period, apparently in the reign of Joram (2 Kings 9:14, 15; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 9:6, 1), Ramoth was taken from the Syrians and held, notwithstanding all the efforts of Hazael to regain it. Joram, having been wounded in the struggle, left his army under the command of Jehu, and returned to Jezreel to be healed (2 Kings 8:29). During his absence Jehu was anointed by order of Elisha (9:1, 2), and commissioned to execute vengeance on the wicked house of Ahab (ver. 7-10). Leaving Ramoth, Jehu drove direct to Jezreel. The king, expecting news from the seat of war, had watchmen set on the towers, who saw his chariot approaching (ver. 16, 17). The rest of the story is well known. **SEE AHAB; SEE JEHU.** After this incident Ramoth-gilead appears no more in Jewish history.

The exact position of Ramoth is nowhere defined in Scripture. The name (*Ramloth*, "heights") would seem to indicate that it occupied a commanding position on the summit of the range of Gilead. In 1 Kings 4:13, we read that when the districts of Solomon's purveyors were arranged, the son of Geber was stationed in Ramoth, and had charge of all the cities of Jair the son of Manasseh, both in Gilead and Bashan; and these cities extended over the whole north-eastern section of Palestine beyond Jordan. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the site of this ancient city. Some would identify it with *Jerash*, the old Roman *Gerasa*, whose ruins are the most magnificent and extensive east of the Jordan (see *Benjamin of Tudela*, by Asher); but this is too far north, and Jerash, besides, lies in a valley. Ewald would locate it at the village of *Reisen*

among the mountains, five miles west of Jerash (*Gesch. Isr.* 3:500). For this there is no evidence whatever. Others locate it on a site bearing the name of *Jel'ad*, exactly identical with the ancient Hebrew *Gilead*, which is mentioned by Seetzen (*Reisen*, March 11, 1806), and marked on his map (*ibid.* iv) and that of Van de Velde (1858) as four or five miles north of es-Salt. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 232 sq.) identifies this Ramoth with *Kullut el-Rabat*, which is situated on one of the highest points of the mountain of Gilead, not far from the Wady Rajib, and west of Ajlin. It is even now strongly fortified, and is visible at a great distance, especially to the northeast. The most probable opinion regarding the site of Ramoth is that which places it at the village of *es-Salt*. This is indicated

(a) by its position on the summit of a steep hill;

(b) by its old ecclesiastical name *Saltus Hiercaticus*, which appears to point to its original "sacerdotal" and "holy" character, Ramoth having been both a Levitical city and a "city of refuge" (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 213);

(c) by the fact that about two miles to the north-west of es-Salt is the highest peak of the mountain-range still bearing the name *Jebel Jilad*, "Mount Gilead;" and

(d) by the statement of Eusebius that Ramoth-gilead lay in the fifteenth mile from Philadelphia towards the west, and this is the exact distance of es-Salt from Rabbath-Ammon (*Onomast.* s.v. "Rammoth"). The situation of es-Salt is strong and picturesque. The hill on which it stands is separated by deep ravines from the loftier mountains that encompass it, and its lower slopes are covered with terraced vineyards, while the neighboring hill-sides and valleys abound with olive-groves. On the summit stands the castle, a rectangular building with towers at the corners, and defended by a deep moat hewn in the rock. The foundations appear to be Roman, if not earlier, but the upper walls are Saracenic. In the town itself, which contains some three thousand inhabitants, there are few remains of antiquity. In the cliffs and ravines beneath it are great numbers of tombs and grottos (*Handbook for Sinai and Palestine*, p. 308). Es-Salt is famous for its vineyards, and its raisins are esteemed the best in Palestine. They are carried in large quantities to Jerusalem (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 349; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 321; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* p. 1121-38; Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 92; Buckingham, *Travels*, p. 20). — Kitto. It is now the only inhabited place in the province of Belka. It is still a place of comparative strength, and overawes the Bedawin by a garrison under the pasha of Damascus.

Tristram says of it, “Ramoith-gilead must always have been the key of Gilead — at the head of the only easy road from the Jordan, opening immediately on the rich plateau of the interior, and with this isolated cone (the Osha) rising close above it, fortified from very early times, by art as well as by nature. Of the fortress only a tall fragment of wall remains, and a pointed archway, with a sort of large dial-plate, carved deeply in stone, surrounded by a rose-work decoration. It appears to be all modern Turkish work” (*Land of Israel*, p. 555). There is a plateau, he further tells us, on the road towards Jordan, and there probably the battle was fought where Ahab received his mortal wound—that being the only place where chariots could come into play.

Winer and others identify Ramoith-gilead, Ramath-mizpah, and Mizpah of Gilead. On this, *SEE MIZPAH; SEE RAMAH*.

Ramoith-negeb

SEE RAMATH-NEGEB.

Rampalle, Jeanne

a French female ascetic of note, was born Jan. 3, 1583, at Saint-Remy; displayed at an early age a tendency to a contemplative life; and when old enough to be admitted to a monastery, joined the Ursulines of Avignon, until, in 1602, she determined to found a home of her own, and established it on the rule of St. Augustine. She then took the name *Jeanne de Jesus*, provided the constitution and such religious books as she believed her companions to be in need of, e.g. *Retraite Spirituelle; Pratique de Devotion*, etc., also hymns and songs. She died July 6, 1636. See *Vie le la Mere Jeanne de Jesus* (Avignon, 1751, 12mo). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rampart

(*l yj echeyl*, ^{<2008>}Lamentations 2:8; ^{<3008>}Nahum 3:8; elsewhere “trench,” “bulwark,” etc.), a fortification or low wall surrounding and protecting a military trench (^{<1005>}2 Samuel 20:15; ^{<2301>}Isaiah 26:1, etc.; comp. ^{<1123>}1 Kings 21:23; ^{<1984>}Psalms 48:14). *SEE ARMY; SEE SIEGE*. In the Talmud the Hebrew word is applied to the interior space surrounding the wall of the Temple (Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 193). *SEE TEMPLE*.

Rampelogo (Or Rampeloco), Antonio

an Italian theologian, was born at Genoa and flourished in the second half of the 15th century. He was an Augustinian monk, and passed for a learned controversialist in his times. According to some modern ecclesiastical writers of Rome, Rampelogo was such an eloquent and persuasive disputant that he was called to the Council of Constance in order to convert the Hussites. He is the author of *Repertorium Biblicum*, which was put in the *Index* by pope Clement VIII, but which, nevertheless, has often been printed (Ulm, 1476, fol.; Nuremb. 1481; Milan, 1494, etc.). See Oudin. *De Script.* ^{<20RE>}*Ecclesiastes* 3:2310. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rampen, Henri

a Belgian divine, was born at Hui, Nov. 18, 1572. Studied successively at Colognes Mayence, and Louvain, and taught Greek and philosophy at the college in Lys. From 1620 to 1637 he taught exegesis of the Scriptures at the university, of which he was several times rector. He finally entered the practical work of the ministry, and secured a canonicate at Breda, but did not like this work, and returned to pedagogy as rector at St. Anne College. He died March 4, 1641. He published *Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelica* (Lond. 1631-34, 3 vols. 4to). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ramrayas

a sect of the Sikhs, deriving their appellation from Rama Raya, who flourished about A.D. 1660. They are by no means numerous in Hindostan. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Ram's Horn

(*l* *bé*, *yobel*', ^{<0004>}Joshua 6:4, 13; elsewhere "jubilee," "trumpet"). The Hebrew word *keren*, i.e. *horn*, is also used for the crooked trumpet, a very ancient instrument. Sometimes it was made of the horns of oxen, and sometimes ram's horns were employed. It is probable that in later times they were made of metal. They were employed in war, and on solemn occasions (^{<0013>}Exodus 19:13). The latter word is also rendered *cornet* (^{<20RE>}Daniel 3:5, 7, 10-15). *SEE JUBILEE*; *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*.

Rams' Skins

DYED RED (μυθᾶμ]μυλ ~~αετ~~φφ^{<1235>} Exodus 25:5; 35:7], ‘*oroth elim mne.oddacmin*; Sept. δερματα κριῶν ἠρυθροδανωμένα; Vulg. *pelles arietum rubricatce*) formed part of the materials that the Israelites were ordered to present as offerings for the making of the tabernacle (^{<1235>}Exodus 25:5), of which they served as the outer covering, there being under the rams' skins another covering of badgers' skins. **SEE TABERNACLE**. The words may be rendered “red rams' skins,” and then may be understood as the produce of the African audad. the *Ovis tragelaphus* of naturalists, whereof the bearded sheep are a domesticated race. The *tragelaphus* is a distinct species of sheep, having a shorter form than the common species, and incipient tear-pits. Its normal color is *red*, from bright chestnut to rufous chocolate, which last is the cause of the epithet *purple* being given to it by the poets. Dr. Harris thinks that the skins in question were tanned and colored crimson; for it is well known that what is now termed red morocco was manufactured in the remotest ages in Libya, especially about the Tritonian Lake, where the original aegis, or goat-skin breastplate of Jupiter and Minerva, was dyed bright red; and the Egyptians had most certainly red leather in use, for their antique paintings show harnessmakers cutting it into slips for the collars of horses and furniture of chariots. It is much more probable, however, that the skins were those of the domestic breed of rams, which, as Rashi says, “were dyed red after they were prepared.” **SEE RAM**.

Ramsauer, Otto Heinrich David

a hymnist of the Reformed Church, was born Nov. 19, 1829, at Oldenburg. Having made his preparatory studies at the gymnasium of his native place, he went, in 1848, to Zurich, in Switzerland. where the well-known Dr. J. P. Lange especially attracted him. While yet a student he wrote a collection of hymns, entitled *Der Frieide und die 'Freude der Kirche*, which were edited by his teacher in 1851. In 1852 he wa's appointed vicar to dean Frei in Trogen, in Switzerland, whom he also succeeded in the pastorate. Three years afterwards, May 27, 1856, he died in the vigor of life. Some of his hymns are very fine, but have not yet found a place in any of our modern German hymn-books. See Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7:384; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1027. (B. P.)

Ramsay, James P.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Aug. 26, 1809. He graduated from Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1827; prosecuted the study of theology under his venerated father, then sole professor in the Theological Seminary of the Associate Church; was licensed to preach Aug. 27, 1833, by the Presbytery of Chartiers, and was ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of Deer Creek, New Bedford, Lawrence Co., Pa., July 1, 1835, by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio. For about twentytwo years he continued faithfully testifying the Gospel of the grace of God among this people. But, his health failing, he subsequently located himself in New Wilmington, and for a time exercised his ministry there. He died Jan. 30, 1862. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 362. (J. L. S.)

Ramsdell, Hezekiah S.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Chatham, Conn., Dec. 4, 1804. When ten years old, the death of his father left him to support himself. At sixteen he was converted, and commenced preaching at nineteen. He joined the New England Conference in 1825, and his successive appointments were, Needham, Chelsea, Vt.; Craftsbury, Vt.; Irisburg, Vt.; Tolland, Conn.; Windsor, Conn.; Tolland and Stafford, Manchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Conn.; Colchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Vernon, Conn.; Vernon and Windsorville, East Putnam, Coventry. From 1833 to 1861, and again from 1868, impaired health prevented him from active work. He frequently spoke on temperance, of which he was an earnest, able advocate. He also served with marked ability in the Senate of the State of Connecticut, and filled various offices of responsibility and trust. Those conversant with his comparatively brief, active ministry speak of him as an able, eloquent preacher, and as equally an indefatigable pastor. In one locality his earnest advocacy of truth raised the anger of some, and they resolved at his next visit to tar and feather him. It was no idle threat; the preparations were made; his brethren urged him not to go, but he was fearless, and went. The leader of the mob was awakened, converted, and became his fast friend. Mr. Ramsdell lived to see his views prevail among his fellows. He died Oct. 23, 1877. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1878.

Ramsey, William B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford Co., Tenn., March 12, 1831. He embraced religion in 1846, was licensed to preach in 1853, and was admitted on trial in the Memphis Conference in the fall of that year. His health failing him in 1854; he entered Andrew College, from which he graduated in 1858. He was readmitted into the Conference in the same year, granted a supernumerary relation in 1862, and in 1863 served in the Confederate army as chaplain for four months. He died of consumption, July, 1865. Mr. Ramsey was sweet-spirited, modest, and unassuming. — *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, 1865, p. 594.

Ramus, Petrus

also known by his original name *Pierre de la Ramee*, was the French philosopher of the 16th century who broke the fetters of barbarous scholastic thought and led men into the clear light of Platonic philosophy. He is usually called one of the founders of modern metaphysics, and this is certainly true in so far as Ramus prepared the way for Descartes (q.v.) in philosophy, and for Pascal in theology, as we shall see presently. Ramus was born of very humble parentage at Cuth, a village in Vermandois, in 1515. He was obliged, when old enough to be of any service, to perform duties as a shepherd. He loved the broad, open fields, but he loved books more. He studied as much as his humble associations could afford him the means of knowledge, and finally, satisfied that he could only get more away from home, left for the city. He went straight to the capital, though yet a youth of a little over eight. Homesickness compelled him to return to the paternal roof, and he walked home as he had walked to Paris, but only to return soon again to the city where he had found so much to learn, and before he was twelve he was once more at Paris. He could not enter school as his pockets were empty and his stomach unsatisfied. He hired out as a servant to a rich student at the College de Navarre, and, by devoting the day to his duties, obtained the night for study, and, under his master's guidance and help, made rapid progress. At the age of twenty-one he was ready to pass examination as if he had been within the walls of a college. The indomitable spirit of the boy had made a resolute man; and, unlike most students, he had not only learned the *dicta* of the savans, but had formed an opinion which was his only own. In presenting himself for the degree of master, he came forward as the champion of reform in the

schools of thought. He undertook to prove the then almost impious task that Aristotle was not infallible. He had gradually withdrawn from Aristotelianism as an authority, and pleaded now for the exercise of individual reason as against the "authority," which scholasticism imposed on all students of philosophy. Enthusiast as he was, he was led to make the extravagant statement in his thesis that "all that Aristotle had said was false" (*quæcunq̄ ab Aristotele dicta essent, commentitia esse*). It speaks, however, a great deal for the ability he showed on this occasion that his judges, although themselves Aristotelians, were compelled to applaud him. Ramus was immediately made a teacher in the College du Mans, and along with two learned friends opened a special class for reading the Greek and Latin authors, designed to combine the study of eloquence with that of philosophy. His audience was large, and his success as a teacher remarkable. He now turned his attention more particularly to the science of logic, which, in his usual adventurous spirit, he undertook to "reform;" and no one acquainted with his system will deny that many of his innovations were both rational and beneficial. His attempts excited much hostility among the Aristotelians; and when his treatise on the subject (*Dialecticæ Partitiones*) appeared in 1543, it was fiercely assailed by the doctors of the Sorbonne, the Academy of Geneva, the majority of the high-schools of the Continent, which had all, in alliance with the Church, given Aristotelianism the supreme rule. The University of Paris linked itself with jurists, councillors, the king's ministers, the king himself, to crush this bold innovator. He was charged with impiety and sedition. and with a desire to overthrow all science and religion through the medium of an attack on Aristotle. On the report of an irregular tribunal appointed to consider the charges made against him, the king ordered his works to be suppressed, and forbade his teaching or writing against Aristotle on pain of corporal punishment. Ramus now devoted himself exclusively to the study of mathematics, and to prepare an edition of Euclid. Cardinals Charles de Bourbon and Charles de Lorraine befriended him, and through their influence he was permitted to begin a course of lectures on rhetoric at the College de Presles, the plague having driven away numbers of students from Paris. He was finally, in 1545, named principal of this college, and the Sorbonne ineffectually endeavored to eject him on the ground of the royal prohibitory decree. The decree was cancelled in 1545, through the influence of the cardinal de Lorraine. Ramus raised the College de Presles from a condition of decay to the height of prosperity, and his reputation went over all the land as an educator as well as philosopher. In 1551

cardinal Lorraine succeeded in instituting for him a chair of eloquence and philosophy at the College Royal, and his inaugural address (*Pro Philosophica Disciplina* [Paris, 1551]) is reckoned a masterpiece of the kind. He devoted the first eight years of his teaching to the first three of the “liberal arts” (grammar, rhetoric, and logic), which he called elementary or exoteric, and published three grammars successively — Greek, Latin, and French. He also mingled largely in the literary and scholastic disputes of the time, and on account of his bustling activity came under the satire of Rabelais. But though Ramus had innumerable adversaries, he might have defied them all, so great was his influence at court, had his love of “reformation” not displayed itself in religion as well as in logic. In an evil hour (for his own comfort) he embraced Protestantism. He had long been suspected of a leaning that way, and, as we have seen, his intellect was by nature scornfully rebellious towards the *ipse dixit* of “authority;” but he had for years decently conformed to the practices of the Catholic cult, and it was only after cardinal Lorraine, in reply to the Conference of Poissy (1561), frankly admitted the abuses of the Church and the vices of the clergy that he ventured formally to abjure the older faith. The outbreak of the religious wars in France plunged him into the dangers of the time, and he finally perished in the fatal massacre of St. Bartholomew, August, 1572. It is believed that he was assassinated at the instigation of one of his most violent and persistent enemies, Charpentier, rector of the College de Presles. *SEE RAMISTS.*

Ranco, Armand Jean Le Bouthillier De

the well-known founder of the reformed order of La Trappe, was born Jan. 9, 1626, at Paris, where he was educated. Having taken his degree in the Sorbonne with great applause, and embraced the ecclesiastical profession, he soon became distinguished as a preacher, and through the favor of cardinal Richelieu obtained more than one valuable benefice. He possessed as a young man a large fortune, and, notwithstanding his clerical character, was carried away by the gayety and dissipation of Parisian life. After a time, however, having embraced the cause of cardinal Retz, he displeased and finally forfeited the favor of cardinal Mazarin; and being deeply moved by the death of a lady, the duchess de Montbazon, to whom he was much attached, he withdrew altogether from Paris, resolved to distribute all his property among the poor, and to devote himself exclusively to the practice of piety and penitential works. Finally, he resigned all his preferments (of which, by the abusive practice of the period, he held several

simultaneously) with the exception of the abbacy of La Trappe, to which convent he retired in 1662, with the intention of restoring the strict discipline of the order. The history of the reforms which he effected will be found under the head TRAPPISTS. He lived in this seclusion for thirty-three years, during which he published a large number of works, chiefly ascetical. He died Oct. 27, 1700. The only remarkable events of his literary life are his controversy with Mabillon, in reply to his *Etudes Monastiques*, on the subject of the studies proper for the monastic life, which is entitled *Traite de la Saintete des Devoirs de 'Etat Monastique*, and his controversy with Arnauld, which drew upon Rance the hatred of the Jansenists. Rance's works are numerous. In his youth he edited *Anacreon* in one volume, octavo (Paris, 1639), with a dedication to cardinal Richelieu. His most noteworthy publications of his religious life, aside from those referred to, are, *Explication sur la Regle de St. Benoit* (Paris, 1689, 2 vols. 4to): — *Abrege des Obligations des Chretiens: — Reflexions Morales sur les Quatres Evangelistas* (Paris, 1699, 12mo): — *Conferences* (on the same, 1699): — *Relation de la. Vie et de la. Mort de Quelques Religieux de la Trappe* (1696. 4 vols. 12mo), and other works on monastic life and its reforms, etc. See Tillemont, *Vie de Rance* (1719, 2 vols. 12mo); Marsollier, *Vie* (1703); Chateaubriand, *Vie*; Moreri, *Dict. Hist.* s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ranconnier, Jacques

a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1600 in the county of Bourgogne, entered the novitiate of the Jesuits at the age of nineteen in Malines, and in 1625 went into the missionary work in Paraguay. He labored very successfully for seven years among the Itatines, whom he converted to Christianity, such as he had to offer, and died among this new people of the Gospel about 1640. He wrote frequent reports of the progress of his work in Paraguay, which are valuable contributions to the history of that South American country. See Sothwell, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*, p. 209; Charlevoix, *Hist. de Paraguay*, liv. 8. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. **SEE PARAGUAY.**

Rand, Asa

an American Congregational divine, born at Rindge, N. H., Aug. 6, 1783, was educated at Dickinson College, where he took his degree in 1806, studied for the ministry, and was ordained at Gorham, Me., Jan. 18, 1809,

as pastor of a Congregational Church. In 1822 he undertook the editorial care of the *Christian Mirror* at Portland, Me., and held this until 1825, when he took the principalship of a female seminary at Brookfield. In July, 1826, he accepted the editorship of the *Boston Recorder*, the *Youth's Companion*, and the *Volunteer*, the last a religious monthly. His health, which had for some time been failing, and had originally forced him from the ministry, finally compelled him also to leave the editorial chair, and he connected himself with a book-store and printing-office at Lowell, Mass. He finally went back to editorial work, and started the *Lowell Observer*, a weekly paper. In 1835 he again began to preach and address public audiences. He took up the slavery question and spoke in behalf of abolition in Maine and Massachusetts. From 1837 to 1842 he preached in Pompey, N. Y., then became pastor of the Presbyterian church in Peterborough, N. Y., the home of the celebrated abolitionist Gerritt Smith. His last years Mr. Rand spent at Ashburnham, Mass., where he died Aug. 24, 1871. He was, while at Gorham, a frequent writer for the religious quarterly published at Portland for 1814-18, and, besides occasional sermons, put in print a volume of *Familiar Sermons: — a Review of Finney's Sermons: — New Divinity Theology*, a vindication of the same: — and a *Letter to Dr. Lyman Beecher*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. i.

Rand, William

an American divine of colonial times, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was a student at Harvard University, class of 1721, then took holy orders, and became pastor at Sunderland, Mass., of a Congregational Church. In 1746 he removed, in the same capacity, to Kingston, N. Y., and died there in 1779. He published five separate sermons (1739-1757). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 386.

Randall, John

an English divine of note, was born about the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, in St. Mary's Hall, and Trinity College, and, after taking holy orders, became rector of St. Andrew Hubbard, London, in 1599. He died in 1622. His published works are: *Sermons on* ^{<163>}Matthew 5:20, and on ^{<121>}1 Peter 2:11, 12 (1620, 4to): — *Sermons on* ^{<188>}Romans 8:38, 39 (1623, 4to): — *Nature of God and Christ* (1624, 4to): — *Great Mystery of Godliness* (1624, 4to; 3d ed. 1640): —

The Sacraments (1630, 4to): — *Lectures on the Lord's Supper* (1630, 4to): — *Twenty-nine Lectures of the Church* (1631, 4to).

Randall, Matthew

a distinguished layman of the Baptist denomination, was born in London. His mercantile tastes led him into business vocations, where he met with success as a merchant. Soon after the peace of 1783, he came to the United States, and took up his residence in Philadelphia, where he remained nearly all his life. For two or three years he lived in Burlington, N. J. While in this place he was baptized by Rev. Dr. Staughton, and continued a member of the Burlington Church until his death, which took place in Philadelphia, Sept. 14, 1833. Dr. Baron Stow says of him that "he was highly esteemed in Christian circles, and his early familiarity with Robert Hall and Drs. Ryland and Stennett was of importance to him in matters of theology, as well as of taste and piety." He adds: "Having the confidence of the authorities of Pennsylvania, he was appointed to several important offices, the duties of which he creditably performed." See *The Missionary Jubilee*, p. 118. (J. C. S.)

Randallites

SEE FREE-WILL BAPTISTS.

Randle, Richmond

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was originally a member of the Tennessee Conference, where he travelled five years. He was transferred in 1836 to the Arkansas Conference, which then included Louisiana west of the Mississippi River. Here he labored efficiently in stations and as presiding elder until the Conference of 1844, when he took a superannuated relation. In 1845 he became again effective, and so continued until 1861, serving as presiding elder for nine of these years. His sons having volunteered, he accompanied them to the war, soon to die. He was a man of deep and fervent piety, a true friend, a noble and useful preacher. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1861, p. 323.

Randle, Thomas Ware

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Stewart County, Tenn., April 13, 1815. He was admitted on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1832, and continued to be an active and very efficient

preacher until within a few months of his death, which took place Aug. 26, 1859. He was several times a delegate to the General Conference. Mr. Randle was a Christian gentleman, modest and kind. His talents as a preacher were excellent, and his zeal knew no abatement. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1859, p. 116.

Randle, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in September, 1807. He was converted when about thirty years of age, and was received on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1841. He labored successfully until 1862, when he became supernumerary. In 1866 he resumed active work as presiding elder on Cross Plains (now Fountain Head) district, where he closed his life, May 2, 1869. He was a man of artless simplicity, true sincerity, and ardent zeal. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1869, p. 349.

Randolph, Francis

D.D., an English divine, was born in 1755. He was made prebend of Bristol in 1791, and died in 1831. He published, *Letter to William Pitt on the Slave Trade* (Lond. 1788, 8vo): — *Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments in Answer to B. Hobbouse* (1792, 8vo): — *Correspondence with the Earl and Countess of Jersey* (1796, 8vo): — *Sermons on Advent* (1800, 8vo): — *Sermons* (Bath, 1803, 8vo): — *State of the Nation* (1808, 8vo): — *Book of Job* (from the Heb. by Elizabeth Smith, with *Preface and Annotations* by F. R. [Bath, 1810]).

Randolph, John

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Trigg County, Ky., May 9, 1829. He was converted in 1847 (or 1848), licensed to preach Nov. 23, 1850, and admitted on trial in the Louisville Conference in 1851. He filled twelve important fields of labor, continuing his work until the first Sunday in June, 1863. The staple of his preaching, as of all he did, was strong practical sense, sanctified and rendered efficient by deep piety. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1864, p. 481.

Randolph, Samuel E.

a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Tennessee. He entered the Tennessee Conference, from which he was

transferred in 1860 to the Florida Conference. He enlisted in 1861 with the Lowndes Volunteers, and in three months fell a victim to disease at Camp Alleghany, Va., Aug. 29, 1861. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1861, p. 345.

Randolph, Thomas

an English divine of note, was born Aug. 30, 1701, at Canterbury, studied at Oxford University, where he was bursar, and after completing his theological course was in 1725 admitted to orders, then taught for a while, and finally accepted two benefices in Kent. In 1748 he was elected President of Corpus Christi College, and later was given a professorship in theology (1768). He died at Oxford March 24, 1783. Dr. Thomas Randolph published a work on the *Prophecies cited in the New Testament compared with the Hebrew Original and the Septuagint Version*, which is exceedingly valuable and scarce. "It presents," says Orme, "at one view the Heb. text, the Sept. version of it, and the quotation in the Greek New Test." The substance of the work is incorporated in Horne's *Chapter on Quotations*.

His son John, who was born July 6, 1749, and was educated at Oxford, became under his father's administration professor of Greek and theology, in 1799 was made bishop of Oxford, was transferred to the see of Bangor in 1807, and in 1809 to that of London, where he died July 28, 1813. He was a member of the Royal Society of London, and published several sermons. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, 83, 84, and the biographical sketch prefaced to the collected writings of Thomas Randolph; Saunders, *Evenings with Sacred Poets*, p. 231; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 8:191. (J. H. W.)

Ranew, Nathaniel

an English divine of the 17th century, noted as a Nonconformist who was ejected at the Restoration, was minister of Little Eastcheap, London, and afterwards vicar of Tilsted, Essex. He died in 1672, aged about seventy-two. He published, *Solitude Improved by Divine Meditation*, etc. (Lond. 1670, 8vo; last ed. 1847, 18mo), a very excellent work in the domain of practical theology: — *Account concerning the Saint's Glory*, etc., equally devout in spirit and excellent in composition and purpose.

Ranfaing, Marie Elisabeth De

a French lady, celebrated as the foundress of a religious order, and known under the name of Elizabeth of the Cross of Jesus, was born, Nov. 30, 1592, at Remiremont, of a noble Lorraine family, and was noted for her beauty. She was affianced to a man for whom she had not the shadow of affection, and therefore objected to wedlock; and when her parents persisted, she sought the retirement of the monastery. She was, however, brought back to society, and married M. Dubois, by whom she had three children. Her husband's death and other mishaps led her to determine the founding of a religious community made up wholly of women reclaimed from a life of debauchery. The number of these women having increased, the prince bishop of Toul thought proper to form them into a religious order, under the name of "Our Lady of Refuge." Mrs. Dubois and her three daughters took the dress belonging to the monastery Jan. 1, 1631. In 1634 Urban VIII gave his approval to this order. It extended over several of the cities of the realm, especially Avignon, Toulouse, Montpellier, and Rouen; and it survived the storms of the Revolution. The mother of Ranfaing died the death of a saint, Jan. 14, 1649. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gizerale*, s.v.

Range

is the rendering of two Heb. words of marked import, besides one or two in an ordinary sense.

1. **ryKakir** (only in the dual, **pyajKakira'yim**, ^{<1185>}Leviticus 11:35, "ranges for pots"), apparently a cooking-furnace, perhaps of pottery (as it could be broken), and double (as having places for two pots or more, or, perhaps, consisting of two stoves set together). **SEE OVEN; SEE POT.**

2. **hrde]** *sederah'*, a *rank*, or row, of soldiers, drawn up in cordon ("range," ^{<2108>}2 Kings 11:8, 15; ^{<4234>}2 Chronicles 23:14); also timbers or chambers in the stories of a building ("board," ^{<1009>}1 Kings 6:9). **SEE ATHALIAH, TEMPLE.**

Rangier(us)

a French cardinal of mediaeval times. was born, about 1035, in the diocese of Rheims. St. Bruno of that place was his tutor. One of his pupils was Eudes of Chatillon, pope under the name of Urban II. Rangier went, to take the habit of Benedictine, to Marmontiers, where he would probably

have died in obscurity, had it not been for contention which arose among the monks, and Raoul of Sangeais, archbishop of Tours. Rangier's abbot, Bernard of Saint-Venant, charged him with a mission to Rome, to maintain the rights of the abbey. The two ecclesiastics obtained a bull conformed to their wishes; but Rangier was kept at Rome by Urban II, who soon made him cardinal, and, in 1090. archbishop of Reggio. In 1095 he went with the pope to France, and took part in the Council of Clermont, where the first crusade was decided upon. After the Council, Rangier followed Urban II to Limoges and to Poitiers, and found himself, March 10, 1096, at the consecration of the abbe of Marmontiers. He soon after returned to his own diocese, and left it no more. excepting to assist Pascal II at the Council of Guastalla (1106). Ughelli speaks of him as a man of great power ("vir magne auctoritatis"). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ranieri

ST., an Italian ascetic of mediaeval times, was born, in or about the year 1100, of a noble family of Pisa. In his youth, the Romish legends say, he had a vision: an eagle appeared to him, bearing in his beak a blazing light, and said, "I come from Jerusalem to enlighten the nations." But Ranieri refused to heed this call to a religious life, and gave himself up to pleasure. But, in the midst of his debaucheries, he was one day surprised by the visit of a holy man, who persuaded him to desert his sinful life. Soon he embarked for Jerusalem, where he took off his own garments, and wore the *schivina*, or slave-shirt, ever after in token of humility. For twenty years he was a hermit in the deserts of Palestine, and during this time is reputed to have had numberless visions. On one occasion, he felt his vows of abstinence to be almost more than he could keep. He then had a vision of a golden vase, set with precious stones, and full of oil, pitch, and sulphur. These were set on fire, and none could quench the flames. Then there was put into his hands a small ewer of water; and when he turned on but a few drops, the fire was extinguished. This vision he believed to signify human passions by the pitch and sulphur, but the water was the emblem of temperance. He then determined to live on bread and water alone. His reverence for water was very great, and most of his miracles were performed through the use of it; so that he was called *San Ranieri dell' Acqua*. But when he tarried with a host who cheated his guests by putting water in his wine, the saint did not hesitate to expose the fraud; for he revealed to all present the figure of Satan, sitting on one of the wine-casks, in the form of a huge cat with the wings of a bat. He did many

miracles after his return to Pisa, and made converts by the sanctity of his life and example. When he died (July 17, 1161), many miraculous manifestations bore witness to his eminent holiness. All the bells in Pisa were spontaneously tolled; and the archbishop Villani, who had been sick in bed for two years, was cured to attend his funeral. At the moment in the funeral service when it was the custom to omit the *Gloria in Excelsis*, it was sung by a choir of angels above the altar; while the organ accompanied them without being played by any perceptible hands. The harmony of this chant was so exquisite that those who heard it thought the very heavens were opened. He was buried in a tomb in the Duomo. After the plague in Pisa in 1356, the life of this saint was painted in the Campo Santo by Simone Memmi and Antonio Veneziano. These frescos are most important in the history of art, and consist of eight scenes from the life of St. Ranieri:

1. His conversion;
2. He embarks for Palestine;
3. He assumes the hermit's dress;
4. He has many temptations and visions in the desert;
5. He returns to Pisa;
6. He exposes the fraud of the innkeeper;
7. His death and funeral obsequies;
8. His miracles after death.

— Mrs. Clement, *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art*, s.v.

Ranke, Carl Ferdinand

doctor of theology and philosophy, and brother of the famous historian, Leopold Ranke, was born at Wiehe, in Thuringia, in 1802. Having finished his preparatory studies at the gymnasium in Pforta, he betook himself to the study of philology and theology. He soon became the head of the Qued. Ibinburg Gymnasium. In 1837 he was called to Gottingen, and in 1842 to Berlin, where he not only superintended the Frederic-William Gymnasium, but also the Royal Real-school, the Royal Elizabeth School, etc. He died March 29, 1876. Ranke was not only an able philologist and pedagogue, but also an excellent Christian, and took an active part in the inner mission and Bible Society. He wrote, *Plan und Bau des Johanneischen Evangeliums* (Berlin, 1854): — *De Libris Historicis Novi Testamenti* (ibid. 1855): — *Clemens von Alexandrien v. Origenes als Interpreten der heiligen Schrift* (ibid. 1861): — *Das Klagelied der*

Hebraer (ibid. 1863), etc. As a contributor to Piper's *Evangelical Year-book*, he wrote on the apostles Andrew (vii, 94), James the Elder (v3:139), Timothy (i, 70). Titus (i, 68): on Symphorianus (xix, 60), Perpetua and Felicitas (ix, 56), Saturnius (xx, 63), Arethas (x3:129), Eustasius (xv3:96), Olaf Petersen (xix, 170), and contributed the German translation of Clement of Alexandria's hymn, Στόμιον πῶλων ἄδαῶν, to Piper's monograph on that hymn (xix, 29, 31). See Schneider, *Theol. Jahrbuch* (1877), p. 227; *Literarischer Handweiser* (1876), p. 235. (B. P.)

Ranke, Friedrich Heinrich

doctor of theology and *Ober-Consistorialrath*, brother of Carl Ferdinand, was born at Wiehe in 1797. Having completed his studies, he labored as a pastor at Riickersdorf, not far from Nuremberg, and then as dean at Thurnau. In 1840 he was appointed ordinary professor of dogmatics at the Erlangen University. In 1841 he was made counsellor of consistory at Bayreuth, and shortly afterwards he was appointed Ober-Consistorialrath. Some years ago he retired from his different offices, and died Sept. 2, 1876. Of his writings we mention, *Untersuchungen iiber den Pentateuch* (Erlangen, 1834-40, 2 vols.): — *Predigten*: — *Gebete uber Worte der heil. Schrift* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1867): — *The Institution of the Lord's Supper* (ibid. 11:81): — *David*, in Piper's *Evangelical Year-book* (v3:106). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:129; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1028; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 78; ii, 108, 327, 330, 732; Schneider, *Theol. Juahrbuch* (1877), p. 227; *Literarischer Handweiser* (1876), p. 235, 550; Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresbericht* (1867), p. 382. (B. P.)

Ranken, David

a Scotch divine, was a member of the Episcopal Church of Scotland at Edinburgh in the first half of the 18th century, and was an author of some repute. He published, *Three Discourses*, ⲁⲓⲃⲃ 1 Peter 3:13, 14 (Edin. 1716, 8vo): — *Three Discourses*, ⲁⲓⲃⲃ 1 Peter 3:14, 16 (1716, 8vo): — *Serm.*, ⲁⲓⲃⲃ 1 Peter 3:13-16 (1717, 8vo): — *Serms.* (1720, 8vo): — *Three Discourses*, ⲁⲓⲃⲃ Philippians 1:27 (1722, 8vo).

Rankin, Thomas

a somewhat noted minister of the early Methodist Episcopal Church — one of Wesley's general assistants — was born in Dunbar, Scotland, 1738. He was religiously trained by his parents. and, at an early age, expressed the

desire to become a minister of the Gospel. After the death of his father, he formed bad acquaintances, and gave himself up to worldly amusements. When he was seventeen years of age, Dunbar was visited by troops of dragoons, among whom were a number of devout Christians, who held meetings morning and evening. Young Rankin attended, and was deeply impressed. He afterwards removed to Edinburgh, where he came under the personal influence of Mr. Whitefield, and was decided to devote himself to Christian work. With this purpose in view, he prepared to enter the College at Edinburgh. Circumstances, however, occurred which prevented his taking a collegiate course; and, by the advice of a friend, he sailed for America, to engage in a commercial enterprise. Wearying of this life, he was glad to find himself once more in Scotland, breathing a more congenial religious atmosphere. Shortly after his return, he met a Methodist minister, who saw the unsettled condition of his mind, and invited Rankin to visit, with him the different Methodist societies of the North. He was even prevailed upon to preach, though he consented with great reluctance, and was so dissatisfied with himself that he was often well-nigh resolved to attempt it no more. While in this state of mind, he listened to the preaching of Wesley, and from that time had the most intense admiration for him. After a great spiritual conflict, he sought Wesley, and related to him his experience of the two preceding years. Wesley advised him to persevere in his religious work, and so removed his doubts that he expressed himself willing to be known everywhere "as a poor, despised Methodist preacher." He was regularly appointed in 1761 to the Sussex Circuit, and in the following year to the Sheffield Circuit. At the next Conference, he was appointed to the Devonshire Circuit. In 1764 he became assistant-preacher in the Cornwall Circuit. In 1765 he was appointed to spend a part of the year in the Newcastle and a part in the Dales Circuit. In 1766 he was stationed upon the Epworth Circuit, and, upon request of the people, was returned the second year. In 1768 he was appointed to labor again in the west of Cornwall. In 1769 he was sent to the London and Sussex Circuit, and also travelled with John Wesley on his preaching tour through the kingdom. In 1770 he accompanied Wesley to the west of England, and everywhere their labors met with great success. In 1771 he was once more stationed with his friends in Cornwall. While at the conference held at Leeds, he met captain Webb, lately arrived from America. Wesley had become greatly dissatisfied with the management of the American mission, and, when the question came up before the conference, intimated his desire to send Rankin as general superintendent. The appointment was made; and

he, together with George Shadford, sailed for America in 1773. Soon after his arrival, Rankin called a conference, the first ever held in America, July 4, 1773, at Philadelphia. Asbury had been previously appointed and sent over as the general assistant of the societies in America; but as Rankin had travelled several years longer, he took precedence over Asbury when he reached here. Besides, the displeasure of Wesley against the American work had probably led him to select for the place a man who could claim superiority over Asbury. Rankin, therefore, held the place of 'general assistant' while here, and presided at the conferences which convened while he was in America. He was stationed at New York and Philadelphia alternately, and remained in this country until 1778, when he again appears at work in England. He visited, while here, many of the churches then within the territory known as the Philadelphia Conference, and would probably have remained, had not the Revolutionary struggle made his stay ill-advised. Immediately after his return to England, he was stationed at London, where he lived two years. In 1783 he asked to be made a supernumerary; and after this date he lived quietly in the English metropolis until his death, May 17, 1810. He was buried in City Road, near Wesley. He was a truly pious man, but too stern and uncompromising to succeed as a leader; and he failed in this country to be of any especial service to Asbury, whom he was intended to assist. He never wavered in difficulties and trials and showed a truly heroic spirit in the hour of need. His irregular education had probably as much to do with his inconsistencies of conduct as his natural propensity to the severe aspects of life. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 239; and his *Hist. of the M. E. Ch.* (see Index); Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Ch.* (N.Y. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 77-124; Wakeley, *Lost Chapters* (see Index); Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:28-34.

Ransom

(¹²¹³ *wydPæ* Exodus 21:30; "redemption," ⁹⁰⁸ Psalm 49:8; or *μ/ydPæ pidyom*, "redemption," ¹⁰⁸⁹ Numbers 3:49, 51; elsewhere *rpKa* *apher*, forgiveness, or *l aē* to act the part of Goel [q.v.]; N.T. *λύτρον*, or *ἀντίλυτρον*), a price paid to recover a person or thing from one who detains that person or thing in captivity. Hence prisoners of war or slaves are said to be ransomed when they are liberated in exchange for a valuable consideration (⁴¹⁶⁹ 1 Corinthians 6:19, 20). Whatever is substituted or exchanged in compensation for the party is his ransom; but the word ransom is more extensively taken in Scripture. A man is said to ransom his

life (^{<0213>}Exodus 21:30); that is, to substitute a sum of money instead of his life as the penalty of certain offences (^{<0212>}Exodus 30:12; ^{<1838>}Job 36:18). The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Hebrew was deemed the *ransom*, or atonement money, and was declared to be a heave-offering to Jehovah, to propitiate for their lives (^{<0212>}Exodus 30:12-16). Some of the sacrifices (as the sin- and trespass-offerings) might be regarded as commutations or ransoms (^{<0101>}Leviticus 4:1-35; 5:1-19). In like manner, our Blessed Lord is said to give himself a ransom for all (^{<5416>}1 Timothy 2:6; ^{<4123>}Matthew 20:23; ^{<4103>}Mark 10:43) — a substitute for them, bearing sufferings in their stead, undergoing that penalty which would otherwise attach to them (^{<4818>}Romans 3:34; 7:23; ^{<4013>}1 Corinthians 1:30; ^{<4007>}Ephesians 1:7; 4:30; ^{<8013>}Hebrews 9:13). *SEE REDEMPTION.*

Ranters

is (1) one of the many names by which the Presbyterians designated the most advanced of the mystical radicals of the Cromwellian period. They were Antinomian heretics, and were probably related to the Familists (q.v.), to whom Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* 3:211 sq.) traces them. In Ross's *Παναεβεία*, the Ranters are described as making an open profession of lewdness and irreligion; as holding that God, angels, devils, heaven, hell, etc., are fictions and fables; that Moses, John the Baptist, and our Lord were impostors; that praying and preaching are useless; that all ministry has come to an end; and that sin is a mere imagination. He says that in their letters the Ranters endeavored to be strangely profane and blasphemous, uttering atheistical imprecations; and he gives a specimen which quite bears out his words. He also alleges that they sanctioned and practiced community of women (ed. 1655, p. 287). Much the same account, also, is given a few years later by Pagitt (*Heresiography* [ed. 1662], p. 259, 294). Baxter also writes respecting them: "I have myself letters written from Abingdon, where, among both soldiers and people, this contagion did then prevail, full of horrid oaths and curses, and blasphemy not fit to be repeated by the tongue and pen of man; and this all uttered as the effect of knowledge and a part of their religion, in a fanatic strain, and fathered on the Spirit of God" (*Own Life and Times*, p. 77). The following passage is found in a *Life of Bunyan*, added to an imitation of his work which is called *The Third Part of the Pilgrim's Progress*: "About this time" (in Bunyan's early life), "a very large liberty being given as to conscience, there started up a sect of loose, profane wretches, afterwards called Ranters and Sweet Singers, pretending themselves safe from, or being

incapable of, sinning; though, indeed, they were the debauchest and profligate wretches living in their bawdy meetings and revels. For, fancying themselves in Adam's state, as he was in Paradise before the fall, they would strip themselves, both men and women, and so catch as catch could; and to it they went, to satiate their lust under pretence of increasing and multiplying" (*An Account of the Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan*, etc. [London, 1692], p. 22). (See Weingarten, *Revolutions-Kirchen Englands* [Leips. 1868], p. 107 sq.; Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.). (2.) In recent times — since 1828 — the name of "Ranters" has been given to those Primitive Methodists who separated from the main body of Methodists, and were distinguished by their unusual physical demonstrations.

Raoul de Flaix

a French monastic, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. It is difficult to enumerate definitely his works. He is undoubtedly the author of *Commentaire sur le Levitique* (Cologne, 1536, fol.). The authors of the *Literary History of France* claim for him a discourse abridged from the *Work of Six Days*, which is found in a manuscript in the King's Library, No. 647; also a *Commentary on the Proverbs*, of which they mention a copy at Cambridge in the library of Pembroke College; and a *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul*. They add that Raoul de Flaix commented on Nahum and the Apocalypse. These glossaries on Nahum and the Apocalypse exist, in fact, under the name of Master Raoul (Magistri Radulfi), in a volume of Clairvaux, which is numbered at present 227 in the library of Troyes. But this is a mistake into which Lelong led the authors of the *Literary History*. A commentary on the Song of Songs, published in some ancient editions of Gregory the Great, had been attributed to Raoul de Flaix. Lelong and Mabillon having proved that this work is by Robert de Tombelaine, abbot of St. Vign de Bayeux, the authors of the *Literary History* have thought it necessary, in consequence, to strike the Canticle of Canticles from the list of sacred books annotated by our Raoul. But in that they appear to be mistaken. In fact, the volume of Clairvaux which is to-day preserved in the library of Troyes offers us, besides the glossaries on the Apocalypse and Nahum, glossaries on the Canticles entirely different from those which have been published under the name of Gregory and restored to the abbot Robert. Sanders mentions also, among the works of Raoul de Flaix, a theological summary — *Summa Radulfi Flaviacensis* — and a treatise, *De Amore Carnis et Odio Carnis* — works of which we have no other account. — Hoefler. *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raoul de St. Trond

a Belgian monastic, was born at Moutier-sur-Sambre, in the diocese of Liege, studied at Liege, and then entered the Benedictine order at Aix-la-Chapelle. He was there made sacristan, master of a school, and grand provost. He was a very devout man; and, dissatisfied with the lax condition of the monastery at Aix, he left for St. Trond, where, after two years, he was made prior, and introduced the reforms of the Clugniacs. In 1108 he was elected abbot, and took part in the quarrel for the pope which agitated the Liege diocese and resulted in its division. He went twice to Rome, where he was warmly received and had much influence. He died March 6, 1138. He wrote: *Gesta Abbatum Tirudonensium Ord. Sancti Benedicti*, in D'Achery's *Spicilegiutz*, 7:344 sq.: — *De Susceptione Puerorum in Monasteriis*, in Mabillon's *Analectau*: — *Contra Simoniacos*, *Lib. VII*, which is still in MS. See *Gallia Christiana*, 3:958-960; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Ecclesiastes* 22:68. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raoul de Vaucelle

a French monastic, was born probably at Merston, in England, and flourished in the first half of the 12th century, first a monk at Clairvaux. and later as abbot of the new monastery founded at Vaucelle, in the diocese of Cambrai, by St. Bernard. Raoul is renowned both for his magnificence and for his charity. In the time of want, he supported for months as many as five thousand paupers. Charles de Visch, in his *Bibliothèque Cistercienne*, counts him among the learned writers of his time, and attributes to him many works; but, according to Pastoret, these works are lost. He died in 1152. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rapaport, Salomo Jehuda Low

a noted Jewish scholar, was born at Lemberg, in Austrian Galicia, in 1790. He first attracted attention among his coreligionists by notes to a Talmudical work of his father-in-law, and subsequently rose to the highest rank among the Hebrew writers of the age by critico-biographical sketches of Saadia Gaon, Rabbi Nathan, Hai Gaon, the poet Eleazar Kalir, etc., in the *Bikkure ha-Ittim* (Vienna, 1828-31); by contributions to the *Kerem Chemed* (Vienna and Prague, 1833-43); and by numerous other dissertations in Hebrew and German, inserted in various other publications. He translated into Hebrew verse Racine's *Esther*, entitled **hdwhy tyraç**

(Vienna, 1827). He also published, under the title of **Ēr[eseýŁæpa** linguistic and archeological lexicon, of which only one part has as yet appeared (Prague, 1852). His poetical contributions in the *Bikkure* may be identified by the cipher **ryç**. Having officiated for some time as rabbi at Tarnopol, he was elected, in 1840, to fill a similar office at Prague, where he died, Oct. 16, 1867. Besides his numerous essays, which are to be found in the different reviews and periodicals, he published, in 1861, a criticism on Frankel's *Darke ha-Mishna*, entitled *Dibre Shalom ve-Emmeth*. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:131 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 482; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 11:485 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Secten*, 3:343 sq.; Stern, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, p. 218 sq.; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israceliten*, p. 533 sq.; Geiger, *Jud. Zeitschrift* (1867), p. 241 sq.; id. *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berlin, 1875), ii, 262; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalendenjahres* (Eng. transl. by the Rev. B. Pick, in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y., 1874-75); Cassel, *Leitfjden zur jud. Gesch. u. Literatur* (1872), 1). 114; Delitzsch, *Zvr Gesch. d. judischen Poesie*, p. 102, 118, 155; Kurlander, *S. L. Rapaport: eine biographische Skizze* (Pesth, 1868). (B. P.)

Raper, William H.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Western Pennsylvania, Sept. 24, 1793. He was first brought to notice by the service he rendered his country in the second war with England. In 1819 he was received on trial in the Ohio Conference, and remained in the effective ranks for about thirty years. He served the Church in various positions, and always acceptably. He was honored by being sent to several general conferences, and had many admirers and friends. He died while travelling with bishop Morris to Aurora, Ind., Feb. 11, 1852. Mr. Raper was a profound theologian, of amiable social qualities, fearless and earnest. — *Minutes of Annual Conf. of M. E. Ch.* 1852, p. 123.

Ra'pha

(Heb. *Rapha'*, **apr**; as in ^{<330>}1 Chronicles 8:2), or **Ra'phah** (Heb. *Raphah'*, **hpr**; as in ^{<1216>}2 Samuel 21:16, meaning *giant* [q.v.]. as translated in ^{<330>}1 Chronicles 20:4, 6, 8; ^{<1216>}2 Samuel 21:16, 18, 20, 22; Sept. ^ⲓΡαφῆς, v. r. ^ⲓΡαφά and ^ⲓΡαφαία), the name of two men. **SEE BETH-RAPHA.**

1. The last of the five sons of Benjamin. son of Jacob (^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 8:2, “Rapha”). B.C. post 1927. The name does not occur in the original register of the family (^{<0421>}Genesis 46:21); but at ^{<0439>}Numbers 13:9, Raphu was the name of the father of the person chosen from Benjamin to spy out the land of Canaan — showing the name, or something similar, to have belonged to the tribe. Raphah is apparently but a variation of the name of Rosh (q.v.). *SEE JACOB.*

2. The son of Binea, and father of Eleasah; eighths in lineal descent from David’s friend Jonathan (1 Chronicles. 8:37, “Raphah”). B.C. post 1000. He is called REPHAIAH in ^{<1393>}1 Chronicles 9:43.

Ra’ phael

(^{<1382>}Ραφαήλ = I a p r] “the divine healer”), “one of the seven holy angels which... go in and out before the glory of the Holy One” (Tobit 12:15). According to another Jewish tradition, Raphael was one of *the* four angels that stood round the throne of God; — Michael, Uriel, Gabriel, Raphael. His place is said to have been behind the throne, by the standard of Ephraim (comp. ^{<0428>}Numbers 2:18); and his name was interpreted as foreshadowing the healing of the schism of Jeroboam, who arose from that tribe (^{<1112>}1 Kings 11:26, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 47). In Tobit he appears as the guide and counsellor of Tobias. By his help, Sara was delivered from her plague (Tobit 6:16, 17), and Tobit from his blindness (11:7, 8). In the book of Enoch he appears as “the angel of the spirits of men” (20:3; comp. Dillmann, *ad loc.*). His symbolic character in the apocryphal narrative is clearly indicated when he describes himself as “Azarias the son of Ananias” (Tobit 5:12), the messenger of the Lord’s help springing from the Lord’s mercy. *SEE TOBIT.* The name, in its Heb. form, occurs in ^{<1330>}1 Chronicles 26:7 as that of a man. *SEE REPHAEL.*

Raphael

ST. (Lat. *Sanctus Raphael*; Ital. *San Raffaello*; Fr. *St. Raphael*; Germ. *Der Helige Rafael*), the same with the above, is considered the guardian angel of humanity. He was sent to warn Adam of the danger of sin, and its unhappy consequences.

*“Be strong, live happy, and love! but first of all
Him whom to love is to obey, and keep
His great command. Take heed lest passion sway
thy judgment to do aught which else free-will
Would not admit. Thine and of all thy sons
The weal or woe in thee is placed. Beware!” (Milton).*

He was the herald who bore to the shepherds the “good tidings of great joy which shall be for all people.” He is especially the protector of the young, the pilgrim, and the traveller. In the apocryphal romance, his watchful care of the young Tobias during his eventful journey is typical of his benignity and loving condescension towards those whom he protects. His countenance is represented as full of benignity. Devotional pictures portray him dressed as a pilgrim, with sandals; his hair bound with a diadem or a fillet; the staff in his hand, and a wallet, or *panetiere*, hung to his belt. As a guardian spirit, he bears the sword and a small casket, or vase, containing the “fishy charm” (Tobit 6:6) against evil spirits. As guardian angel, he usually leads Tobias. Murillo’s painting, in the Leuchtenberg Gallery, represents him as the guardian angel of a bishop who appears as a votary below. St. Raphael is commemorated in the Church of Rome on Sept. 12.

Raphael, Or Raffaello, Santi Or Sanzio,

called by his countrymen “*Il Divino*,” i.e. “the Divine,” is ranked by almost universal opinion as the greatest of painters. He was certainly the Sophocles of the glorious art of form and color. He was born at Urbino April 6, 1483. In 1497, on the death of his father, Giovanni Santi, who was his first instructor, he was placed under Pietro Perugino (q.v.), the most distinguished painter of the period, who was then engaged on important works in the city of Perugia. The profound feeling, the mystic ecstasy, which characterized the Umbrian school while yet under the leadership of its founder, the Perugian, and before it degenerated into the mannerism and facile manufacture at which Michael Angelo sneered, took possession of the soul of Raphael. He soon acquired a wonderful facility of execution. He showed such great talent that Perugino employed him on his own works; and so well did he perform his task that it is difficult now to separate the work of the master from that of the pupil. In 1504 Raphael visited Florence, and improved his style by studying composition and expression in the works of Masaccio, the sweet and perfect modelling of Leoniardo da Vinci, and color and effect in those of Fra Bartolomeo. He seems to have lived in Florence till 1508, when he went to Rome, on the invitation of

pope Julius II. His celebrated frescos in the Vatican, and numerous important works, were then commenced. Julius died in 1513, but his successor, Leo X, continued Raphael's services, and kept his great powers constantly in exercise. Raphael and Rome are synonymous terms in the history of Italian art of the 16th century. Though Michael Angelo labored at Rome, and the impress of his genius is everywhere in the avenues of Roman art, yet by common consent the Roman school of art owes its origin and life to Raphael. It became the grandest of all the Italian schools of painting, and gave concrete reality to the aspirations and longings of his predecessors by carrying art to a height all but ultimate. The Roman school combined the virility and boldness of Florence with the simplicity and the devotional sweetness of Umbria and Siena; in short, all Italian excellences Raphael gathered in his Roman creation; but with the artist who gave it birth the school alone can be identified, and, illustrious as were many of his pupils. His own death marks the fading hour of the Roman school. Of all the Roman painters, it was Raphael alone who made his works not less the expression and measure of all the knowledge, philosophy, and poetry of his time than witnesses to his genius and vouchers for what we call the immortality of his fame. He achieved the labors of a demigod; his successors wrought like mere men. Raphael had scarcely reached his prime when a sudden attack of fever carried him off, on the anniversary of his birth, in 1520. "The works of Raphael are generally divided into three classes: his first style, when under the influence of Perugino's manner; his second, when he painted in Florence from 1504 to 1508; and his third style, which is distinguishable in the works executed by him after he settled in Rome. Each of these styles has its devoted admirers. Those who incline to art employed in the service of religion prefer the first manner, as embodying purity and religious feeling. His last manner, perfected when the taste for classical learning and art was strongly excited by the discovery of numerous valuable works of the classic period, is held by many connoisseurs as correctly embodying the highest art; while his middle, or Florentine, style is admired by some as exemplifying his powers freed from what they deem the rigid manner of Perugino, untainted by the conventionalism of classic art. In all these different styles he has left works of great excellence. The *Coronation of the Virgin*, in the gallery of the Vatican, and the *Sposalizio*, or Marriage of the Virgin, in the Brera Gallery at Milan, which is an improved version of Perugino's *Sposalizio*, painted in 1495 for the cathedral of Perugia, belong to the first period. The *St. Catharine*, in the National Gallery, London; the *Entombment*, in the

Borghese Gallery, Rome; *Let Belle Jardinziere*, in the Louvre, belong to his second period. The *St. Ceciliæ*, at Bologna; the *Madonna di San Sisto*, at Dresden; the *Cartoons*, at Hampton Court; the *Transfiguration*, and all the Vatican frescos, except *Theology, of the Dispute on the Sacrament*, the first he executed on his arrival from Florence are in his third manner, or that which peculiarly marks the Roman school in its highest development" (Chambers). The two great Madonnas of Raphael are the *Madonna dellac Sedia* and the *Madonna di San Sisto*. The former, which is at the Pitti Palace, Florence, is, according to critical standards, not so perfect as others of the same painter which have failed to obtain universal popularity. But as a representation of the Roman view of the Holy Family, nothing could be more beautifully expressed. We see only a happy mother bending over the lovely child in the intensity of her affection and content, while the babe looks forth from the picture with a strange glance of conscious superiority. The *Madonna di San Sisto* cannot be described, and no copies of it, photographs or engravings, can convey a correct idea. In this work Raphael reached the perfection of his type, humanity raised to divinity. The grace and beauty of the Virgin seem apart from and above earthly associations. In the solemn, thoughtful, yet childlike expression of the infant Christ there is the foreshadowing of the sufferer, the Saviour, and the Judge. It is singular that not until 1827. when the picture was cleaned, were the innumerable heads of angels surrounding the Virgin discovered. The *Transfiguration* which was Raphael's last and also his greatest work, he left unfinished. It seems as if he had labored while already on the way to heaven, and we do not wonder that Vasari, in his ecstasy of joy over this work by human hands, with so much of heavenly skill in it, is led to exclaim, "Whosoever shall desire to see in what manner Christ transformed into the Godhead should be represented, let him come and behold it in this picture." "Raphael," says Lanzi, "is by common consent placed at the head of his art, not because he excelled all others in every department of painting, but because no other artist has ever Dossessed the varir-ns parts of the art united in so high a degree." See, besides Vasari and Lanzi, Robertson, *The Great Painters of Christendom* (published by Cassell, Lond. and N. Y., and handsomely illustrated), p. 79-95; Radcliffe, *Schools and Masters of Painting* (N.Y. 1877, 12mo), ch. viii et al.; Mrs. Clement, *Painters*, etc. (ibid. 1877, 12mo), p. 473-485; Duppa, *Life of Raphael* (in Engl., Lond. 1815); Wolzogen, *Raphael* (tr. by Burnett, ibid. 1866); Quatremere de Quincy, *Vie de Raphael* (tr. into Engl. by Hazlitt, 1846);

Perkins, *Raphael and Michael Angelo* (Lond. and Bost. 1878); *Lond. Quar. Rev.* April, 1870.

Ra' phah

(~~138D~~1 Chronicles 8:2). *SEE RAPHA*.

Raph' aim

(**Ῥαφαῖν** ; but some MSS. omit), a name given (Judith 8:1) as that of the son of Gideon and father of Acitho in the ancestry of Judith. It is evidently = **μϑαρ**, *Rephaim* (q.v.).

Raphall, Morris Jacob

a Jewish rabbi, was born at Stockholm, Sweden, in September, 1798. He was educated at the Jewish college of Copenhagen, and was so precocious that in his thirteenth year he received the Hebrew degree of Chabir Socius (analogous to the "fellowship" of the English universities), which entitled him to the honorable designation of Rabbi. In 1812 he went to England, where he remained for six years, devoting himself to the study of the English language. The next six years he spent in travelling and studying in Europe. On his return to England in 1825 he married, and took up his residence in London. In 1832 he gave some lectures on the Biblical poetry of the Hebrews, and in 1834 commenced the publication of the *Hebrew Review*, the first Jewish publication ever issued in England. When this had reached its seventy-eighth number, ill-health compelled him to relinquish it. In 1840 he acted as secretary of Dr. Solomon Henschel, the chief rabbi of London, and in 1841 he was appointed rabbi preacher of the synagogue at Birmingham, England. He was also the chief instrument in founding the first national school in England for the Jews, of which he acted as head master. In 1849, having previously received the degree of Ph.D. from the University of Giessen, he was called to New York as rabbi preacher to the Anglo-German congregation *B'nai Jeshurun*, where he died, June 23, 1868. His main work is his *Post-Biblical History of the Jews* (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols.), and the translation of *Eighteen Treatises of the Mishna*, in connection with D. A. de Sola (2d ed. Lond. 1845). Besides, he translated into English from the works of Maimonides, Albo, and Wessely, which translations are found in the *Hebrew Review*. (B. P.)

Raphel, Georg

a German Lutheran divine of some note, was born in 1673, and was last superintendent of Lineburg. He died in 1740. He was one of the best commentators of that class of exegetists who have attempted to illustrate the Bible from classic authors. His *Annotiones in Sacran Scripturam* contains historical illustrations of some passages in the Old Test., and philological explanations of many in the New, chiefly taken from Xenophon, Polybius, Arrian, and Herodotus. He also edited the Greek homilies of Chrysostom, with a Latin translation and notes, annexed to the edition of the *Annotations* published at Leyden (1747, 2 vols. 8vo). See Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl.* s.v.; Home, *Introd. to the Scriptures*.

Ra'phon

(Ὶ Ραφειών; Alex. and Josephus Ὶ Ραφών; Peshito, *Raphon*), a city of Gilead, under the walls of which Judas Maccabeus defeated Timotheus (1 Maccabees 5:37 only). It appears to have stood on the eastern side of an important wady, and at no great distance from Carnaim — probably Ashteroth-Carnaim. It may have been identical with Raphana, which is mentioned by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* v, 16) as one of the cities of the Decapolis, but with no specification of its position. Nor is there anything in the narrative of 1 Maccabees, of 2 Maccabees (ch. xii), or of Josephus (*Ant.* 12:8, 3) to enable us to decide whether the torrent in question is the Hieromax, the Zerka, or any other. In Kiepert's map, accompanying Wettstein's *lauran*, etc. (1860), a place named *Er-Rafe* is marked, on the east of Wady Hrer, one of the branches of the Wady Mandhur, and close to the great road leading to Sanamein, which last has some claims to be identified with Ashteroth-Carnaim. But in our present ignorance of the district this can only be taken as mere conjecture. If *Er-Rafe* be Raphana, we should expect to find large ruins.

Ra'phu

(Heb. *Raphu'*, ארפח; *healed*; Sept. Ὶ Ραφουῦ), father of Palti, which latter was sent with Caleb and Joshua as a spy into the promised land; representing the tribe of Benjamin (Ὶ Numbers 13:9). B.C. ante 1658.

Rappists, also known as Harmonists, are a Christian people living in community of goods, and in celibate state, at Economy, Pa., in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, and hence also not infrequently called Economites. They

owe their origin to George Rapp, a German, who was born at Iptingen, in Wirtemberg, in October, 1757, of humble parentage, and had enjoyed only a moderate education. Having always been a devout Christian and a close reader of the Bible, he became convinced that the lifeless condition of the churches was in accord with the vital character of apostolic Christianity, and in 1787 began to preach among those of like mind with himself in the little village where he was then living. The clergy resented this interference with their office, and both Rapp and his adherents were visited with all manner of persecution, and denounced as "Separatists," a name which they bore ever after while in Germany, and which they themselves accepted gladly. In the course of six years the Rappists numbered not less than 300 families, scattered over a distance of twenty miles from the home of George Rapp. The consistent manner in which the Separatists bore themselves gave little opportunity for positive accusation, yet they were constantly annoyed by government and clergy, and in 1803 finally determined to end all strife by emigration to a land of freedom. Rapp, accompanied by his son and two other followers, came to this country in advance to select a home for all like-minded with himself. In the course of one year 600 persons came over, and were settled by Rapp in different parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland, while he himself, with several skilful mechanics and ingenious persons, prepared for a family home for the Separatists the land he had purchased in Butler County, Pa., along the Conequenessing Creek. On Feb. 15, 1805, those who had come with Rapp, and such others as had followed thither, organized themselves formally and solemnly into the "Harmony Society," agreeing then to throw all their possessions into a common fund, to adopt a uniform and simple dress and style of house, to keep thenceforth all things in common, and to labor for the common good of the whole body. Later in the spring they were joined by fifty additional families; and thus they finally began with what must have made up all together less than 750 men, women, and children. But these were all accustomed to labor, and with such a leader as Rapp then was — in the prime of life, only forty-eight years old, of robust frame and sound health, with great perseverance, enterprise, and executive ability, and remarkable common-sense — the society got on very successfully. In the first year they erected between forty and fifty log-houses, a church and school-house, a grist-mill, a barn, and some workshops, and cleared 150 acres of land. In the following year they cleared 400 acres more, and built a saw-mill and a tannery, and planted a small vineyard. A distillery was also a part of this year's building — a thing not so very strange in those days of

general tendency towards strong drink among the laboring classes — though they themselves indulged only very moderately in any intoxicating liquors. Rapp was the general in all departments. He planned for all. He was their preacher, teacher, guide, and keeper.

Until 1807 community of goods and the hope of the approach of the millennial reign alone distinguished the Rappists from other Christians; but in that year an unusual religious awakening led them to determine upon a still closer life with God, and, having become persuaded that it was the duty of the followers of Jesus to conform in *all* things to the life of Christ and his apostles, the Rappists, in the spirit of the apostle Paul, that “he that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife,” forsook marriage, and since that time celibacy is one of the distinguishing tenets of the Harmonists, and they that have wives do truly live “as though they had none.” A member writing on the constancy of the Rappists to the decision of 1807, in 1862. says, “Convinced of the truth and holiness of our purpose, we voluntarily and unanimously adopted celibacy, altogether from religious motives, in order to withdraw our love entirely from the lusts of the flesh, which, with the help of God and much prayer and spiritual warfare, we have succeeded well in doing now for fifty years.”

In 1814 the Rappists determined to remove to Indiana, and the unanimity of feeling which prevailed when the council so ordered proves how well organized and how sincere they all were. They settled in the Wabash valley, on a tract of 27,000 acres, and called the place “New Harmony” — a property which, in 1824, they sold to Robert Owen (q.v.), who settled upon it his New Lanark colony — and bought and removed to the property they still hold at Economy. For some years the society was in a most flourishing condition, and, by frequent accessions from Germany, maintained their ground remarkably until 1831, when an adventurer — Bernhard Muller by right name, who had assumed the title *Graf*, or count, Maximilian de Leon, and had gathered a following of visionary Germans — joined the Economists, and sowed the seed of discord. [n 1832 Rapp determined upon a dissolution, and 250 members — about one third — left Economy for Philipsburg, where they settled, to break up in a short time, and finally to furnish a small quota to the Bethel Community in Missouri. Thereafter the Economists no more sought for accession. But they have steadily increased in wealth in spite of all their removals and numerical

decadence; and now own, besides their village and estate at Economy, much property in other places, having a large interest in coal-mines and oil-wells, and railroads and manufactories, and controlling at Beaver Falls the largest cutlery establishment in the United States.

At present the town of Economy counts about 120 houses, very regularly built, and it is well drained and paved. It has water led from a reservoir in the hills, abundant shade-trees, a church, an assembly hall, a store, and different factories. The house which the society built for their founder is a sort of museum, and serves also as a pleasure resort to all that remain of the Rappists, who, according to Nordhoff, number about 110 persons, most of whom are aged, and none under forty, with some 35 *adopted* children, and an equal number living there with parents who are hired laborers, these numbering about 100. The whole population is German, and German is the medium of communication on the street and in the church, as well as in the houses. Most of the men wear for Week-day dress blue “roundabouts,” like boys’ spencers, and pantaloons of the same color, and broadbrimmed hats; and are full of quiet dignity and genuine politeness. On Sunday the men wear long coats. The women are dressed quite as oddly as the men, with their short loose gowns, kerchiefs across the shoulders, and caps that run up to the top of a high back-comb. The present dress of the Harmonists was worn by Rapp and his associates when they came to this country, and continued from choice by them and their successors.

The agreement, or articles of association, under which the “Harmony Society” was formed in 1805. and which has been signed by all members thenceforward, reads as follows:

“Whereas, by the favor of Divine Providence, an association or community has been formed by George Rapp and many others upon the basis of Christian fellowship, the principles of which, being faithfully derived from the Sacred Scriptures, include the government of the patriarchal age, united to the community of property adopted in the days of the apostles, and wherein the simple object sought is to approximate, so far as human imperfections may allow, to the fulfilment of the will of God, by the exercise of those affections and the practice of those virtues which are essential to the happiness of man in time and throughout eternity:

“*And whereas* it is necessary to the good order and well-being of the said association that the conditions of membership should be clearly understood, and that the rights, privileges, and duties of every individual therein should be so defined as to prevent nmistake or disappointment, on the one hand, and contention or disagreement, on the other;

“*Therefore*, be it known to all whom it may concern that we, the undersigned, citizens of the county of Beaver, in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do severally and distinctly, each for himself, covenant, grant, and agree, to and with the said George Rapp and his associates as follows, viz.:

“Article 1. We, the undersigned, for ourselves, our heirs, executors, and administrators, do hereby give, grant, and forever convey to the said George Rapp and his associates, and to their heirs and assigns, all our property, real, personal, and mixed, whether it be lands and tenements, goods and chattels, money or debts due to us, jointly or severally, in possession, in remainder, or in reversion or expectancy, whatsoever and wheresoever, without eversion, qualification, or reserve, as a free gift or donation, for the benefit and use of the said association or community; and we do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs, executors, and administrators, to do all such other acts as may be necessary to vest a perfect title to the same in the said association, and to place the said property at the full disposal of the superintendent of the said community without delay.

“Article 2. We do further covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we will severally submit faithfully to the laws and regulations of said community, and will at all times manifest a ready and cheerful obedience towards those who are or may be appointed as superintendents thereof, holding ourselves bound to promote the interest and welfare of the said community, not only by the labor of our own hands, but also by that of our children, our families, and all others who now are or hereafter may be under our control.

“Article 3. If, contrary to our expectation, it should so happen that we could not render the faithful obedience aforesaid, and should be induced from that or any other cause to withdraw from the said

association, then and in such case we do expressly covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we never will claim or demand, either for ourselves, our children, or for any one beholden to us, directly or indirectly, any compensation, wages, or reward whatever for our or their labor or services rendered to the said community, or to any member thereof; but whatever we or our families jointly or severally shall or may do, all shall be held and considered as a voluntary service for our brethren.

“Article 4. In consideration of the premises, the said George Rapp and his associates do, by these presents, adopt the undersigned jointly and severally as members of the said community, whereby each of them obtains the privilege of being present at every religious meeting, and of receiving not only for themselves, but also for their children and families, all such instructions in church and school as may be reasonably required, both for their temporal good and for their eternal felicity.

“Article 5. The said George Rapp and his associates further agree to supply the undersigned severally with all the necessaries of life, as clothing, meat, drink, lodging, etc., for themselves and their families. And this provision is not limited to their days of health and strength; but when any of them shall become sick, infirm, or otherwise unfit for labor, the same support and maintenance shall be allowed as before, together with such medicine, care, attendance, and consolation as their situation may reasonably demand. And if at any time after they have become members of the association, the father or mother of a family should die or be otherwise separated from the community, and should leave their family behind, such family shall not be left orphans or destitute, but shall partake of the same rights and maintenance as before, so long as they remain in the association, as well in sickness as in health, and to such extent as their circumstances may require.

“Article 6. And if it should so happen, as above mentioned, that any of the undersigned should violate his or their agreement, and would or could not submit to the laws and regulations of the Church or the community, and for that or any other cause should withdraw from the association, then the said George Rapp and his

associates agree to refund to him or them the value of all such property as he or they may have brought into the community, in compliance with the first article of this agreement, the said value to be refunded without interest, in one, two, or three annual instalments, as the said George Rapp and his associates shall determine. And if the person or persons so withdrawing themselves were poor, and brought nothing into the community, notwithstanding they depart openly and regularly, they shall receive a donation in money, according to the length of their stay and to their conduct, and to such amount as their necessities may require, in the judgment of the superintendents of the association.”

In 1818 a book in which was recorded the amount of property contributed by each member to the general fund was destroyed. In 1836 a change was made in the formal constitution or agreement above quoted, in the following words:

- “**1.** The sixth article [in regard to refunding] is entirely annulled and made void, as if it had never existed; all others to remain in full force as heretofore.
- 2.** All the property of the society, real, personal, and mixed, in law or equity, and howsoever contributed or acquired, shall be deemed, now and forever, joint and indivisible stock. Each individual is to be considered to have finally and irrevocably parted with all his former contributions, whether in lands, goods, money, or labor; and the same rule shall apply to all future contributions, whatever they may be.
- 3.** Should any individual withdraw from the society or depart this life, neither he, in the one case, nor his representatives, in the other, shall be entitled to demand an account of said contributions, or to claim anything from the society as a matter of right. But it shall be left altogether to the discretion of the superintendent to decide whether any, and, if any, what allowance shall be made to such member or his representatives as a donation.”

On the death of “Father” Rapp, Aug. 7, 1847, the articles were re-signed by the whole society, and two trustees and seven elders were put in office to perform all the duties and assume all the authority which their founder had relinquished with his life.

Under this simple constitution the Harmony Society has flourished for sixty-nine years; nor has its life been threatened by disagreements, except in the case of the count de Leon's intrigue. It has suffered three or four lawsuits from members who had left it, but in every case the courts have decided for the society, after elaborate, and in some cases long-continued trials. It has always lived in peace and friendship with its neighbors.

Its real estate and other property was, from the foundation until his death in 1834, held in the name of Frederick (Reichert) Rapp, who was an excellent business man, and conducted all its dealings with the outside world, and had charge of its temporalities generally, the elder Rapp himself avoiding all general business. Upon Frederick's death the society formally and unanimously imposed upon father Rapp the care of the temporal as well as the spiritual affairs of the little commonwealth, placing in his name the title to all their property. But, as he did not wish to let temporal concerns interfere with his spiritual functions, and as, besides, he was then growing old, being in 1834 seventy-seven years of age, he appointed, as his helpers and subagents two members, R. L. Bilker and J. Henrici, the latter of whom is still, with Mr. Jonathan Lenz, the head of the society, Mr. Bilker having died several years ago.

The theological belief of the Harmony Society naturally crystallized under the preaching and during the life of father Rapp. It has some features of German mysticism, grafted upon a practical application of the Christian doctrine and theory. At the foundation of all lies a strong determination to make the preparation of their souls or spirits for the future life the pre-eminent business of life, and to obey in the strictest and most literal manner what they believe to be the will of God as revealed and declared by Jesus Christ. In the following paragraphs is given a brief summary of what may be called their creed:

1. They hold that Adam was created "in the likeness of God;" that he was a dual being, containing within his own person both the sexual elements, reading literally, in confirmation of this, the text (^{1800B}Genesis 1:26, 27), "And God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness, and let *them* have dominion;" and, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them;" which they hold to denote that both the Creator and the first created were of this dual nature. They believe that had Adam been content to remain in this

original state, he would have increased without the help of a female, bringing forth new beings like himself to replenish the earth.

2. But Adam fell into discontent, and God separated from his body the female part, and gave it him according to his desire, and therein they believe consisted the fall of man.

3. From this they deduce that the celibate state is more pleasing to God; that in the renewed world man will be restored to the dual Godlike and Adamic condition; and,

4. They hold that the coming of Christ and the renovation of the world are near at hand. This nearness of the millennium is a cardinal point of doctrine with them; and father Rapp firmly believed that he would live to see the wished-for reappearance of Christ in the heavens, and that he would be permitted to present his company of believers to the Saviour whom they endeavored to please with their lives. So vivid was this belief in him that it led some of his followers to fondly fancy that father Rapp would not die before Christ's coming; and there is a touching story of the old man that when he felt death upon him, at the age of ninety, he said, "If I did not know that the dear Lord meant I should present you all to him, I should think my last moments come." These were indeed his last words. To be in constant readiness for the reappearance of Christ is one of the aims of the society; nor have its members ever faltered in the faith that this great event is near at hand.

5. Jesus they hold to have been born "in the likeness of the Father;" that is to say, a dual being, as Adam before the fall.

6. They hold that Jesus taught and commanded a community of goods, and refer to the example of the early Christians as proof.

7. They believe in the ultimate redemption and salvation of all mankind; but hold that only those who follow the celibate life, and otherwise conform to what they understand to be the commandments of Jesus, will come at once into the bright and glorious company of Christ and his companions; that offenders will undergo a probation for purification.

8. They reject and detest what is commonly called "Spiritualism." — Nordhoff, *Communitistic Societies*, p. 81-86.

Raratongan Version

Raratonga, the largest and most important of the Harvey Islands, between 500 and 600 miles west of Tahiti, and discovered by the Rev. John Williams, of the London Missionary Society, in 1823, is inhabited by about 3500 inhabitants. The language of Raratonga is spoken throughout the other six islands of the Harvey group: and although it has a close affinity to the Tahitian and Marquesan idioms, yet a distinct version of the Scriptures was found necessary. The Raratongan version mainly devolved on the Rev. John Williams, and in 1830 the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Galatians were printed. In 1836 an edition of 5000 copies of the New Testament was published in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1842 a second edition of 5000 copies was printed, and in 1851 the entire Scriptures were published by the same society, having availed itself of the Raratongan version prepared by Mr. Buzacott, a missionary at Raratonga. Of the first edition 5000 copies were printed, but in 1854 a subsequent edition of 5000 copies was rendered necessary, which is still in course of circulation. The good effects of reading this version, and the change thereby produced in the state and character of the natives of Raratonga, have been thus described by the martyred Williams: "In 1823 I found them all heathens; in 1834 they were all professing Christians. At the former period I found them with idols and maraes; these, in 1834, were destroyed. I found them without a written language, and left them reading in their own tongue the wonderful works of God." See *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 378 sq. (B. P.)

Rashba

(**abçr**), the initials of RABBI SOLOMON BEN-ABRAHAM *Ibn-Adrat*, a native of Barcelona, who was born about 1285, and died in 1310. He studied under Nachmanides (q.v.), and in 1280 he was acknowledged president of the school of Barcelona, and a kind of oracle with the East and the West, with which he maintained an extensive correspondence. He was an acute thinker, an enemy to all equivocation, and an advocate of the open truth. He wrote a large collection of **µyçwdj**, or *Novellas*, discussive and expository *nf* Talmudic law, published in successive portions and times: — **twbwçtw twl aç**, *Questions and Answers* on law and ritual subjects (Lemberg, 1812): — **twrga**, *Letters* (ibid. 1809): — **çdqh tdwb[**, *On Sabbath and Festival Observances* (Buda, 1820): — **tybh trwt**, *The*

Law of the House, domestic regulations from the Talmud (Prague, 1811): — **twdga cwrp**, *Explanations of the Agadoth* (Furth, 1766). He also prohibited the study of Grecian philosophy until after twenty-five years of age. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 18 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 26; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:157 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain*, p. 112; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 301 sq.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 252; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 295; but especially the monograph by Dr. Perles, *Salomo ben-Abrahams ben-Aderet, sein Leben u. s. Schriften, nebst handschriftlichen Beilagen zum ersten Male herausgegeben* (Breslau, 1863), and the reviews of that monograph in Frankel's *Monaetsschrift*, 1863, p. 183 sq.; Geiger, *Jud. Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

Rashbam

(**µbçr**), the initials of RABBI SAMUEL BEN-MEIR, Rashi's daughter's son, who was born at Ramero about 1065, and died in 1154. He was a sober exegete, appealing to the "intelligentes." He completed the commentaries on certain Talmudic treatises left unfinished by his grandfather Rashi (q.v.), and also the commentary on Job. Rashbam's literal, grammatical, and exegetical principles in the interpretation of the Word of God convinced his grandfather to such a degree that he declared that if he had to rewrite his expositions he would adopt those principles. In this manner Rashbam wrote his commentary on the Pentateuch, under the title of **µbçr h pç** *The Expositions of Rashbam*, which was published for the first time in the edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with several commentaries (Berlin, 1705). It was republished in the imperfect condition from Oppenheimer's MS., beginning with ~~¶1800~~ Genesis 18 and ending with ~~¶1810~~ Deuteronomy 33:3, in the excellent edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with sundry commentaries (Amsterdam, 1727-29). Dr. A. Geiger published from a Munich MS. a portion of the missing commentary, extending from ~~¶1800~~ Genesis 1:1-31, in the *Kerem Chemed* (Berlin, 1854), 8:41-51, which, however, has not been inserted in the excellent edition of the Pentateuch, with sundry rabbinic commentaries, published at Vienna in 1859, in which Rashbam's commentary is given. A supercommentary, entitled **^rq l awmç**, *The Horn of Samuel*, on Rashbam's exposition, by S. S. Hessel, was published in Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1727. Rashbam also wrote a *Commentary on the Five Megilloth*, of which that on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes was published by A. Jellinek (Leipsic, 1855), while

excerpts from the other three Megilloth were also edited by the same author (ibid. 1855). Rashbam is also said to have written a commentary on the Psalms, which was edited by Isaac Satanow, Berlin, and reprinted in Vienna in 1816; but it is very doubtful whether he is really the author. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:239 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 285; Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s.v.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:158 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, ii, 391; 3:34; Levy, *Exegese bei den franzcs. Juden* (Leips. 1873), p. 17 sq.; Ginsburg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 42 sq., where the first chapter of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given in English (Lond. 1861); id. *Song of Songs* (ibid. 1857), p. 43 sq.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berl. 1845), p. 70 sq.; Geiger, in $\mu\text{y}\text{m}[\text{n y}[\text{f}\text{n}$ (ibid. 1847), p. 29-39; id. *Parshandatha* (Leips. 1855), p. 2024; Jellinek, in his edition of the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1855), p. 7 sq. (B. P.)

Rashbaz

(/bqr), the initials of RABBI SIMON BEN-ZEMACH *Duran*, who belonged to a family which, originally of Provence, was then settled in Spain, and ultimately emigrated to Algiers. In the persecution that took place in 1391, Simon Duran, with a number of his coreligionists, emigrated to Algiers, where, from his profound learning, he obtained the title of the Great. Here he succeeded Ribash (q.v.), who had also fled from Spain, as the head of all the Jewish congregations which position he occupied until his death, in 1444. He wrote various works, some so violent against Christianity and Moslemism that they have very properly been suppressed by his coreligionists. Of his works we mention $\text{f}\text{p}\text{q}\text{m bhwa}$, *The Lover of the Just*, a commentary on Job, with an introduction on the principles upon which it should be expounded; edited by Jos. Malcho (Venice, 1590), and reprinted in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible: — $\text{twba } \hat{\text{g}}\text{m}$, *Shield of the Fathers*, a great theological work, in three parts, treating of different subjects, especially of the fundamental articles of religion; to be found in the Bodleian and in *Oppenheimerianac*; one part is a commentary on the treatise *Aboth* (Livorno, 1762: Leipsic, 1855), while the second part, which is very severe against Christians and Turks, has been published by his son under the title of $\hat{\text{g}}\text{mw t}\text{q}\text{q}$, *Bow and Shield*. He was also famed for his medical abilities, and practiced with great reputation in Aragon. His profound erudition in Rabbinical lore, philosophy, and medicine procured for him the esteem of the learned Israelites of his time. His learned

solutions of upwards of 700 points of law are consulted at the present day. See First, *Bibl. Jud. i*, 216 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 92; id. *Bibliotheca Antichristiana*, p. 109, 111; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain*, p. 194; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 387; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 657; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 128; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 289; Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (1875), 8:101, 154, 170 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*. 3:87; Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. synagog. Poesie* (Berl. 1865), p. 251; Cassel, *Leitfaden der jid. Gesch. u. Literatur*, p. 13; but especially Jaulus, *R. Simeon ben-Zemach Duran*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1874, p. 241 sq. (B. P.)

Rashi

(**רש"י**), formed of the initials of RABBI SOLOMON IZCHAKI, or ISAAKI = BEN-ISAAC, the great Talmudic scholar and commentator, founder of the Germano-French school of Biblical exegesis, and erroneously called *Jarchi*, was born in 1040 at T'roes, in Champagne, and not at Lunel, in Perpignan. He was the son of a thorough Talmudist, and thus from his youth imbibed an insatiable desire to become master of Rabbinic lore. He was a pupil of B. Isaac ben-Jakar, the greatest pupil of Rabbi Gershom (q.v.). As to the extent of his scholarship, it is a matter of dispute. Basnage terms him one of the most learned of the rabbins, while Jost takes but a low estimate of his scientific and literary attainments. However this may be, he was certainly a master in Israel in the ordinary learning of his people, the Holy Scriptures, and the whole cycle of Talmudic lore. He spent much of his life in wandering from place to place, visiting the different seats of learning in Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, giving lectures and maintaining disputations in the Jewish schools. At Worms they may still show, as they could a few years ago, the chamber where he taught a class of students, and the stone seat hewn in the wall from which he dispensed his instructions. His famous lectures secured for him the distinguished and witty title of *Parshandatha* (**אֲתִדְרָשׁ**), i.e. *Interpreter of the Law*, which is the name of one of Haman's sons (~~Esther~~ Esther 9:7). Under the title **יְלֵבֵב דְּמַלְיָא תְּפִי**, He wrote a commentary on thirty treatises of the Talmud, printed in the editions of that work, and the several books separately in many different editions; they are also published with supercommentaries and glossaries: — **תְּבַבָּא יִקְרָא פ**, *A Commentary on Aboth* (Cracow, 1621, a. o.): — **תְּוִינְחֵמָה פ**, *A Commentary on the*

Mishna, condensed from that on the Talmud (Berlin, 1716): — A *Commentary on the 100 Chapters of the Bereshith Rabba*, *hbr çrdm s tyçrbs* (Venice, 1568): — a collection of Halachoth, entitled *µdrph s* (Constant. 1802): — penitential hymns, or Selichoth. Besides these, and other works too many to be enumerated, he also wrote on the Old Test., under the general title of *Perush al Esrizm vacarba*, [*braw µyrç[I [ÇWRP*, which, for the most part, is found in the Rabbinic Bibles. They have also been published in different portions in numerous editions, with and without the text, especially that on the Pentateuch, a good and critical edition of which has been edited by Dr. A. Berliner (Berlin, 1866). Various parts have also been translated into Latin by different authors, but more extensively by B. J. F. Breithaupt, 1710-14 (viz. Pentateuch, 1710; historical books, 1714; Prophets, Job, and Psalms, 1713), who also accompanied the translation with very learned and extensive annotations, besides giving the supercommentaries entitled *hyra rwg* by Lowe (Prague, 1578), and *µymkj ytpç* by Sabbatai Bass. Rashi, having been long engaged in writing annotations on the Talmud, formed the habit of composing after the manner of that work, in an extremely concise and obscure style, and with the frequent use of its terms and idioms. He condensed as much as possible, and endeavored to give the precise original thought by a natural method of interpretation, by explaining the grammar of the passage, by paraphrasing its meaning, by supplying the wanting members of elliptical forms, and by sometimes rendering a word or expression into the French of that day. At the same time, he did not fail to bring forward the received interpretations of the Talmud and Midrashim, and to point out the support which the Rabbinical Halachoth receive from such passages as he thought available. The rigid brevity of his style, which often leaves the reader in perplexity as to his meaning, has served to call forth a number of supercommentaries on his works by several Jewish authors, which are enumerated in Furst. In his commentaries on the Bible he combines the traditional exposition contained in the Talmud and Midrashim with a simple and liberal explanation of the text, and does not see any inconsistency in putting side by side with the Halachic and Hagadic interpretation his own verbal interpretations, which are sometimes at variance with tradition. Though unacquainted with the labors of the Spanish grammarians and expositors, he incorporates in his commentaries all the lore contained in the cyclopedias of Jewish tradition, as well as the learning of the French expositors, and all are made tributary to the

elucidation and illustration of the Scriptures. Rashi's piety and learning were so great, and his influence upon the Jewish nation by means of his expositions was so extraordinary, that his comments are almost looked upon as part of the Bible, and his interpretations in the present day are regarded by the most orthodox Jews as the authoritative import of Holy Writ. Rashi died July 13, 1105. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* ii, 78-90; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico Ideli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transi.), p. 125 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleian.* col. 2340-2357; Turner, *Jewish. Rabbis*, p. 17 sq., 69 sq., 110 sq.; Basnage, *list. des J/fs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 630; Geiger, *Jid. Zeitschrif*, 1867, p. 150 sq.; id. *Parshandatha* (Leips. 1855), p. 12, etc.; Zmlnz, in *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* (Berl. 1822), p. 277, etc.; id. *Heisst Rashi Jar-chi?* in Jost's *Annalen*, i, 328 and 385, etc.; Zunz, *Zue Geschichte u. Literatur* (ibid. 1845), p. 62, etc.; id. *Literatursgesch. zur synagogalen Poesie* (ibid. 1865), in 252 sq.; *Synagogale Poesie* (ibid. 1855), p. 181-183, Kimnchi, *Liber Radicum*, p. 43 sq. (Berol. 1847, ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leips. 1871), 6:70 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. d. Juden in den Roman. Staaten* (Wuirzb. 1865), p. 53 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, ii, 230 sq.; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Bresl. 1870), p. 311; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews* (Bost. 1812), i, 256; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 282 sq., 406 sq. Ginsburg, *Levita's Masoreth ha-Masoreth* (Lond. 1867), p. 105; id. *Ecclesiastes* (ibid. 1861), p. 38 sq.; and *Song of Songs* (ibid. 1857), p. 40 sq.; Keil, *Introd. to the Old Testament* (Edinb. 1870), ii, 383 sq.; Bleek, *Einleitung in das de Testament* (Berl. 1865), p. 100, 103, 105; Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Testaments* (Jena, 1869), p. 196, 199, 339, 522; Levy, *Die Exegese bei den fi'acnCsischen Israeliten avom 10ten bis 14ten J'ahrhundert.* (Leips. 1873), p. 10 sq.; and the interesting essay in Merx's *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, i, 428 sq.; Siegfried, *Rashi's Einfluss auf Nicolaus von Lya und Luther in der Auslegung der Genesis* (Halle, 1870). (B. P.)

Raskolniks

(that is, *Schismatics*), the general name used to denote the various sects which have dissented from the Russo-Greek Church. The first body that left the Established Church was the sect of the *Strigolniks*, which arose in the 14th century. Another more remarkable sect appeared in the latter part of the 15th century in the republic of Novgorod, teaching that Judaism was

the only true religion, and that Christianity was a fiction because the Messiah was not yet born. The chief promoters of this sect were two priests called Dionysius and Alexius, the protopapas of the cathedral of Novgorod, together with one named Gabriel, and a layman of high rank. These secret Jews conformed outwardly to the Greek Church with so great strictness that they were reputed to be eminent saints, and one of them, Zosimus by name, was raised, in 1490, to the dignity of archbishop of Moscow, and thus became head of the Russian Church. By the open profession of adherence to the Established Church of the country, the members of this Jewish, or rather Judaizing, sect managed to conceal their principles from public notice; but they were at length dragged to light by Gennadius, bishop of Novgorod, who accused them of having called the images of the saints logs; of having placed these images in unclean places, and gnawed them with their teeth; of having spit upon the cross, blasphemed Christ and the Virgin, and denied a future life. The grand-duke ordered a synod to be convened at Moscow on Oct. 17, 1490, to consider these charges; and although several of the members wished to examine the accused by torture, they were obliged to content themselves with anathematizing and imprisoning them. Those, however, who were sent back to Novgorod were more harshly treated. "Attired," says count Krasinski, "in fantastic dresses intended to represent demons, and having their heads covered with high caps of bark, bearing the inscription, 'This is Satan's militia,' they were placed backwards on horses, by order of the bishop, and paraded through the streets of the town, exposed to the insults of the populace. They had afterwards their caps burned upon their heads, and were confined in a prison — a barbarous treatment, undoubtedly, but still humane considering the age, and compared to that which the heretics received during that as well as the following century in Western Europe."

The metropolitan Zosimus, finding that the sect to which he secretly belonged was persecuted as heretical, resigned his dignity in 1494, and retired into a convent. About the beginning of the 16th century, a number of these Judaizing sectarians fled to Germany and Lithuania, and several others who remained in Russia were burned alive. The sect seems to have disappeared about this time; but there is still found, even at the present day, a sect of the Raskolniks which observes several of the Mosaic rites, and are called *Subotniki*, or Saturday-men, because they observe the Jewish instead of the Christian Sabbath.

Soon after the Reformation, though Protestant doctrines were for a long time unknown in Russia, a sect of heretical Raskolniks arose who began to teach that there were no sacraments, and that the belief in the diivinity of Christ, the ordinances of the councils, and the holiness of the saints was erroneous. A council of bishops convened to try the heretics condemned them to be imprisoned for life. Towards the middle of the 17th century various sects arose in consequence of the emendations introduced into the text of the Scriptures and the Liturgical books by the patriarch Nikon. This reform gave rise to the utmost commotion in the country, and a large body both of priests and laymen violently opposed what they called the Niconian heresy, alleging that the changes in question did not correct, but corrupt, the sacred books and the true doctrine. The opponents of the amended books were numerous and violent, particularly in the north of Russia, on the shores of the White Sea. By the Established Church they were now called *Raskolniks*. They propagated their opinions throughout Siberia and other distant provinces. A great number of them emigrated to Poland and even to Turkey, where they formed numerous settlements. Animated by the wildest fanaticism, many of them committed voluntary suicide, through means of what they called a baptism of fire; and it is believed that instances of this superstition occur even now in Siberia and the northern parts of Russia.

The Raskolniks are divided into two great branches, the *Popovschins* and the *Bezpaopovschins*, the former having priests, and the latter none. These again are subdivided into a great number of sects, all of which, however, are included tinder the general name of Raskolniks. The Popovschins are split into several parties in consequence of a difference of opinion among them on various points, but particularly on outward ceremonies. They consider themselves as the true Church, and regard it as an imperative duty to retain the uncorrected text of the sacred books. They consider it to be very sinful to shave the beard, to eat hares, or to drive a carriage with one pole. The separation between the Raskolniks and the Established Church was rendered complete by Peter the Great, who insisted upon all his subjects adopting the civilized customs of the West, among which was included the shaving of the beard. Peter's memory is in consequence detested by the Raskolniks; and some of them maintain that he was the real Antichrist, having shown himself to be so by changing the times, transferring the beginning of the year from the 1st of September to the 1st of January, abolishing the reckoning of the time from the beginning of the

world, and adopting the chronology of the Latin heretics who reckon from the birth of Christ.

The most numerous class of the Raskolniks are adherents of the old text, who call themselves *Staroverdzi* (those of the old faith), and are officially called *Steroobradtzi* (those of the old rites). There are very numerous sects also included under the general denomination of *Bezpopovschius*, or those who have no priests. The most remarkable are the *Skoptzi*, or Eunuchs; the *Khlestovschiki*, or Flagellants; the *Millotkrnes*, and the *Duchobortzi*. But the purest of all the sects of Russian dissenters — are the *Martinists*, who arose in the beginning of the present century, and have signalized themselves by their benevolence and pure morality. *SEE RUSSIAN SECTS; SEE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.*

Rasponi, Cesare

an Italian cardinal, was born at Ravenna, July 15, 1615, of noble family, and lived at Rome in his youth. He studied under the Jesuits with such success that they made him speak in public at fourteen years of age. Urban VIII gave him, among other presents, an abbey with a rental of 300 crowns. A poem entitled *Princeps Hiero-politicus*, dedicated to the pope, testified to the gratitude of the young beneficiary. He studied Greek; wrote some poetry, both serious and comic, in Italian; and, by the advice of cardinal Barberini, he abandoned his studies of antiquity for canonical law. Admitted to the degree of Doctor, he took possession, in 1636, of a prebendaryship of the Collegiate Church of St. John Lateran. The office of keeper of the records of that chapter gave him the opportunity to collect materials for the history of that church, which he published in 1656. He showed so much zeal and prudence in fulfilling the important duties with which he was intrusted that Innocent X, enemy of the Barberinis, loaded him with additional favors. During a voyage which he made to France, he reconciled cardinal Barberini with the pope, and was so happy as to put an end to the division which had existed so long between these two families, arresting the marriage of the niece of Innocent X with Maffeo Barberini. There is a curious manuscript of this voyage in existence, commencing Nov. 5 1648, and ending March 19, 1650. Being appointed health officer by Alexander VII, he saved the pontifical domain from the pestilence and famine which ravaged the neighboring countries. In the great quarrel which happened between the Corsican guards and the duke de Crequi, ambassador of the king of France, armed with full power by the pope, he

showed such a spirit of conciliation that, after the treaty of Pisa, concluded in 1664, the pope accorded to him the cardinal's hat (1666), and called him to the government of the duchy of Urbino, which he kept in spite of great bodily suffering. He died at Rome, Nov. 21, 1675. His tomb is in the Church of St. John Lateran. He left a large part of his wealth to the hospital of the catechumens. We have of his works *Historia Basilica S. Joannis Laterani*; he also left, in manuscript, *Memoires sur sa Vie*: — *Recueil des Statuts*, etc. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rasponi, Felice

an Italian nun, was born at Ravenna in 1523 of an illustrious house, which, since the 12th century, had given prelates, captains, senators, and magistrates to several little Italian states. She was but three years old when the death of her father, senator Zeseo, left her to the care of a mother, who brought her up with great rigor. In order to divert her mind from the severe treatment she had to endure, she learned the Latin language; studied, in the translations, Aristotle and Plato; and made the works of the holy fathers the object of her constant meditations. She was compelled to enter the convent of Sant' Andrea di Ravenna. Her learning and beauty were celebrated by many poets of the time. She was chosen superior of the convent in 1507. She died July 3, 1573. She left a *Traict de la Connoissance de Dieu*, and a *Dialogue sur l'Excellence de l'Etat Monacal*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ras'ses, Children Of

(**υἱοὶ Ῥασσῆϊς**; Vullg. *filli Tharsis*), one of the nations whose country was ravaged by Holofernes in his approach to Judea (Judith 2:23 only). They are named next to Lud (Lydia), and apparently south thereof. The old Latin version reads *Thiras et Rasis*, with which the Peshito was probably in agreement before the present corruption of its text. Wolff (*Das Buch Judith* [1861], p. 95, 96) restores the original Chaldee text of the passage as Thars and Rosos, and compares the latter name with Rhosus, a place on the Gulf of Issus, between the Ras el-Khanzir (Rhossicus Scopulus) and Iskenderun, or Alexandretta. If the above restoration of the original text is correct, the interchange of Meshech and Rosos, as connected with Thar, or Thiras (see ^{<GREEK>}Genesis 10:2), is very remarkable; since if Meshech be the original of Muscovy, Rosos can hardly be other than that of Russia. **SEE ROSH**. — Smith. The Vulg. reads *Tharsis*, which has led some to suppose

that the original was $\zeta\upsilon\zeta\rho\tau$, and that *Tarsus* is meant. Fritzsche proposes to find the place in $\text{Ὶ}\rho\omega\sigma\sigma\text{Ὶ}$, $\text{Ὶ}\rho\omega\sigma\sigma\text{Ὶ}$, a mountain-range and town south from Amanos (*Exeg. Handb.* p. 143).

Rastall, John

a learned London printer of the first half of the 16th century, deserves a place here for his controversy with John Frith, which resulted in his becoming a Protestant. He was educated at Oxford, and he died in 1536. Though he printed, edited, and translated as well as compiled many books, he is principally known in connection with his *Three Dialogues*, of which the *New Booke of Purgatorye* (1530, fol.) was answered by Frith; his *Apology against John Frith*; and *The Church of Joshn Rastall*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, 1743; Wood, *Athenoe Oxon.* i, 100.

Rastenburg, Conversation At.

This was a religious conference, held in 1531, to consider the rights of the Anabaptists in Prussia. On the Lutheran side, the debate was conducted by Poliander (q.v.), Speratus (q.v.), and Brismann; on the part of the Anabaptists. Peter Zenker (q.v.), preacher at Dantzic, replied. Duke Albert was present, and finally decided against the Anabaptists, who were banished peremptorily from the country. The Conversation at Rastenburg had been preceded by a synod, held there in 1530, on which occasion Zenker had presented his confession of faith.

Rastignac, Armand Anne Auguste Antonin Sicaire, De Chapt De,

a French prelate, nephew of Louis Jacques (q.v.), was born in 1726. He had scarcely received the degree of D.D. when he was made vicar-general by the archbishop of Arles. In the conference of the clergy in 1755 and 1760, he voted for the refusal of sacraments to the opponents of the bull *Unigenitus*. Three times he refused the bishopric; and when, in 1773, his uncle, marshal Biron, obtained for him, without his knowledge, the Abbey of Saint-Mesmain, in the diocese of Orleans, he hastened to resign a priory which he held *in commendam*. He was deputed by the clergy to the States-general in 1789; but in August, 1792, he was imprisoned, and on the 3d of September following he was massacred. Among his works are —
Questions sur la Propriete des Biens-fonds Ecclesiastiques en France

(Paris, 1789, 8vo): — *Accord de la Revelation et de la Raison comte le Deisume* (ibid. 1791, 8vo). See Hoefler. *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rastignac, Aymeric, De Chapt De,

a French prelate, was born about 1315. He was a descendant of an ancient family, originally from Limousin. After filling various ecclesiastical preferments, he became, in 1359, bishop of Volterra, Tuscany. In 1361 he was transferred by Innocent VI to the bishopric of Boulogne, and at the same time was made governor of that city. In 1364 the emperor Charles IV conferred on him a diploma which gave him the title “prince of the empire.” While chancellor of the University at Boulogne, he made for it a name which it preserved for a long time. In 1371 George XI transferred him to the bishopric of Limoges, and in 1372 the duke of Anjou made him governor-general of Limousin. He died at Limoges, Nov. 10, 1390. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rastignac, Louis Jacques, De Chapt De,

a French prelate, was born at Rastignac in 1684. He was the third son of Francois de Chapt, marquis of Rastignac. In 1714, after having been made prior of the Sarbonne, and also grand vicar of Lucon, he received the degree of D.D. In 1720 he was made bishop of Tulle; and in 1723 the king gave him the abbey La Couronne, in the diocese of Angouleme, and, two days afterwards, transferred him to the archbishopric of Tours. Pope Benedict XIII eulogized him in a short speech in 1725, on account of the zeal which he showed in opposing the Jansenists; but the many dissensions which he afterwards had with the Jesuits caused him to favor the Gallican body, and even the Jansenists. He had displayed so much talent in the meetings of the clergy in 1726, 1734, and 1743 that he was chosen to preside over those of 1745, 1747, and 1748; and the speeches which he delivered during the different sessions are monuments of his knowledge and eloquence. In 1746 he established the foundling hospital, Adeille, at Tours. By a mandamus in 1747, he condemned the book of pere Pichon, *L'Esprit de l'Eglise*; and, in order to counteract the pernicious principles of this Jesuit, in 1748 and 1749 he wrote three works — one upon repentance, one upon communion, and the third upon Christian justice in relation to the sacraments of penance and the eucharist. So many complaints were made that cardinal Rohan, by order of the king, instructed four bishops to examine the work. They wrote to M. de Rastignac, asking

for explanations; but he refused to make any. He used the greater part of his income in assisting the poor. He died Aug. 2, 1750. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rat

SEE MOLE.

Ratcliffe, William P.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamsburg, Va., Feb. 18, 1810. He was admitted to the ministry in the fall of 1834, and was transferred to the Arkansas Conference at its first session, 1836. He labored faithfully for more than thirty years, not only filling circuits, stations, and districts, but also serving as Bible agent. He died in the village of Mount Ida, Montgomery Co., Ark., May 1, 1868. — *Min. of Annual Conf. M. E. Ch., South*, 1868, p. 274.

Ratel, Louis Jean Baptiste Justin,

a French priest, was born at St. Omer, Dec. 14, 1758. He was the son of a hatter, and was placed by his uncle, a dignitary in one of the abbeys of Artois, in the Seminary of the Thirty-three at Paris, where he studied theology. Having taken license, he was, while yet very young, appointed to the living of Dunkirk. But, although French, this parish was dependent on the Dutch diocese of Ypres; and each nomination of a curate became the occasion of litigation. The abbot Ratel defended this benefice when the Revolution broke out. Having taken up arms in 1792, he did not wait to be exempted from the service on account of the weakness of his sight; and, during the terrors of the period, he took refuge with his family in the village of La Roche-Guyon. He afterwards returned to Paris, and organized and directed the correspondence with the Vendéans and the Norman Federation. He aided, also, the famous English admiral Sir William Sidney Smith to escape from the Temple, and published many pamphlets which attracted attention, particularly that one which related to the *coup d'état* of 18th Brumaire. Concealed in Boulogne, he there secretly fulfilled the duties of agent of count d'Artois, then succeeded, amid a thousand dangers, in escaping to England, where he was long known under the names of Dubois and Lemoine. His relations with lord Castlereagh and the principal members of the English cabinet enabled him to be of great service to French emigrants. It was also by his mediation that Pichegru and Moreau

were reconciled. Although absent, he was accused of various conspiracies; and he was condemned to death, and a price set on his head. He was long searched for by the imperial police. He did not return to his native city till April, 1814. During the Hundred Days he retired to Ypres, where he fell sick; and, after the return of the Bourbons, he went to live on his place at Maigiral, where he died. Jan. 26, 1816. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rates, Church,

money raised annually in the parishes of England for the maintenance or repair of the parish church, etc. Rates are agreed on by the parish in vestry assembled; and they are charged, not on the land, but on the occupier. The parish meetings are summoned by the church-wardens, who, if they neglect to do so, may be proceeded against criminally in the ecclesiastical courts. *SEE CHURCH-WARDENS*. Not fewer than eighteen bills have been before Parliament these last twenty years for the modification or settlement of church-rates. In Ireland, these rates have been altogether abolished by the Church Temporalty Act of 1833.

Rathbun, Valentine

an American divine of colonial days, flourished near the opening of the 18th century as pastor of a Baptist Church at Pittsfield, Conn., and later at Stonington, Conn., where he died in 1723. He was at one time a member of the Shaker community, but three months sufficed to satisfy him that his place was in other folds. He published a tract against the Shakers, entitled *Some Brief Hints of a Religious Scheme*, etc. (Hartford, 1781, 12mo, and often).

Rathel, Wolfgang Christopher

a German educator, of note also as a writer on patristics, was born at Selbitz, April 12, 1663; was educated at Jena; and, after teaching privately, was, in 1689, made professor of Hebrew at the gymnasium at Bayreuth, in 1697 ecclesiastical superintendent of Neustadt, and in this position savagely opposed all inroads of the Pietists. He died June 28, 1729. Among his works of interest to us is *De Bibliotheca Patrum* (Neust. 1726, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 41, 459, 460.

Ratherius (Rathier) Of Liege

a monastic of mediaeval times, was born of a noble family, probably in 890. He was reared in the convent at Lobach, in the diocese of Liege, and was afterwards one of its monks. In 926, when his friend Hilduin, also a monk, went to Italy to visit his nephew, king Hugo, Ratherius accompanied him. Hilduin was made first bishop of Verona (931), and shortly after archbishop of Milan; and upon this promotion, his friend Ratherius was placed in the vacated see of Verona. In 934, when Arnold of Bavaria invaded Italy, Ratherius sided with the invader; and when Arnold was successfully disposed of, Ratherius was promptly deposed and imprisoned at Pavia. During his incarceration he wrote his *Proeloquia* (in six books). By the intercession of powerful friends he was put into the custody of the bishop of Arno, and thence escaped, in 939, to Southern France. He was private tutor for a time, and in 944 returned to Lobach. He was full of ambition, and pined for the opportunity to return to Italy. Finally, made bold by hope of regaining the king's favor in open confession, he hastened to Hugo's presence, and really secured the forfeited place. But though restored to the see, he could not recover the favor of his parishioners; and, after various vicissitudes, he returned to the dwelling-place of his youth once more. In 952 Otho the Great called him into the vicinity of his brother Bruno; and when he was elevated to the archbishopric of Cologne, Ratherius was made bishop of Liege. He proved, however, very soon that the disappointments of life had told too greatly upon his whole character to fit him any longer for great responsibilities. He failed in all his undertakings, politically and ecclesiastically; and the discontent in the see was so great and widespread that the emperor felt compelled to dispossess him, and retire him to the little abbey of Alna, a dependence of Lobach. Even here he made himself extremely unpopular by his overzealous defence of the sacramental views of Paschasius Radbertus. In 961, for the third time, the see of Verona was given to him, but the clergy of the diocese succeeded again in effecting his removal. He was once more after this a monk at Lobach and abbot at Alna. He died before he had secured the Abbey of Lobach, for which he strove finally as if an honor to be coveted. He died at the house of the count of Namur, April 25, 974. His writings, which are numerous and valuable, are collected in one edition by P. and H. Ballerini (Verona, 1765). See Vogel, *Ratheius von Verona* (Jena, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Lea, *Hist. of Celibacy*; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. 2, Gieseler,

Eccles. Hist.; Foulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, 1, 7; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christianity*, 3:171, 172. (J. H. W.)

Rathmann, Herrmann

a German theologian of the Pietistic tendency, was born at Lubeck in 1585; studied at Leipsic, Rostock, and last at Cologne, where he became magister of the philosophical faculty; and delivered philosophical lectures at Frankfort-on-the-Main and Leipsic until 1612, when he became dean of St. John's Church at Dantzic. In 1617 he took a like position at St. Mary's, in the same place, and in 1626 was made pastor of St. Catharine's. He died June 30, 1628. He got into a controversy with his zealous Lutheran colleague, John Corvinus (q.v.), regarding Mysticism and Osiandrianism. Rathmann was a very devout man, and rejected the mere *profession* of faith as sufficient to entitle a person to Christian fellowship. He also distinguished between the mere letter of the Holy Word and its inner meaning, regarding the former as a dead, fruitless instrument ("instrumentum passivum, lumen instrumentale historicum"), which could only take life by the inspiring influence of the Holy Spirit. The Konigsberg theologians (Osiander school) accused him of Schwenkfeldianism; those of Jena, of Calvinism; only Rostock accepted his theology as orthodox. See Dorner, *Gesch. der deutschen Theologie*, p. 551 sq.; Frank, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.* i, 365 sq.; Niedner, *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1854, p. 43-181. (J. H. H.)

Rath'umus

(*Ράθυμος* v. r. *Ράθυος*; Vulg. *Rathimus*), "the story-writer" (1 Esdras 2:16, 17, 25, 30), the same as "Rehum the chancellor" (^{<508>}Ezra 4:8, 9, 17, 23).

Ratich, Wolfgang

a distinguished German educator, was born in 1571, at Wilsten, in Holstein. A difficulty in speech compelled him to give up the ministry, for which he had intended fitting himself; and he applied himself to the study of the Hebrew and Arabic languages and mathematics. He claimed to be the inventor of a new system of instruction, vastly superior to the prevailing ones, and in 1612 addressed a memorial to the Diet of Frankfort, in which he asserted that not only could old and young in a short time easily learn Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, philosophy, theology, and the arts and

sciences, but that uniformity of language and religion could be introduced into the whole empire. Several princes were led to interest themselves in his scheme. Professors Helwig and Jung, of Giessen, and Granger, Brendel, Walter, and Wolf, of Jena, were invited to investigate it. They judged it excellent in theory, and made a favorable report upon it. Ratich agreed with prince Ludwig of Anhalt-Kithen and duke John Ernest of Weimar to instruct children by his new system, and also by it to qualify teachers to give instruction in any language, in less time and with less labor than by any other method used in Germany. A printing-office was furnished him in Kbthen, and his books were printed in six languages. A school was established for him, with one hundred and thirty-five scholars. But Ratich proved incompetent to give practical effect to his theories. He became unpopular, and, being an earnest Lutheran, fell under the ban of the religious prejudices of a community attached to the Reformed faith. His school failed in a short time. Prince Ludwig quarrelled with him, and, in 1619, imprisoned him but he was released in 1620, after having signed the declaration that "he had claimed and promised more than he knew or could bring to pass." His system was now attacked by some who had been his friends. The countess Sophia von Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, however, recommended him to the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna. At the request of that statesman, Drs. BrUckner, Meyfart, and Ziegler examined his method; and they again made a favorable report upon it in 1634. Ratich, without doubt, had a practical conception of the objects of education. He preferred to give instruction in those branches which could be made useful in life rather than to pay so much attention to the dead languages. In his memorial to the Diet at Frankfort, he held that a child should first learn to read and speak the mothertongue correctly, so as to be able to use the German Bible. Hebrew and Greek should then be learned as tie tongues of the original text of the Bible, after which Latin might be studied. His views were embodied in a number of rules, or principles, the chief of which *are*:

1. Everything should be presented in its order, a due regard being always had to the course of nature.
2. Only one thing should be presented at a time.
3. Each thing should be often repeated.
4. Everything should be taught at first in the mothertongue; afterwards other languages may be taught.
5. Everything should be done without compulsion.
6. Nothing should be learned by rote.
7. There should be mutual conformity in all things.
8. First the thing by itself, and afterwards the explanation of it; that is to say, a basis of material must be laid in the mind before any rules can be applied to it. Thus, in teaching grammar, he gave no rules, but began with

the reading of the text, and required that the rules should be deduced from it. 9. Everything by expression, and the investigation by parts. In his *Methodus* he has left minute directions to teachers concerning the details of the course, and the proper methods of instruction; but they are very prolix, and impose an immense amount of labor on the teacher, without seeming to call for a corresponding degree of exertion on the part of the pupil. Comenius, after reading his book, remarked that he “had not ill displayed the faults of the school, but that his remedies were not distinctly shown.” Ratich’s works were written in Latin, and are diffuse, tedious, and somewhat pedantic. He died in 1635. See *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

Ratier, Vincent

a French preacher of note, was born in 1634. At sixteen years of age he entered the Order of the Dominicans, and in 1694 was made superior general of the order in France. He resigned this position in 1698, and died near the opening of the 18th century, greatly respected on account of his indefatigable zeal. He had preached with great success in the principal cities of France. He wrote, *Octave Anglique de Saint-Francois de Sales* (Orleans, 1667, 8vo): — *Oration Funebre de Jeanne-Gabrielle Danvet des Marets, Abbesse du. Mont-Notre-Dame, pres Provins* (Orleans, 1690, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ratification

is, in the Book of Common Prayer, used to indicate the act of confirming and sanctioning something previously done by another, as in assuming the obligations of baptism at the reception of confirmation.

Rationale

(1.) The chairs of theology and philosophy (during the scholastic ages) were the oracular seats from which the doctrines of Aristotle were expounded as the *rationale* of theological and moral truth. “There cannot be a body of rules without a *rationale*, and this *rationale* constitutes the science. There were poets before there were rules of poetical composition; but before Aristotle, or Horace, or Boileau, or Pope could write their arts of poetry and criticism, they had considered the reasons on which their precepts rested, they had conceived in their own minds a theory of the art. In like manner, there were navigators before there was an art of navigation; but before the art of navigation could teach the methods of finding the

ship's place by observations of the heavenly bodies, the science of astronomy must have explained the system of the world." Anthony Sparrow, bishop of Exeter. is the author of a work entitled *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*.

(2.) A peculiar form of the bishop's *pallium* (*pectorale*, λογύον), appropriated by the bishops of Rome to themselves from the time in which they began to assume the title of *pontifices maximi* and the dignity of the high-priests of the Old Testament. It was sometimes sent by the Roman pontiffs to other bishops as a mark of distinction and favor. It was in the form of a trefoil, quatrefoil, or oblong square, like the piece of stuff worn by the Aaronic high-priest. It appears in England on bishop Gifford's monument at Worcester in 1301. It was worn, perhaps for the last time on record, at Rheims. The pope has a formal, and cardinals and Italian bishops wear superb brooches to clasp their copes. The Greek περιστέθιον, worn by patriarchs and metropolitans over the chasuble, is an oblong plate of gold or silver, jewelled.

(3.) The word *rationale* is also the name of a treatise explaining the meaning, and justifying the continuance, of that ceremonial which it was thought fit to retain in the Church of England in the year 1541. The members of the committee to whom this subject was intrusted were warmly attached to the splendor of the Roman ritual, and, of course, made few alterations. The collects in which prayers were offered for the pope, and the offices for Thomas a Becket and some other saints, were omitted; but so slight were the changes introduced that in many churches the missal and breviary already in use were retained. The *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of Durand, bishop of Mende, written in the latter part of the 13th century, gives the "reasons" of the forms and ceremonies of Romish worship. See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* v, 106; Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.* 1, 63; Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* (see Index).

Rationalism

a term applied to a specific movement in theology which assumed definite shape about the middle of the 18th century, and culminated in the first decades of the 19th. Its chief seat was in Protestant Germany. Its distinguishing trait consisted in erecting the human understanding into a supreme judge over the Word of God, and thus, by implication, denying the importance, and even necessity, of any miraculous revelation whatever.

But a tendency to rationalism has existed to some degree wherever human thought has made the least advances. Especially are its outbreaks distinctly recognisable at several points along the course of the history of theology; and in several countries it had existed as a clearly defined movement even before its full development in Germany. (In the chief features of this article, we shall follow the paper of Dr. Tholuck in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* 12:537-554.)

I. English Rationalism. — Sporadic tendencies towards rationalism existed among the Averrhoists in the Middle Ages, and among the anti-Trinitarians of the 16th century; but these were largely of a philosophical or a mystical type. But in English *deism* the tendency became definitely theological and anti-Biblical. In reaction against the confessional persecutions and intolerance of the 17th century, not a few gifted minds were led to look for a really tenable position only in the elementary traits that are common to all confessions, and even to all religions whatsoever. This led gradually to a denial of the necessity of revelation, and to an exclusive reliance upon the light of nature (*lumen natura*). This *lumen* became thus both the source and the judge of all religious truth. This movement was variously styled *naturalism*, *deism*, and occasionally also *rationalism*. English deism differs, however, in this respect from German—that it proceeded mainly from non-theologians, and was openly hostile to the Bible; whereas German rationalism sprang from theologians eminent in the Church, and it professedly honored the Scriptures as a valuable summary of the highest religious truths. The former, according to Nitzsch (*System*, § 28), was largely a *denier of revelation*; the latter was a *philosophical exegete*. But as the former relied, in the last instance, on the *lumen naturae*, and the latter on the so-called “sound human understanding,” the ultimate result was identical.

II. Rationalisms in the Netherlands. — This arose simultaneously with English deism. Here, also, the toleration of different confessions led to latitudinarianism. The tendency was further promoted by a revival of classical humanism. Forerunners of rationalism appeared before the middle of the 17th century. Voetius (*Disput. Theol. i*, 1) mentions a work (of 1633) which did not hesitate to hold thus: *Naturalis ratio iudex et norma fidei*. The tendency was systematically prepared for by the Cartesian philosophy. Without directly touching the foundations of faith, it yet silently undermined them by the fundamental maxim, *De omnibus*

dubitandum. This maxim, though reverently intended, yet resulted, in practice, in a thoroughly anti-Biblical drift. Duker and Roell held that human reason is as infallible as God, its author; and that if it ever errs, this results from mere lack of attention to its inner light. The influence of Spinoza was in the same direction. In his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, he had subjected the religion of the Bible to a philosophical interpretation which was fatal to its positive validity. His disciple, L. Meyer, taught unhesitatingly (1666), *Quidquid rationi contrarium, illud non est credendum*. Also from the time of Spinoza forward there appears, even among devout theologians, a tendency to break loose from orthodox traditions. This is further promoted by the works of gifted French refugees—Bayle, Le Clerc, and others.

III. German Rationalism. — This subject falls naturally into the following five subdivisions: the period of preparatory discussion (1660-1750); the period of historical criticism (1750 -1780); the period of philosophical criticism (1780-1800); the period of the so-called *rationalismus vulgaris* (1800-1814); the period of philosophical rationalism (from Kant to Feuerbach).

1. Preparatory. — It was only incidentally that foreign rationalism attracted the attention of German theologians before the close of the 17th century. The earliest assailant of Herbert of Cherbury and of Spinoza was Musaeus, in 1667 and 1674. But a German basis for rationalism had already been laid. In the midst of the violence of orthodox polemics, Calixtus had laid the foundations for a less rigid tendency. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) had spread immorality among the masses and indifference among the nobility. The succeeding years of material prosperity and of French luxury still further undermined the power of the old orthodoxy. But the Lutheran Church still firmly held its old position till towards the close of the century. The Reformed Church was the first to be affected. Duisburg became the rallying-point of suspected Cartesians from all quarters. Here H. Hulsius (1688) defended the principle of Roell, that reason is the ultimate judge in matters of faith, and substituted syllogistic argumentation for the *testimonium internum*. He also declared that theology was the handmaid of philosophy, instead of the converse. The same views were found elsewhere in Reformed circles. Bashuvsen held, in a dissertation (Zerbst, 1727), that reason is the test of faith, and that none but fanatics appealed to a *testimonium spiritus*. Similar sentiments soon found place in Lutheran schools, though not in the theological faculties.

Thomasius, first at Leipsic, then at Halle, was the first to give to them much prominence. His main endeavor of life was the “dissipation of prejudices” from every field of thought or inquiry, and the criterion of his efforts was a prudential regard for the “useful;” and as the only judge of the “useful” was the so-called common-sense of the educated classes, it is plain that the rationalistic foundation was already fully laid. But the name rationalism was as yet almost wholly unknown, and in outward form the authority of the Scriptures was still almost universally admitted.

Inside of the German Church of the 17th century, and down to the middle of the 18th, there prevailed two parallel streams of life — the subjective devotion of pietism, and a subjective proclivity to individual criticism — both of them having this in common, that they opposed the objective validity of formal orthodoxy. On the part of pietism, this opposition was not *consciously* intended; but in lavishing such exclusive emphasis on the Bible as opposed to creeds, and on the witness of the Spirit as opposed to priestly guidance, it actually did so in fact. Thus the venerable Michael Lang, of Altdorf, allowed himself, in his zeal for vital piety, to stigmatize the orthodox symbols as ape-Bibles and sectarian documents. Speller found the yoke of these symbols insupportable in some points; Joachim Lange and others actually disregarded them on occasion. Haferung seriously objects to the formula that goodworks spring from faith. The pious Rambach virtually undermines the orthodox theory of inspiration. The form of dogmatics began to undergo a change. Breithaupt (1700) and Freylinghausen (1703) purposely avoided the traditional phraseology in their systems of theology. And this tendency from within the Church was promoted by influences which came now from England and Holland. The force of this influence may be judged of by the opposition it at first met with. Lilienthal mentions, between 1680 and 1720, no less than forty-six works against atheism, twenty-seven against rationalism, and fifteen against indifferentism. The forms of the opposition varied all the way from a natural desire for a clear understanding of the grounds of faith to an absolute indifference, or even a frivolous atheism. The eminent Leipsic pastor Zeidler (1735) thought to honor the Bible by the utmost contempt of systems of doctrine. Out of pietism there sprang a number of warmhearted mystics, who laid exclusive stress on the “inner spark, the inner word,” thus opening the path to every sort of vagary. Under the guidance of this “inner word,” Dippel presented, in 1697, a very free criticism of the dogmas of inspiration and atonement. Loscher complained,

in 1725, that even good theologians were falling into the danger of insisting simply on Christian love and morals, and forgetting the danger from assaults of false teachers. In the same year, an eminent publicist called for a consolidation of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, asserting that, after all, piety and love were the only things essential. Edelmann began, in 1735, with slight variations from strict orthodoxy, and ended, with Spinoza, in denying the personality of God and the immortality of the soul. The aged Loscher sorrowfully laments, in 1746, that, after his fortyseven years of faithful ministry, the condition of theology and of the Church was only growing worse and worse; and sadder still is the lament of Koch, in 1754, that the Bible had almost lost all respect on the part of the cultured classes, and that it was abandoned to the ignorant as a collection of childish fables.

All the preceding inroads upon orthodox tradition had been carried out under the demands of the so-called sound human understanding. It was mostly the work of non-theologians. But from the beginning of the 18th century, a definite philosophical system was made to serve the interests of rationalism. Leibnitz and Wolff threw out thoughts that powerfully contributed to ends which their authors were very far from intending. Leibnitz's distinction of doctrines into those which can be rationally proved and those which are above reason was used to cast positive suspicion upon the whole of the latter class. Wolff's distinction of theology into the two parts, natural and revealed, was turned to the same service. As natural theology could give a *reason* for its dicta, and revealed theology could *not*, it came to pass that almost the whole stress was laid upon the former. But this incipient undermining process was as yet hardly felt outside of the professional circles. The pulpit remained almost unaffected. The most eminent example of the union of the old with the new tendencies was in the case of Matthew Pfaff, professor in Tubingen (1716), then in Giessen (1756), who died in 1760. Holding fast to the chief old landmarks, he yet relaxed much from confessional rigidity, and earnestly labored for the union of the two German churches. The mention of Pfaff brings us to the close of this first phase of German rationalism.

2. The Period of Historical Criticism. — The condition of theology, and, indeed, of science and art also, about the middle of the 18th century, was that of a mummylike stiffness and a shallow systematization. The vital contest which had broken out in Spener's time between pietism and orthodoxy had lost its vigor and died away. The second generation of Halle

pietists had left the stage, J. H. Michaelis in 1738, J. Lange in 1744; G. Francke outlived his age — until 1770. So, also, had departed the last champions of the old orthodoxy — Wernsdorf in 1729, Cyprian in 1745, Loscher in 1749; Wolff, having outlived the vitality of his own system, departed in sadness in 1754. The superficial and pedantic Gottsched still held his mastery in the fine arts. An unproductive, compiling spirit prevailed in science and theology. “Most of our preachers,” says Erenius, “give now large attention to the making of collections of curiosities, stamps, and old coins.” There was wanting a fresh wind to fill the weary sails of life. But just now the lacking stimulus was abundantly supplied; it was furnished by the furor of criticism which broke out first on the field of *history*, then on that of *philosophy*.

Although Thomasius and others had already done something in the field of historical criticism, this was only from a superficial, empirical standpoint. It was only when historical criticism assumed a thorough and systematic form that it wrought its full clarifying and revolutionizing effects on the whole field of theology. New investigations were now instituted; every nook and corner of antiquity, linguistics, and science of every form was subjected to a searching and sifting such as had never before been paralleled; and the results attained were such as clearly required a re-examination and reconstruction of the whole circle of the religious sciences. It is true the main motive which inspired the critical movement was devoid of deep religious character, and hence many of its boasted results have proved to be untenable; but many others are admitted, and accepted by all parties as absolutely unassailable.

Also, on this critical field, English deism had been in the advance, and had contributed no insignificant results. Toland, Collins, Tindal, and Bolingbroke had unsettled the popular faith in the authenticity of the canon, insisting that the multiplicity of apocryphal books, some of them accepted by the fathers, threw doubt upon all the others; that many passages in the Gospels were manifestly spurious; that the time of the settlement of the canon was absolutely unknown; that the genuine sacred books of the Jews had perished in the time of the Exile, etc. Hobbes gave lengthy reasons for disbelieving the Pentateuch; Collins threw discredit upon Daniel; Morgan gave to the views of Toland and Bolingbroke an attractive rhetorical expression, thus disseminating them among the uneducated. Collins assailed the very foundations of the historical argument to wit, the prophecies — insisting that the predictions of the Old

Testament relate, when properly interpreted, to very different things from those to which the New-Testament writers apply them. Only in one of the Prophets — Daniel — are there real predictions; but these relate, not to Christ, but to political events. Moreover, these prophecies of Daniel “were written after the events.”

In Germany the full tide of revolutionary criticism takes systematic form in Semler of Halle. By Semler almost the whole circle of orthodox landmarks was thrown into confusion: the Bible-text was assailed; the pertinency of standard proof-texts was denied; the genuineness of Biblical books was contested; the foundation was dashed away from numerous usages and dogmas which had hitherto passed as absolutely unassailable. Although many of the points which Semler made were subsequently further developed and accepted as sound, yet the immediate effect in *his* day was to throw doubt into the whole arsenal of orthodoxy.

The general effect was to set in motion an unparalleled vigor of critical investigation. It spread like wildfire among all the universities and all ranks of the clergy. Biblical criticism and exegesis, the history of the Church and of doctrine, were speedily enriched and enlarged. In Halle, Semler found an able and like-spirited pupil in Gruner, at Leipsic labored the cautious but progressive Ernesti (since 1759); Michaelis represented the movement at Gottingen (since 1750); Griesbach, Doderlein, Eichhorn, at Jena; Henke at Helmstedt, Tollmer, Steinhart, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Under the labors of these and kindred critics there was scarcely a single dogma that remained unscathed. But the general inspiration, the purpose, of the whole is not the overturning, but only the clarification, the correct construction, of the Biblical teachings. Even the authority of the Church is held fast to by Semler, though in a peculiar manner. The symbols and forms of the Church are useful in preserving external unity and uniformity. Criticism is simply the right of the private judgment of the individual. His position seemed practically to involve a doubt of the possibility of attaining to objective truth; his radical mistake was the assumption that religion can exist without a doctrinal basis. Starting out from the warm atmosphere of pietism, he gradually descended until he had little more reverence for the oracles of God than for the fables of Ovid. Holding that the inner conviction of our own truth-loving heart is the sole test as to the inspiration of a book, he decided against the claim of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the Canticles; he doubted the genuineness of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel; he held that the Pentateuch is but a collection of legendary

fragments. The New Testament is better than the Old, though some of its parts are positively pernicious; the Apocalypse is the fabrication of a fanatic; the Gospel of John is the only one which is *useful* for the modern Church. There are two elements in the Bible, the transitory and the eternal. It is the prerogative of criticism to sift among the chaff and select out the scattered grains of pure truth. Much of the Bible was written simply for local or party purposes: it was never intended for general use. A principle of which Semler made large use was the celebrated "accommodation theory." He insisted, namely, that Christ and the apostles taught many things by way of mere accommodation to the whims and prejudices of the age. They did not abruptly contradict many false views that prevailed, but they partially accepted them, though planting within them a substratum of absolute truth. To sift out this truth from the encasement of rubbish is the privilege of the clear-sighted modern critic. In the field of dogmatics Semler was almost ferocious in his iconoclasm. For the Protestant or even the apostolical fathers he showed the most thorough disrespect. One after another of the central dogmas of orthodoxy fell under the hammer of his criticism, and seemed to be dissipated forever. And what Semler did at Halle, a bold choir of like-minded men did in other parts of Germany.

Of very considerable influence in this second half of the 18th century were translations of the works of English and Dutch rationalists and deists. Semler himself acknowledges his great indebtedness to Wettstein and Le Clerc. The biographies of the day are full of references to the wide influence of Toland and Tindal. The same fact is evinced by the scores and scores of clerical attempts at refuting these sceptics.

From the lawless subjectivism of Semler the descent was easy to the most absurd and degrading consequences. Two theological writers especially carried out the logical consequences in both their writings and their lives. Edelmann took up the tradition of Thomasius, and constructed his whole system of theology from a superficial utilitarian standpoint. Not what is *true*, but what is of use to the subject, was his whole inquiry. The result was that he simply reduced Christianity to a feeble and insipid deism. But the climax was reached in Bahrtdt. This man used his eminent popular talents to ridicule the Bible, to blaspheme Christ, and to degrade to the very lowest infamy the name of theologian. His popular treatises were read by the ten thousand, and produced great evil. But his career as a whole marked a turning-point in the tide of rationalism. Criticism, when left unguided by any fixed principle of objective truth, was found to be fruitless

and to lead only to destruction. It became necessary to look about for some corner-stone of truth upon which to stay the tottering edifice of theology and religion. The various attempts to discover this constitute —

3. *The Period of Philosophical Criticism (1780-1800).* — After the decline of the popularity of Wolff, the vitality of philosophy in Germany stood at the zero point. So long as philosophy was represented by the feeble eclecticism of Mendelssohn, Garve, Sulzer, Meiners, Platner, Reinhard, and Flatt, the criticism of the Semler school could flatter itself with standing upon philosophical ground; for both tendencies were built upon the one principle of the so-called “sound human understanding.” But when Kant came, both systems were overturned at a blow. Kant showed that our transcendental knowledge reaches no further than our experience, and that our knowledge of supernatural objects is defensible only as postulates of the practical reason. Philosophy and theology must concede that the proofs for the existence of God avail no further than simply to establish a probability. The subjective morality of utility was overthrown by the principle that no morality is possible save where it is grounded upon a purely objective “ought.” It was shown that the whole duty of theology was, by the help of religious ideas, to contribute to the supremacy of the “ought” in human society. But also the philosophy of Kant took on somewhat of the coloring of the age, and many of the old rationalists interpreted it as favorable to them. Thus the three Kantian *postulates* of the *practical* reason were metamorphosed into mere *hypotheses* of the *theoretical* reason. The objective categorical imperative was identified with the subjective voice of conscience; and that “morality is the chief thing in religion” was said to be the very essence of the old subjectivism. But there were two phases to the matter: while one current of rationalistic theology welcomed Kant and vainly hoped to force the new wine into the old bottles, another current mocked at it as mere mysticism and scholastic jargon. Only a few deeper-sighted men, such as Schmidt, Vogel, and Tieftrunk, saw the folly of both of these positions — saw that the *new* was utterly subversive of the *old*.

4. *The Period of the So-called Rationalismus Vulgaris (1800-1833).* — The attitude of the theology dominant at the dawn of the 19th century was thus: The Holy Scriptures *rationaly interpreted* were still revered as the codex of a rational religion and morality. But with every advance step in what was called historical exegesis, the discrepancy between the traditional sense of the Bible and the new construction which reason endeavored to

put upon it became more strikingly apparent. Semler's accommodation theory was made to apply to every narrative and every doctrinal statement of the whole Bible. Every passage in the Scriptures was thought to be so enveloped in a Judaistic haze as to render necessary a great deal of clarification before the true sense could be reached. The New Testament citations from the Old were thought to be totally misapplied. Jesus was thought by some to have been a veritable fanatic. John the Baptist regarded him as sinless; but did Jesus think so himself? The myth theory began now to play its *role*. L. Bauer published in 1800 a Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testaments; the miracles were explained away as mere natural events.

As early as 1794 the aspect of matters was thus summed up by Riem: "The champions of the religion of pure reason have already advanced so far that all the best theologians are going over to them, and all candidates for position hold them in great honor. It has already come to be a settled matter that reason is the court of highest appeal; and that this court will not decide against itself is easy to see." A writer in 1792 had said: "The truth of a doctrine rests upon rational grounds. If it can stand the test of reason; if it does not contradict any of the results of science and experience; if it commends itself to all rational men, then it is true, and no fanatic can prove the contrary." Krug went so far in 1795 as to deny to Christian truth any more permanent worth than that of the teachings of any other transitory system of philosophy. "Let no one say that God could make none other than a perfect revelation. There is no perfect revelation. The utterances of holy men spring up from their souls just as the utterances of other men; hence they necessarily bear the coloring of the environment from which they sprang." Such sentiments were legislatively condemned in some parts of Germany; but not so in Prussia. Here the chief Church councillor, Teller, on being asked whether any positive confession was any longer to be exacted of candidates for Church membership, replied that, apart from baptism and the eucharist, no other yoke was to be imposed; on the contrary, every applicant was to be unhesitatingly received with the simple formula: "I baptize thee upon thy confession of Christ, the founder of a more spiritual and more joyous religion than that of the society [the world] to which thou hast hitherto belonged."

With the changed phase of things at the close of the 18th century, the term "rationalism" came into more frequent use. At first it was chiefly used by opponents. Men like Gabler contrasted rationalism with the fundamental

principle of Protestantism. to wit, the normative authority of the Bible, showing the utter inconsistency of the two. Henceforth it is used mainly as a term of reproach; it was never cordially accepted by those to whom it was applied.

As soon as rationalism became clearly conscious of its attitude towards revelation, it felt more fully than ever the necessity of defining its own fundamental principles. Also an external stimulus urged it to this step. Hitherto it had peaceably reclined its head on the bosom of each successively rising system of philosophy; but since the rise of the speculative systems of Fichte and Schelling, such an alliance was impossible. The haughty speculative systems disdained to fraternize with the superficial reasonings of the “sound human understanding.” Also, even rationalism stood aghast at the bottomless abyss of the pantheistic mysticism of Schelling; and numerous works of rationalistic source assailed the new “atheism.” But the empirical platitudes of rationalism met with only ridicule and sneers from the new lords of the intellectual world. Fichte, Schelling, and Goethe agreed in stigmatizing the best principles and the whole system of the rationalists as commonplace and vulgar.

At last, however, there appeared a system of philosophy under the wings of which the rationalists felt that they could flee for refuge; this was the faith-philosophy of Jacobi. The radical weakness of the old rationalism was that it gave no scope to the spontaneities of sentiment and the heart, but rather measured everything by the cold, dry processes of argumentation. It was utterly ungenial, unpoetic; a mere probability was the highest word it could say in behalf of the most central truths. The system of Jacobi remedied this. It supplemented the coldness of mere intellectual probability by the “immediate certainty of feeling;” it restored to *faith* its co-legitimacy with knowledge. Accordingly, all the better representatives of honest rationalism hailed the faith-philosophy of Jacobi, and used it to rescue the sinking bark of the current theology. Notably was this the case with Gabler, who now urged as the deepest proof of the truth of religion a “Nithigungsgefühl mit Uraussprüchen der allgemeinen Vernunft” — that is, he held that religious truth commends itself directly to our inner consciousness with all the compelling force of intuition. From this time forward it became common to lay great stress upon what, with Kant, was the imperative of the practical reason, and to style it the faith of reason (*Vernunftglauben*). This procedure was partially justified by Kant himself, who claimed to have set limits to reason only in order to give greater play

to faith. It was still more justified by the Half-Kantians, such as Bouterweck, who derives all the ideas of reason from a so-called truth-feeling and truth-faith. This is the philosophic ground upon which are based the definitions of reason and the understanding as given in the theology of Bretschneider and Wegscheider; to wit, that reason is the faculty for generating ideas directly out of consciousness without the intervention of the discursive activity, while understanding is the faculty for confirming and elucidating these ideas.

Thus rationalism has, since the beginning of the 19th century, made considerable advances beyond its previous dry and shallow common-senseism. It was helped to this by the philosophy of Fries, who, by his doctrine of faith and insight, placed reason in antagonism to the understanding; and still more so when this philosophy was adopted by the gifted and noble-minded De Wette. For a long while yet — into the third decade — the tone and foibles of rationalism remained largely the same as those given to it by the abstract, shallow prosiness of Nicolai and of Teller, of Semler, and in some respects of Gabler, Rohr and Paulus follow in the steps of Teller; Bretschneider and Wegscheider reproduce much of the loose syncretism of a Semler. The chief scientific weakness of Wegscheider's celebrated *Institutiones* lies in its dearth of definitely fixed ideas and in its avoidance of decided utterances. He asserts: "In rebus gravissimis ad religionem pertinentibus convenire omnes gentes." Hase raises the question whether any real student of the history of philosophy could agree to this. Wegscheider's only defence is to timidly insert a *ferè omnes*. He reiterates the old demonstrations of the existence of God; and when Kant's antinomies stare him in the face, he concedes that, taken singly, these demonstrations are not conclusive, but thinks that they are so when *taken all together*. Hahn declares that deism and naturalistic rationalism are identical. Wegscheider indignantly protests, inasmuch as rationalism accepts revelation thus far: that God endowed the founder of Christianity with extraordinary inner gifts, and gave him many outward tokens of special guidance."

At this point there rises the so-called *supernaturalist* school. It includes those who protested against the absolute autonomy of reason in matters of religion; and though many of its adherents still clung to views irreconcilable with due reverence for the Bible, still it formed the platform upon which a higher and more Biblical standpoint was subsequently reached. Among these supernaturalists were men like Storr and Flatt in

Wurtemberg, and Reinhard in Dresden. But by the beginning of the second decade of the century even these feeble supernaturalist voices were silent, and rationalism seemed to remain solitary and victorious upon the field of battle. Yet the dry crumbs of rationalism could not satisfy the deep wants of the German nation; the stimulus to a deeper insight and a richer faith came from without. It was from the thunder-strokes of the Leipsic and the Waterloo victories that the rejuvenation of German life went forth. This rejuvenation brought, in its train a restoration of life, first in the German Church and then in German theology. Inside of theology the rationalistic movement continued until 1825. Among its ablest assailants at this time are Tittmann and Sartorius; but outside of the schools many signs indicated that its reign was over. The new policy of the Prussian government discountenanced it; the religious and patriotic enthusiasm occasioned by the tercentenary of the Reformation (1817) was uncongenial to it, the theses of Harms and the disputation of Leipsic (which had the courage to summon the rationalistic clergy to resign their clerical positions) were of the same purport. In 1830 the new *Kirchenzeitung* of Hengstenberg went so far even as to call for the expulsion of rationalistic professors from the universities. As yet, however, it was but a small band who opposed rationalism. But they had the courage of faith and the vitality of truth on their side, and their influence was very deeply felt.

Just at this time the decisive influence of Schleiermacher came to the help of the opponents of rationalism. With all its rationalistic methods, the system of this great theologian was hostile to rationalism as a whole. It promoted a positive faith in a positive Christianity; it was powerfully influential in implanting a reverence for positive religion in the higher and learned circles of German life; it regarded religion as one of the essential necessities of human nature, and it saw in the Church an organization essential to the nurture of religion. The period was now past when *faith* and *culture* were regarded as uncongenial to each other. In effecting this change in public sentiment, Fichte and Schelling contributed no inconsiderable increments to the potent influence of Schleiermacher. The very last scientific effort of rationalism was made on the appearance of Hase's *Inutterus Redivivus*. In this book Hase transports himself into the sphere of ancient Protestant orthodoxy, and attempts such a presentation of it as shall harmonize with the rich fruits of modern culture. The school of Rohr assailed (1833) this book with desperate earnestness; but the very choice of its weapons betrayed the forlorn hope of the cause. The replies

which Hase made to these assaults may be regarded as having given the death-blow to scientific rationalism. As a result of the contest, rationalism was forced to confess that the "reason" upon which it leans for support is simply the common-sense of man in general. Henceforth the system is branded with the title *rationalismus vulgaris*, against which Rohr himself has no other objection to make save that the adjective *communis* would be a little more polite.

5. Philosophical Rationalism. — During the whole period of theological rationalism there had existed a current of *philosophical* rationalism. The climax of this current was reached when Hegel persuaded himself that he had imposed upon Christianity such an interpretation as presented it as the adequate expression of the very highest philosophical truth. But this climax-period was but of momentary duration. When the vapors of enthusiasm were dissipated, it was seen that this transfiguration of Christianity was but a delusion. The downward flow of speculative rationalism begins with Strauss's *Dogmatik* (1840). In this work it is shown that the connection between speculative thought and Christian doctrine is only of the very slightest kind. The next downward step was taken by the Young Hegelians, when they taught, with Feuerbach, that philosophy alone can give any real satisfaction to thought, and that religion can serve at best only a practical need. This changed opinion in regard to the nature of religion sprang from a changed position in philosophy. The profound monism of Hegel had given place to a feeble dualism. Feuerbach denies that speculative thought is the only instrument for philosophizing, and insists that the telescope of the astronomer and the hammer of the geologist are also entitled to respect. Thus *induction* is substituted for *deduction*, and the entering wedge for the whole stream of modern materialism is started in its course. The climax of speculative degradation was reached when, in the hands of the more advanced Young Hegelians, philosophy completely disowned itself, and confessed that the sum total of attainable useful truth is to be found in the path of material experiment and practical observation.

We have now reached the close of rationalism as a vital movement. It sprang out of a reaction against the stiff, formal orthodoxy of the opening 18th century. It expired in 1833, under the critical strokes of Hase and the religious inspiration that went out from Schleiermacher. Taking up the inspiration of Schleiermacher, and rising to a much higher theological position than he, a noble company of the most gifted theologians of any

age have completely rescued German scientific theology from the dishonor and obscurity which had befallen it during the rationalistic period. Pre-eminent among these rehabilitators of orthodoxy are such men as Neander, Nitzsch, Ewald, Julius Stiller, Dorner, Twisten, Olshausen, Sack, Ebrard, Ullmann, Hundeshagen, Lücke, Umbreit, Stier, Hagenbach, Gieseler, Bleek, Tholuck, Rothe, and their disciples. In the hands of these men Christian theology has been raised to the dignity of the noblest of sciences; and supreme reverence for Christ and the Bible have been shown to consist well with the profoundest learning and the greatest speculative ability.

But the scattered echoes of German rationalism were long in entirely dying away. Faint imitations of the movement went out over all the other Protestant nations. It invaded modern Holland and England and France and America. But in these countries it was but a foreign importation, and it has shown no vital power of original production. And even in Germany there are individual representatives of the dead system. But these are without popular power or scientific significance. They are simply echoes from a buried past.

IV. Literature. — On the general subject of rationalism, consult Staudlin, *Gesch. des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus* (1826); Saintes, *Hist. du Rationalisme* (1841); Hagenbach, *Gesch. des 18ten und 19ten Jahrhunderts* (1856); Hundeshagen, *Der deutsche Protestantismus* (1850); Auberlen, *Die göttliche Offenbarung* (Basle, 1861-64); Beyschlag, *Ueber das "Leben Jesu" von Renan* (Halle, 1864); Bockshammer, *Offenbarung und Theologie* (Stuttg. 1822); Bretschneider, *Ueber die Grundprincipien der evang. Theologie* (1832); La Saussaye, *La Crise Religieuse en Hollande* (Leyd. 1860); Cornil, *Feuerbach und seine Stellung zur Religion und Philos. der Gegenwart* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1851); Engelhardt, *Schelling und Strauss* (Erlangen, 1864); Feldmann, *Der Wahre Christus und sein rechtes Symbol* (Altona, 1865); Van Prinsterer, *Le Parti Anti-revolutionnaire et Confessionnel dans l'Anglise Reformee des Pays Bas* (Amsterdam, 1860); Haffner, *Die deutsche Aufklärung* (Münch., 1864); Held, *Jesus der Christ* (Zurich, 1865); Henhofer, *Der Kampf des Unglaubens* (Heidelberg, 1861); Henke, *Rationalismus und Traditionalismus im 19ten Jahrhundert* (1864); De Groot, *Die Groninger Theologen* (Gotha, 1863); Hurter, *Ueber die Rechte der Vernunft und des Glaubens* (Innsbruck, 1863); Kahnis, *Der innere Gange des deutschen Protestantismus seit der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Leipsic, 1854); Nicolas, *Die Gottheit Jesu* (Regensburg,

1864); Noacl, *Die Freidenker in der Religion* (Berne, 1851); Riggenbach, *Der heutige Rationalismus* (Basle, 1862); Riickert, *Der Rationalismus* (Leipsic, 1859); Schott, *Briefe iber Religion* (Jena, 1826); Schwartz, *Zur Gesch. der neuesten Theologie* (Leipsic, 1864); Tholuck, *Die Gesch. des Rationalismus* (Berlin, 1865); Astie, *Les Deux Theologies Nouvelles* (Paris, 1862); Colani, *Ma Position* (ibid. 1860); Fazet, *Lettres h un Rationaliste* (ibid. 1864); Franchi, *Le Rationalisme* (Brussels, 1858); Lups, *Le Traditionalisme et le Rationalisme* (Liege, 1859); Remusat, *Philosophie Religieuse* (Paris, 1864); Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought* (Lond. 1863); Draper, *Intellectual Development of Europe* (N. Y. 1863); Hedge, *Reason in Religion* (Bost. 1865); Jelf, *Supremacy of Scripture* (Lond. 1861); Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought* (ibid. 1859); Pusey, *Historical Inquiry* (ibid. 1826); Rigg, *Modern Anglican Theology* (ibid. 1859); Schaff, *Germany, its Theology* (Philadel. 1857); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (N. Y. 1865); Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (N. Y. 1873), vol. 1; Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe* (ibid. 1866); Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (ibid. 1877), vol. i. (J. P. L.)

Ratisbon

a city of Germany, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils (*Concilia Ratisponenses*). The first of these was held in 792. In this council the errors of Felix, bishop of Urgel, who maintained that Christ is only the *adoptive* Son of God, were condemned, and he himself sent to Rome to pope Adrian, before whom he confessed and abjured his heresy in the church of St. Peter; he maintained, with Elipandus, that Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God by adoption only. See Labbe, *Concil.* 7:1010. **SEE FELICIANS.**

A second council was held in 796. Grievous complaints having been made both by the priests and laity of the ministrations of the chorepiscopi, it was decided in this council that the latter had no power to perform episcopal functions, being only priests, and that, consequently, all the previous acts were null and void; it was also forbidden to make any new chorepiscopi. This rank, however, among the clergy did not entirely cease until the middle of the 10th century. See Labbe, *Concil.* 7:1152.

A third council was the conference held in 1541, and generally called the *Diet of Ratisbon*. Though it had in view the settlement of all religious differences between the Protestants and the adherents to papal authority, it only resulted in effecting a mutual agreement to refer the settlement of

their differences to a general council. See Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 143; Marsden, *Hist. of the Sects of Christendom*; Buchanan, *Treatise on Justification*; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*. **SEE REFORMATION.**

Ratramnus Of Corbey,

an Aquitanian monk of the first half of the 9th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the controversialist of Paschasius Radbertus on the subject of the holy eucharist (q.v.). Ratramnus's personal history is scarcely known, except that he was the personal friend of Godeschalus, and was regarded in his day as one of the ablest defenders of Augustinianism. He is sometimes called *Bertram the Monk, or Bertram the Priest*, but it is thought that this is a corruption of B. Ratramnus, "Beatus" being sometimes prefixed to the names of venerated writers, even when there had been no act of beatification. His literary activity falls between 830 and 868. One of the works in defence of Augustinianism which proves its author to have been more than ordinarily versed in patristic literature is by Ratramnus, and is entitled *De Predestinatione Dei*. It was written at the request of king Charles the Bald in 850. He lays down the following Augustinian dogmatics: "The elect are destined to mercy and salvation; the godless to eternal punishment; the latter are given over to sin only in so far as, on account of their foreseen hard-heartedness and wickedness, the divine help towards goodness is denied them." More important is his controversy with Paschasius on the eucharist, which led to the composition of his work *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, also written at the express wish of the king in 844, and being a defence of pure symbolical sacramental doctrine. To the question of Charles the Bald, "Quod in ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur, corpus et sanguis Christi utrum in mysterio fiat an in veritate?" he answered with the distinction of what occurred really, perceivably, "in veritate," and what "in mysterio" comes to pass. A change, he held, occurred in the eucharist, but not a real, perceivable one; it is the mere act of faith which makes bread and wine the spiritual food and drink of the body and blood of Christ. The book was lost sight of after a time, and it was even ascribed, when met with, to Scotus Erigena, and as such it was burned in 1050 by the Synod of Vercelli in the Berengarian Controversy. During the English Reformation the work was suddenly resurrected from its obscurity, and had much influence. It was published at Cologne in 1532, after having been brought into notice by bishop Fisher, of Rochester, as early as 1526, that prelate referring to it as maintaining the

Catholic doctrine of the eucharist. It largely influenced the minds of archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley; and, as it proved of more service to the Protestants than to the Romanists, it was put into the *Index* in 1559 by the censors of the Tridentine Council. In England an edition was brought out in English by William Hugh, under the name of *The Book of Bertram*, in 1548. In the *Bibliotheca Maxima*, containing Ratramnus's writings, this work is omitted, on the ground that it is a forgery of the Reformers, or is, at least, so hopelessly interpolated by supposititious heretics that it is not worth while to attempt its restoration. Yet there are theologians even in the Church of Rome who maintain the position assumed by Ratramnus as defensible. Against Hincmar of Rheims Ratramnus defended Godeschalcus in the dispute over the *trinitas deitas*; but this apology is lost. Another work is his *Liber de Eo, quod Christus ex Virgine natus est*, in which it is not questioned that Mary, *utero clauso*, conceived, but rather the opinion which sprang up at about that time, that the conception had been *incerto transite*. Ratramnus gained most renown among his contemporaries by his work *Contra Græcorum Opposita*, with which, by request of Hincmar of Rheims, he opposed the encyclica of Photius in 867, and defended the Oriental Church and her dogmas. In the Migne edition, these works are in the *Patrologie*, 121, 1-346 and 1153-1156. See Mabillon, *Benediktiner Annalen*, vol. 2 and 3; *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, v, 332-351; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift. hist. Theol.* 1858, p. 546 sq.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.*; Soames, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 3:118 sq.

Ratte, Guitard De

a French prelate, was born at Montpellier in 1552. He was advisory clerk in the Parliament of Toulouse. When imprisoned with the president, Duranti, he showed so much opposition to the government that his house and library were pillaged, and he was condemned by Parliament to be executed. Henry IV indemnified Ratte by giving him the abbey of Saint-Sauveur of Lodeve, and a life-pension of 12,000 francs. For his fidelity to the king, he afterwards received the abbey of Val-Richer, in the diocese of Bayetx, and that of Saint-Chinian, in the diocese of Saint-Vous. He was made vicar-general at Montpellier and archdeacon of Valence, and in 1596 bishop of Montpellier. On his way to Toulouse he was attacked by three large dogs, and mortally wounded. He died July 7, 1602. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rattles

(Fr. *crecelle, tarturelle, rattelle*; Lat. *crotalum*). Prior to the introduction of bells (*q.v.*), rattles of wood or of iron were struck or shaken by the hand to summon the people to worship. The Celtic *cloc*, which preceded the use of bells, was a board with knockers. The Greeks used the ἄγιοσίδηρον (sacred iron), a mallet and plate of iron, and the ἅγια ξύλα (sacred wood), two clappers, as a summons to prayer. The latter are mentioned by John Climacus as used for rapping at the cell-doors in the monasteries of Palesine, in the 6th century, as a night signal and wakinghammer. At University and New colleges, Oxford, fellows are summoned to a meeting in common room by the blow of a hammer at the stair-foot. By the rule of Pachomius a trumpet was used. At Burgos the clappers are called *matraca*; in Italy, *serandola*; and in some parts of France, *symandites*, which sound for service between the Mass of Maundy-Thursday and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, sung on Easter eve in the Mass after Nones, when the bells are disused, in memory of the Lord's silence in the tomb, and the speechless timidity of the apostles — a custom dating from the 8th century. At Caen the ceremonial gives the signal for censuring with tablets. Neogorgus says boys carried rattles in the procession of Good-Friday.

Ratray, Thomas, D.D.

an English prelate, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford University, took holy orders shortly after graduation, and, after filling various ecclesiastical preferments, became in 1727 bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1739 primus. He died in 1743. His publications are, *Essay on the Nature of the Church*. etc. (Edinb. 1728): *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (Lond. 1744, 4to): — *Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenants* (ibid. 1748).

Ratze(n)berger, Matthaeus

a physician at the court of the elector Joachim in the Reformation period. He took such an important part in the Protestant movement that he deserves a place here. He was born at Wangen, in Wurtemberg, in 1501. and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he was the constant companion of Luther; and when, by the decided part he had taken at the court of the elector Joachim, where he was court physician, he was obliged to abandon a most lucrative position and practice, he was, by the intercession of his dear school friend, made body physician of the count of

Mansfield, and held this position until, in 1538, the elector John Frederic of Saxony made him his court doctor. He was also the house physician of the great Reformer himself, and frequent[ly] together the two friends discussed the exciting questions of the day, the physician being daily drawn closer and closer towards the earnest evangelical preacher. Ere he was aware of it, Ratzenberger was as much a student of theology as of medicine, and finally he wrote theological treatises, many of which have retained their value, and attest the unconscious influence of Martin Luther upon him. All his writings betray a desire of approval for the Lutheran position, and they are therefore valuable as an index of much that Luther thought, but never wrote himself. Hence, also, Ratzenberger's *Historia Lutheri*, newly edited by Neudecker (Jena, 1850), is one of the most valuable contributions to the material for Luther's memoirs. The *Historica Relatio de Johanne Friderico*, etc., first mentioned in Arnold's *Kirchen- u. Ketzer-gesch.*, later as *historia Arcana*, and finally published under the title *D. M. Ratzenberger's geheime Geschichte*, etc. (Altorf, 1775), is now generally regarded as a forgery of the anti-Melancthonians, and W. von Reiffenstein, of Stolberg, is supposed to have been its author (1570). After the death of Luther, Ratzenberger was one of his executors, and an editor of the German edition of the Reformer's writings published at Jena. See the *Life of Luther* by Seckendorf; *Biographie von Andreas Poach* (Jena, 1559).

Rau

a name common to many literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. CHRISTIAN, was born Jan. 25, 1613, at Berlin, studied at Wittenberg, and was made magister in 1636. He then went to Königsberg, Leipsic, Rostock, Hamburg, and Upsala, where he was offered a pastorate, which he declined. In 1638 he visited England, and in 1639 set out for the Orient, and resided a short time at Smyrna, where he learned Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Modern Greek. In Constantinople he made a valuable collection of old books, and in 1642 was made professor of Oriental languages at Oxford; in 1644 he was called to Utrecht; in 1645 he lectured at Amsterdam, in 1650 at Upsala, in 1669 at Kiel, and finally settled at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1671, where he died, June 21, 1677. His best work is *Concordantiarum flebr. et Chald. J. Buxtoflor Epiitome* (Berl. and Frankf. 1677). A number of other works are enumerated in Jocher's *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:1926. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:134; Winer, *Handbuch*

der theolog. Literatur, p. 121, 721; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 114.

2. HERIBERT, a rationalist and preacher of the so-called German-Catholic Congregation, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1813, where he also died, Sept. 26, 1876. He wrote, *Allgemeine Geschichtliche der christl. Kirche von ihrem Eosntstehen bis (atf die Gegemcart* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1846): — *Neue Stunden de Andacht* (4th ed. Leips. 1863, 3 vols.): — *Sermons*, etc., published at different times. See *Literaorischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 551; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* ii, 1032.

3. JOACHIM JUSTUS, doctor and professor of theology, was born April 11, 1713, at Berlin, studied at Jena, and in 1736 was called to Konigsberg as professor of theology and Oriental languages, where he died, Aug. 19, 1749. He wrote, *Diatribē Hist. philos. de Philosophia Lactantii Firm.* (Jena, 1733): — *Anfangsgrunde der hebr. Grammatik nech den luhoi satzen des D. Danz* (Konigsb. 1739; published by G. 1). Kypke, *ibid.* 1749, etc.). See Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v: Furst *Bibl. Jud.* 3:134; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 114; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 40, 909; ii, 721.

4. JOHANN EBERHARD, professor of theology, was born at Altenbach, in the principality of Siegen, and died in 1770 at Herborn. He wrote, *Dissertatio de Precibus Hebroeorum* (Marburg, 1717): — *Diatribē de Synagoga Magna* (Utrecht, 1725): — *Dissert. Philologicotheologica de Libamine Facto in Sacra Mensa Exodus 25.: 29, ventilita* (Herborn, 1732): — *Notoe et Aninadversiones in Hadr. Relandi Antiquitates Vetelrunm tebr.* (*ibid.* 1743): — *Exercitatio Academica de Vube super Arcam Fuderis* (*ibid.* 1757-58; reprinted, Utrecht, 1760): — *Duce Dissertationes Sacrl Antiquarioe* (*ibid.* 1760). See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:134; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 137-139; ii, 722.

5. JOHANN WILHELM, doctor and professor of theology, was born at Rentweinsdorf, in Franconia, March 9, 1745. In 1770 he was repetent at Gittingen; in 1773, rector at Peine, in Hanover; in 1775 he was made rector and professor of theology at Dortmund, and in 1779 ordinary professor of theology at Erlangen, where he died, July 1, 1807. He wrote, *Nonnulla ad Quamstion. ans Ortio Montana Apostolor. Initiandor. Causa dicta sit* (Erlangen, 1802-3): — *Untersuchun en die wahre Ansicht der Bergpredigt betreffend* (*ibid.* 1805): — *Freimuihige Untersuchungen uber die Typologie* (*ibid.* 1784): — *De Jo. Bapt. in rem Christ. Studiis* (*ibid.* 1785-

86): — *Materinlien zu Kanzelvortragen* (ibid. 1797-1806). See Furst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3:134; Winer, *Handbuch derl theologischen Literatur*, i, 246, 247, 390, 556, 557, 559; ii, 122, 722. (B. P.)

Rauch, Christian Daniel

one of the most distinguished German sculptors, and noted for his work in the latter years of his life in sacred art, was born at Arolsen, the capital of the principality of Waldeck, in 1777. He began the study of sculpture as a boy, but the death of his father in 1797 obliged him to accept the humble but profitable position of valet to Frederick William II. king of Prussia. Under Frederick William III, who conceived a great liking for young Rauch, facilities for designing and modelling statues were afforded him, and he was even recommended as a pupil in the Academn of the Fine Arts. A statue of Endymion and a bust of queen Louisa of Prussia, executed at this time, convinced the king of Rauch's abilities; and although his request for dismissal had been repeatedly refused, he was now granted his request, and given a small pension in order to be enabled to proceed to Rome for further improvement. He spent six years in that city, working at hlis profession, and enjoyed the friendship of Thorwaldsen, Canova, and also of William Humboldt, at that time Prassian minister there. Among his works at this time were bass-reliefs of *Hippolytus and Phoedra*, *a Mars and Venus wounded by Diomedes*, a colossal bust of the king of Prussia, a bust of the painter Raphael Mengs, etc. In 1811 he was called by the king of Prussia to Berlin, to execute a monumental statue of queen Louisa. This great work obtained for Rauch a European reputation. It is in the mausoleum of the queen in the garden of Charlottenburg. Not quite satisfied with this triumph, he commenced a new statue of the queen, which he finished eleven years afterwards, and which is allowed to be a masterpiece of sculpture. It is placed in the palace of Sans-Souci, near Potsdam. Rauch, after this, lived principally at Berlin, but occasionally visited Rome, Carrara, and Munich. He labored indefatigably in his profession, and by 1824 had executed seventy busts in marble, of which twenty were of colossal size. He died at Dresden, while on a visit there, Dec. 3, 1857. His greatest secular work is the magnificent monument of Frederick the Great, which adorns Berlin. His greatest work in sacred art is his *Moses Group*, in the entry of the Friedenskirche (Church of Peace) at Potsdam. It was begun in 1854 and finished in 1855, and is really his last great work. Noteworthy are also his group of the first two Polish lings in

the cathedral at Posen, his statues of Schleiermacher and Kant, and his representations of Faith, Hope, and Love in the church at Arolsen.

Ranch, Christian Henry

distinguished as that missionary of the Moravian Church who began its work among the North American Indians, was born at Bernburg, Germany, July 5, 1715. He arrived in this country July 16, 1740, and soon after visited Shekomeko, Dutchess County, N. Y., a village inhabited by Mohicans and Wampanoags, notorious for their evil ways, and especially for their love of strong drink. Various other missionaries had attempted to convert them without success. Ranch, on his arrival, went into the hut of the worst savage of the whole clan, Wasamapah by name, commonly known as Tschoop, seated himself at his side, told him of the Saviour, and then, saying that he was very tired in consequence of his long journey, lay down by the fire and went to sleep. This simple act of trust made a deep impression upon the Indians. He won their confidence. Tschoop was converted and baptized, and became an eloquent and enthusiastic preacher of the Gospel; other converts were gathered in, and a flourishing mission was established at Shekomeko, which subsequently spread to New England. In 1757, Rauch went to Jamaica as missionary to the negroes. He died on the island of Jamaica, Nov. 11, 1763. See Spangenberg, *Account of the Manner in which the United Brethren carry on their Missions* (Lond. 1788), p. 62, 63; Amer. S. S. Union, *Tschoop, the Converted Indian Chief*; Schweinitz, *Life and Times of Zeisberyer*, ch. v. (E. de S.)

Rauch, Frederick Augustus

Ph.D., D.D., first president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, IPa., was born at Kirchbracht, in Hesse-Darmstadt, Germany, July 27, 1806. At the age of eighteen he entered the University of Marburg, and took his diploma in 1827. He then became a teacher in Frankfirt, and afterwards spent a year at the University of Heidelberg. In his twenty-fourth year he became extraordinary professor in the University of Giessein. After one year he was called as ordinary professor to Heidelberg, but this appointment he never realized. Having uttered his mind too freely on the subject of government in some public exercises at Giessen, he arrayed the civil powers against himself, and was compelled to provide for his safety in voluntary self-expatriation. He arrived in this country in the fall of 1831. He spent one year at Easton, as professor of German, in Lafayette College,

and in the study of the English language. In June, 1832, he was appointed to take charge of the classical school connected with the seminary of the German Rleformed Church at York, Pa. The same year he was ordained to the holy ministry. In 1835 he removed to Mercersburg, and became the first president of Marshall College, which position he ably filled till his death, March 2, 1841. Shortly before his death he published his *Psychology*, which has passed through a number of editions, and is used as a text-book in its department of philosophy in several of our colleges. *The Inner Life* is a posthumous work, being a see tion of sermons by Dr. Rauch, edited by the Rev. Dr. Gerhart. Thoroughly learned, deeply pious, ardent, generous, and noble, Dr. Rauch's brief life has left behind it a lasting influence. In March, 1859, his remains were removed to Lancaster, Pa., under the auspices of the alumni of Marshall College and the board of trustees of Franklin and Marshall College, on which occasion a eulogy on his life and character was delivered by his distinguished colleague, Prof. J. W. Nevin, D.D.

Raucourt, Louis Marie

a French prelate, was born in 1743. He entered the Benedictine Order, and studied theology in many of its monasteries. In 1768 he was made procurer of the abbey of Clairvaux, in 1773 prior, and in 1783 abbot. He did much in embellishing this abbey, and greatly increased the library. Being expelled during the revolution, he fled to Juvancourt, where he lived in retirement till 1804, when he settled in Bar-sur-Aube, where he died in 1824.

Rauhe Haus

Picture for Rauhe Haus

(Germ. for *Rough House*), THE, a great juvenile reform institution at the little hamlet of Horn, three miles from the German port of Hamburg, owes its origin to John Henry Wichern, the founder also of the German Home Mission Work. *SEE INNER MISSION*. The peculiar name which it bears (*Rough House*) is not due to any peculiar feature of the institution, as one might suppose, but rather to an awkward translation of the German *patois* into the classical language. The house in which the institution was first located was built some hundred and fifty years ago by a certain Mr. Ruge, a gentleman of wealth and culture, and in every sense quite contrary in character to the name given him in classical German. People of Hamburg's suburbs always knew the place by the name of the "Ruge House," and so

the institution was called *Rauhe Haus* when it was first opened on Nov. 1, 1833, by Wichern, with the assistance of his mother, he being then but a young man of twenty-five, and as yet not even in social relations with the opposite sex. For years previous to this event Wichern had conceived a plan for the amelioration of the condition of the lower classes. While at the university his mystical tendencies were noted. He frequently gave himself up to practices of great personal self-denial, and he formed an association of young men for self-improvement and religious edification. There was a constant longing for entire and unconditional consecration to God's service in this band, who all recognised the great fact that Christianity is only a truth to those who experience it. An acquaintance with Dr. Julius, then well known as a philanthropist, who had visited England and America in the interests of prison reform, only quickened Wichern in his purposes, and when, on his return from the university to Hamburg, he was placed in charge of a Sabbath-school in the religiously neglected suburbs of St. George, Wichern conceived a plan that should enable him to begin the task for which he felt himself called of God. Though poor himself, his father having died while he was yet scarcely out of the years of infancy, and his mother having depended upon him for years, he yet set about to realize his purpose. All the difficulties that arose in his way only acted as fresh incentives to exertion. His enthusiasm knew no restraints nor barriers. Finally he succeeded in interesting the syndic Seiveking, a man of warm heart and full pocketbook. A house upon his estate which was occupied by a gardener was vacated for Wichern as a place in which to try his schemes by actual experiment. It was a small space for so vast an undertaking, but Wichern was quite content to let his enterprise have a small beginning. Full of faith, and encouraged by what was already gained, he made immediate arrangements for the occupancy of the *Rauhe Haus* (see illustration), small and poor as it was, and however uninviting its little windows, and thatched roof and low ceilings appeared. With the help of a few interested friends, such repairs as were absolutely necessary were made, he entering the premises himself as an inmate. The day of opening was marked by the admission of three boys; in a short time the number increased to twelve, and thus humbly began beneath that roof of straw, on the Seiveking estate, a movement for the neglected youth of Germany whose influence is seen and felt not only in that country, but all over the Continent and far beyond it, and whose results can never be estimated by mortal man. A careful examination shows that, so far as the children of the *Rauhe Haus* alone are concerned, a very moderate estimate gives eighty per cent. of them as

saved from what would inevitably have been a life of vice or crime. Describing this most Christian charity, Elihu Burritt says:

“These boys had been treated or regarded as a species of human vermin, baffling the power of the authorities to suppress. They had slept under carts, in doorways, herding with swine and cattle by night, when begging or thieving hours were past. Such were the boys that found themselves looking at each other in wonder and surprise the first evening they gathered around the hearth-stone of that cottage-home. There was no illusion about this sudden transformation in their experience. In their midst was that bland, benevolent man, with his kind eyes and voice, looking and speaking to them as a father to his children. And there was his mother, with the law of kindness on her lips, in her looks, in every act and word; and *he* called her mother, and *they* call her mother; and the first evening of their common life she became the mother of their love and veneration; and they, ragged, forsaken, hopeless castaways, conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, became the children of her affection. This cottage, away from the city and its haunts, with its bright fire by night and the little beds under the roof — with its great Bible and little Psalm-books, was to be their home. The great chestnut-tree that threw out its arms over it, and all the little trees, and the ditches, hillocks, and bushes of that acre, *were their own* ... The feeling of home came warming into their hearts like the emotions of a new existence, as the father spoke to them of our house, our trees, our cabbages, turnips, potatoes, pigs, and geese and ducks, “which we will grow for our comfort.”

The boys at once set to work. At the end of the first week they had made a year’s progress in this new life and its hopes and expectations. The faith that they could do something, be something, and own something grew daily within them. “So eager did they become,” says the first report of the institution, “to accomplish the undertaking that they frequently worked by lantern-light in the evening, rooting up bushes and trees, in spite of snow or rain.”

As the number of pupils increased, and there seemed danger that the size of the family would seriously affect its domestic character, Mr. Wichern divided the compaly into households, containing from twelve to fifteen each — the children themselves, as each new house was required,

performing a large part of the work. The first colony, “under the care,” as the report says, “of an earnest young disciple of the law of love, who had come from a distance to discipline his heart and life to the regime of kindness, and who had lived in their midst as an elder brother,” commenced their separate family life with affecting ceremonies. On a bright Sabbath morning, and in the presence of several hundred friends, the new cottage was dedicated “to the Good Shepherd, through whose love and help twenty-seven boys had already been gathered into a sheltering fold.” With numbers and resources increased, new cottages of the same unpretending character were built in a semicircle around the Rough House. Girls were admitted, and separate cottages were constructed for them; and a new building was erected which afforded a more commodious residence for the superintendent, a chapel, kitchen, and other apartments for the general use of the little community, which grew to be quite a village. In 1851 Dr. Burritt found a considerable cottage-village, with workshops, dwelling-houses, a little chapel, a wash- and drying-house, a printing-office, bake-house, and other buildings. There were in all about seventy boys and twenty-five girls, constituting four families of boys and two of girls. Each family-house was under the charge of a superintendent (male or female), assisted by one or more brothers, as they are called — the superintendent being ordinarily a candidate for the ministry. The brothers are young men of the best character, who undergo a training of three or four years, after which they devote themselves to the care of similar institutions now rising all over Germany, quickened into life by this blessed experiment; or they become city missionaries, carrying the Gospel personally to the neglected and wretched. From thirty to forty brothers are inmates of this institution at one time, receiving no remuneration but their living, superintending the industry and aiding in conducting the moral discipline of the establishment. In its daily life this singular village is separated into three important divisions: domestic, educational, and industrial. Each family is to some extent an independent community. The members eat and sleep in their own dwelling, and the children belonging to each look up to their own particular father or mother as home-bred children to a parent. Each household has thus its individual character, its peculiar interest and history, and each bears some name of its own, such as the Beehive, the Dove’s-nest, and the like. The bond of union is the loving father at the head of the whole institution; closely drawn by the morning and evening gatherings for prayer in the chapel or mother-house, and the celebration in common of the many festivals of the Church. The

superintendents of the several houses meet the chief weekly to render their reports, and to discuss all questions of discipline. In their turn, each separate family visits him once a week in his study; and the record of each member, whether good or bad, is fully considered and passed upon—any child being admitted, at the close of the interview, to private conference with him, a privilege that is often improved. The children were told at the beginning that *labor* is the price of *living*, and that they must earn their own bread if they would enjoy it. Mr. Wichern did not point them to ease and affluence, but to an honorable poverty, which they were taught was not in itself an evil. In illustration of this, the dress, food, and furniture of the cottages are of the simplest character. The secular education given is of the most rudimental description, reaching about the average of the German primary school—three quarters of the weekly recitations being devoted to the study of the Bible Catechism, Church history, and to music. The principal labor, farming, is carefully taught in all its branches; in addition, instruction is given by the brothers in printing and other trades. The boys remain at the Rough House about four years, and the girls five. They are then apprenticed to service, chiefly in the city of Hamburg, whenever the work of redemption is sufficiently confirmed to admit of their exposure again to temptation. But it must not be inferred from the duration of their term of reform that the Rough House holds its inmates by force. As they come voluntarily, so they stay until dismissed by their own choice. The simple means relied upon for the accomplishment of this great reform work are prayer, the Bible, singing, affectionate conversation, severe punishment when unavoidable, and constant, steady employment in useful labor. “In a peculiar manner,” says Dr. Peirce, “Wichern relied upon the Word of God. He made the whole Bible the familiar companion and food of the pupil. The whole Scripture was made to open to their minds, in an impressive series of readings, like a mine of priceless metal — reaching a climax in the Evangel of the New Testament. The thought that, miserable, wicked, despised as they were, Christ, the Son of God, loved them—loved them enough to suffer and die for them, and still loved them—melted their hearts, and gave them both hope and a strong incentive to reformation.”

As the Rauhe Haus is now constituted, it is partly a refuge for morally neglected children, partly a boarding-school for the moral and intellectual education of those children of the higher classes whose vicious or unmanageable character makes them fit subjects for training by such competent hands as the Rauhe Haus superintendents; lastly, a training-

school for those who wish to become teachers or officials in houses of correction hospitals, etc., in promotion of the objects of the Home Mission. This is an especially important enterprise, Its trained men are employed in positions of trust, such as prison directors, stewards of estates, and superintendents of charitable houses. It was founded in 1845, and is a kind of conventual house. Entrance into this institution is limited to the age of twenty to thirty. Besides religious belief and good character, freedom from military duties, bodily and mental health, some scholastic acquirements, and a knowledge of some craft or of agriculture are required. The boarding-school was established in 1851, and at the same time a seminary was founded, in which twelve brethren of the Rauhe Haus are especially prepared for school-work. A printing-office, a bookbinder's shop, and bookselling, form part of the institution also. The last named has its principal depot at Hamburg, and from it trade with all Germany has been opened. The Rauhe Haus has brought out numerous publications, and all these enjoy a very large sale. A monthly periodical called *Fliegende Blatter*, devoted to the Inner Mission, is printed, edited, and circulated by the Rauhe Haus. It may be added also that during the recent German wars the inmates furnished the principal organizers of what was like our "Sanitary Commission" in the war with the South. Dr. Wichern is still living as we write (1878), but he has retired from all *active* connection with the Rauhe Haus. See *Amer. Education. Monthly*, Jan. 1868, art. i; (*Luth.*) *Ev. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1874, p. 129; *National Repository*, Dec. 1878, art. iii; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (see Index).

Raulin, Hippolyte

a devoted Minim, was born about 1560, at Rethel. For many years he preached with great success, and was considered one of the most eloquent men of his day. In the capacity of a provincial of his order he governed the province of Lyons; afterwards that of Lorraine. He wrote, *Panegyre Orthodoxe, Mysterieux, et Prophetique sur l'Antiquite. Dignite, Noblesse, et Splendleur des Fleurs de Lys* (Paris, 1626). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raulin, Jean

a French preacher, was born at Toul in 1443. After finishing his studies, he received the degree of D.D. Before this time he had composed a

commentary upon the *Logic* of Aristotle. In 1481 he was made president of the college at Navarre, and so acquitted himself that he was greatly esteemed. Desiring to live a more secluded life, he entered the Abbey of Clugny in 1497, and by his exemplary life led many others to follow his example. Under the direction of cardinal Amboise, he greatly aided in reforming the Order of St. Benedict. Raulin enjoyed the same reputation as Barlette, Millaid, and Menot. His sermons were plain, methodical, and replete with citations made from sacred writings and scholars. He wrote, *Epistoloe* (Paris, 1520): — *Doctrinale de Triplici Morte, Naturali, Culpoe, et Gehennoe* (ibid. 1520). His *Sermons* in Latin were published in Paris in 1642. He died Feb. 6, 1514. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raumer, Frederic von

the accomplished German historian, was born at Worlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau, in 1781. In 1811 he was appointed professor of history at Breslau, and in 1819 he was called to Berlin. In 1859 he was released from the duty of lecturing, but he still continued till near his death, June 13, 1873. He was the Nestor of all German historians, and senior of all the living German professors. He is the author of the well-known *History of the Hohenstaufen Dynasty* (1823-27, and often, 6 vols.), a work deserving praise for its interesting narrative of the events of a romantic period. He also published *Lectures on Ancient History* (3d ed. 1861, 2 vols.): — *History of Europe from the Close of the 15th Century* (1832-50, 8 vols.), a work marked by the conciliatory style in which it describes the contentions of various religious and political parties. Besides, he wrote a number of other works, as *Handbuch zur Gesch. d. Literatur* (1864-66), etc., which we pass over. See *Litercarischer Handwieiser*, 1873, p. 300; Gostwick and Harrison, *Outlines of German Literature*, p. 551 sq. (B. P.)

Raumer, Karl Georg von

doctor of philosophy and theology, brother of the well-known historian Frederic (q.v.), was born April 7, 1783, at Wurlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau. Having graduated at the Joachimsthal Gymnasium in Berlin, he went to Gottingen for the study of languages, history, and poetry. From Gottingen he went to Halle in 1803, where he attended the lectures of Wolf and Becker, and where he also made the acquaintance of Steffens, who introduced him in 1805 to the famous geologist Werner at Freiberg. In

1808 we see Raumer at Paris, in 1810 at Berlin; in 1811 he is professor and member of council for mining at Breslau. The Franco-Prussian war, in which he acted as adjutant to general Gneisenau, being over, he was called in 1819 as professor to Halle, where he remained till 1823, being obliged to leave the place in consequence of distrust aroused against him. He then acted as tutor in the Dittmar Educational Institution at Nirunberg, when, in 1827, he was called as professor to Erlangen, where he died, June 2, 1865. Raumer took a very lively and active interest in all matters promoting the kingdom of God. He is best known as the author of *Palumstina* (Leipsic, 1835, and often since): — *Der- Zug der Istraeliten atis Aegypten nutch Ctanaman* (ibid. 1837): — *Beitrate zur biblischet Geographie* (ibid. 1843): — *Geschichte desr aidatgopgik* (3d ed. Stuttgart, 1857, n7 1861, 4 vols.) — and as the editor of Augustine's *Confessiones*, with notes (ibid. 1856, and often). See Fi rst, *uibl. Juti icct*, 3:134; Zucholtz, *Biblioth. Theolog.* ii, 1033; *Lifterarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 300; Winer, *Theolog. Handbuch*, ii, 722; Thomasius, *Rtede am Grobe rudes lerrn Kiarl v. / Partmer* (Erlangen, 1865); Laumer, *Lebeun von im selbst* (Stuttgart, 1866); Hauck, *Theolo. Jahresbericht*, 1865, p. 734 sq.; 1866, ip. 361 sq. (B. P.)

Raumer, Rudolph von

professor of languages and son of Karl Georg von Raaumer, was born April 14, 1815, at Breslau. Hie prepared himself at thle gymnasia in Erlangen and Niirnberg, and in 1832 entered tihe University of Erlangen, continuing, hiowever, his studies at Gottingen and Munich. In 1840 he commenced lecturing at Erlangen, in 1852 was made professor in ordinary, and died there Aug. 30, 1876. He wrote *Die E'itnci lsiing des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache* (Stattgart. 1845), which he concludes with the remarkable words that "the destiny of our (the German) people will always be connected with Christianity" — See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* ii, 1033; *Literatrische-Handweiser*, 1873, p. 300; 187;6, p. 352; Schneider, *Theolog. Jahrbuch.* 1878, p. 226 sq. (B. P.)

Raus(s), Lucas

one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born in 1723 in thie city of Hermanstadt, in Transylvania. He was the son of Lucas Laus, an eminent German divine, under whose careful training he enjoyed the best opportunities for mental and moral culture. Designed for the Christian

ministry, his studies were prosecuted at the universities of Leipsic and Jena. He immigrated to the United States in 1750, and at once identified himself with its interests. He commenced his labors in Philadelphia, and, as there were few organized Lutheran churches at the time and the members were scattered, his work was very much of an itinerant character. In 1754 he removed to York. Pa., where he continued to reside until his death, which occurred July 11, 1788. Mr. Raus enjoyed the reputation of being an accomplished scholar, particularly in the department of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages. He conversed with great fluency in several modern languages. His descendants are still numbered among the citizens of the place in which he so long labored. See *Luth. Observer*, April 19, 1878.

Rauscher, Joseph Othmar

one of the most prominent ecclesiastical princes of Austria and of the 19th century, was born Oct. 6, 1797, at Vienna, being the son of an imperial officer. He first intended to study law, which he did for three years, but afterwards betook himself to the study of theology, and, almost twenty-six years of age, he was ordained priest Aug. 27, 1823. For two years he labored as vicar at Hutteldorf, not far from Vienna, but he was soon called to Salzburg as professor of canon law and Church history. Here he commenced the elaboration of a comprehensive Church history, of which the first two volumes, reaching down to Justinian (Sulzbach, 1824-29), promised so well for the young author that he undoubtedly would have become one of the brightest stars among the Roman Catholic historians were he left in his position; but in 1832 he was appointed director of the Oriental Academy at Vienna, and from that time on he was invested with different offices, to which also belonged the instruction of the present Austrian emperor and his brothers. In 1849 the metropolitan archbishop of Salzburg, prince Friedrich von Schwarzenberg, his former pupil and now his friend, appointed Rauscher to the bishopric of Seckau. For four years he discharged his episcopal duties, amid great difficulties, in the most zealous and happy manner, when, in 1853, the emperor appointed him to the archiepiscopal see. In his new position the emperor intrusted to him a mission which forever connected his name with the Church history of Austria, viz. the negotiation of a concordat between Austria and the Apostolic See, which, unhappily for Austria, was signed Aug. 18, 1855. For this deed Rauscher was made cardinal, Dec. 17 of the same year. For twenty years Rauscher moulded the ecclesiastical as well as political affairs of Austria; for his position made him not only the intimate counsellor of the

emperor, but also a prominent member of the House of Peers. It would be too long to enumerate his numerous speeches and pastoral letters, which are all distinguished both by the depth of thought as well as by their rhetoric and noble language. He also took a prominent part in the last Vatican Council, and died Nov. 24, 1875. See *Litertischer Handweiser*, 1875, p. 470; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (9th ed. Mitau, 1874), ii, 344, 363 sq. (B. P.)

Rautenberg, Johann Wilhelm

father of the Inner Mission at Hamburg, was born at Moorflath, near Hamburg, March 1, 1791. He studied at Kiel under Twesten, and at Berlin under Neander, who both influenced him, and brought him nearer to Him whom he afterwards proclaimed with such fervor and blessing. In 1820 he was appointed pastor of St. George, a suburb of Hamburg, where, amid many difficulties and obstacles he labored for forty-five years. He promoted every Christian enterprise which furthered the kingdom of God, and the many societies which he assisted with his word and counsel are his lasting monuments. He died March 1, 1865. Rautenberg is well known as a hymn-writer and preacher. After his death Sengelmann published *Festliche Nachnige*, a collection of 169 hymnological pieces (Hamburg, 1865); he also published *Predigten* (ibid. 1866). See Koch. *Geschicile des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7:292 sq.; Zuchold. *Libioth, Theolog.* ii, 1034; Lowe, *Denkwirdifakeiten aus dem Leben u. Wirken Rautenbergs* (Hamb. 1866); Hauck. *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (1866), ii, 198 sq., 701 sq. (B. P.)

Rautenstrauch, Franz Stephan

a German theologian of the Romish Church, was born at Platten, Bohemia, in 1734, became a Benedictine monk at Braunanl, and was there teacher of philosophy, theology, and canon law. In 1773 he was made prelatu of the convent and director of the theological faculty at Prague, and in the following year was called to Vienna to assist in the Ministry of Education. He died at Erlau, Hungary, in 1785. He was a more than ordinary man, and as a Romanist enjoyed the confidence of all liberalminded men. He was a favorite at the court of the scholarly emperor, and was the intimate friend of Hontheim (q.v.), whose liberal ideas he favored; but on these very accounts he had much to suffer from the enmity of the Jesuits. He prepared the scheme for the course of instruction for the theological faculty in the Austrian universities. and published several minor

works. On the occasion of the visit of pope Pius VI in Vienna, he wrote *Patriot. Betrachtungen*, etc.; but he is best known by his *Synopsis Juris Ecclesiastici* (Vienna, 1776). See Sabroekh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, 7:144 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Ravana

(from the causal of the Sanscrit *ru*, cry, alarm; hence literally he who causes alarm) is the name of the *Rakshasha* (q.v.) who, at the time of Rama, ruled over Sri Lanka or Ceylon, and, having carried off Sita, the wife of Rama, to his residence, was ultimately conquered and slain by the latter. Ravana is described as having been a giant with ten faces, and, in consequence of austerities and devotion, as having obtained from Siva a promise which bestowed upon him unlimited power, even over the gods. As the promise of Siva could not be revoked, Vishnu evaded its efficacy in becoming incarnate as Rima, and hence killed the *daemon-giant*. — *Chambers's Encyclop.* s.v. **SEE VISHNU**.

Ravel, Pierre

a French Protestant theologian, was born about 1680. He was a descendant of the celebrated Jean Mercier. He was pastor of a church at Souzet. His works are. *Bibliotheca Sacra, sive Thesaurus Scripturae Canonicoe Amplissimus* (Geneva, 1650, 1660, 2 vols.): — *Additamenta Nova ad Bibliothecam Sacrae* (ibid. 1685).

Raven

Picture for Raven

(**br̥p**‘*oseb*’; Sept. and New Test. **κρόαξ**, Vulg. *corvus*), the well-known bird of that name which is mentioned in various passages in the Bible. There is no doubt that the Heb. ‘*oseb*’ is correctly translated, the old versions agreeing on the point, and the etymology, from a root (**br̥**) signifying “to be black,” favoring this rendering. A raven was sent out by Noah from the ark to see whether the waters were abated (^{<0007>}Genesis 8:7). This bird was not allowed as food by the Mosaic law (^{<0815>}Leviticus 11:15); the word ‘*oseb*’ is doubtless used in a generic sense, and includes other species of the genus *Corvus*, such as the crow (*C. corone*), and the hooded crow (*C. cornix*). Ravens were the means, under the divine command, of supporting the prophet Elijah at the brook Cherith (^{<1170>}1

Kings 17:4, 6). They are expressly mentioned as instances of God's protecting love and goodness (~~1884b~~ Job 38:41; ~~1724b~~ Luke 12:24; ~~1439b~~ Psalm 143:9). They are enumerated with the owl, the bittern, etc., as marking the desolation of Edom (~~2341b~~ Isaiah 34:11). "The locks of the beloved" are compared to the glossy blackness of the raven's plumage (Song of Solomon v, II). The raven's carnivorous habits, and especially his readiness to attack the eye, are alluded to in ~~2107b~~ Proverbs 30:17. *SEE OREB*. The Sept. and Vulg. differ materially from the Hebrew and our A.V. in (~~1087b~~ Genesis 8:7; for whereas in the Hebrew we read "that the raven went forth to and fro [from the ark] until the waters were dried up," in the two old versions named above, together with the Syriac, the raven is represented as "not returning until the water was dried from off the earth." On this subject the reader may refer to Houbigant (*Not. Crit* 1, 12), Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 801), Rosenmuller (*Schol. in V. T.*), Kalisch (*Genesis*), and Patrick (*Commentary*), who shows the manifest incorrectness of the Sept. in representing the raven as keeping away from the ark while the waters lasted, but as returning to it when they were dried up. The expression "to and fro" clearly proves that the raven must have returned to the ark at intervals. The bird would doubtless have found food in the floating carcasses of the deluge, but would require a more solid resting-ground than they could afford. *SEE DELUGE*. The subject of Elijah's sustenance at Cherith by means of ravens has given occasion to much fanciful speculation. It has been attempted to show that the 'orebim ("ravens") were the people of Orbo, a small town near Cherith; this theory has been well answered by Reland (*Palest.* ii, 913). Others have found in the ravens merely merchants; while Michaelis has attempted to show that Elijah merely plundered the ravens' nests of hares and other game! Keil (*Comment.* on ~~1170b~~ 1 Kings 17) makes the following just observation: "The text knows nothing of bird-catching and nest-robbing, but acknowledges the Lord and Creator of the creatures, who *commanded* the ravens to provide his servant with bread and flesh." It has also been well replied that an animal unfit for food or sacrifice did not necessarily defile what it touched. "An ass was as unclean as a raven; yet no one was polluted by riding on an ass, or by eating that which an ass had carried." An objection more to the point would be that the flesh which ravens would bring would leave the prophet no opportunity of being satisfied that it was such as he could legally receive; either that it was the flesh of a clean beast, or, if so, that it had not died with the blood undrained. But to this, too, the answer is obvious: if Jehovah could so restrain and overrule the instincts of these

voracious birds as to make them minister to his servant, he could also take care that they should select nothing but what was fit, and he could give Elijah confidence that it was so. Some, however, understand *Arabs* to be there meant. *SEE ELIJAH.*

The raven belongs to the order *Insectores*, family *Corvidoe*. The raven is so generally confounded with the carrion crow that even in the works of naturalists the figure of the latter has sometimes been substituted for that of the former, and the manners of both have been mixed up together. They are, it is true, very similar, belonging to the same Linnaean genus, *Corvus*, and having the same intensely black color; but the raven is the larger, weighing about three pounds; has proportionally a smaller head, and a bill fuller and stouter at the point. Its black color is more iridescent (hence the comparison to the bridegroom's locks, Song of Solomon v, 11), with gleams of purple passing into green, while that of the crow is more steel-blue; the raven is also gifted with greater sagacity; may be taught to articulate words; is naturally observant and solitary; lives in pairs; has a most acute scent; and flies to a great height. Unlike the crow, which is gregarious in its habits, the raven will not even suffer its young, from the moment they can shift for themselves, to remain within its haunt; and, therefore, though a bird found in nearly all countries, it is nowhere abundant (Bochart, *Hiero.* ii, 796 sq.; Kimchi on ¹⁹⁴⁷Psalm 14:7). Whether the raven of Palestine is the common species, or the *Corvus montanus* of Temminck, is not quite determined; for there is of the ravens, or greater form of crows, a smaller group including two or three others, all similar in manners, and unlike the carrion crows (*Corvus corone*, Linn.), which are gregarious, and seemingly identical in both hemispheres. Sometimes a pair of ravens will descend without fear among a flight of crows, take possession of the carrion that may have attracted them, and keep the crows at a distance till they themselves are gorged. (Comp. Horace, *Ep.* i, 16, 48; Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 942). The habits of the whole genus typified by the name '*oreb*' render it unclean in the Hebrew law; and the malignant, ominous expression of the raven, together with the color of its plumage, powers of voice, and solitary habits, are the causes of that universal and often superstitious attention with which mankind have ever regarded it.

In the mythological history of the Gentiles, we find the appellation of Ravens bestowed upon an oracular order of priesthood. In Egypt, it seems, the temples of Ammon were served by such — perhaps those priests that

occur in the catacombs playing on harps, and clothed in black. More than one temple in Greece had similar raven priests. It was the usual symbol of slaughter among the Scandinavians; and a raven banner belonged to the Danes. and also to the Saxons; one occurs among the ensigns of the Normans in the Bayeux tapestry; and it was formerly a custom in the Benedictine abbeys on the Continent to maintain in a very large cage a couple of ravens, where several are recorded to have lived above fifty years. The Raven of the Sea, that ominous bird in Northern mythology, is properly the cormorant — the *moryran* of the Celts. Jewish and Arabian writers tell strange stories of this bird and its cruelty to its young; hence, say some, the Lord's express care for the young ravens after they had been driven out of the nests by the parent birds; but this belief in the raven's want of affection to its young is entirely without foundation. To the fact of the raven being a common bird in Palestine, and to its habit of flying restlessly about in constant search for food to satisfy its voracious appetite, may, perhaps, be traced the reason for its being selected by our Lord and the inspired writers as the especial object of God's providing care. There is something weird and shrewd in the expression of the raven's countenance; a union of cunning and malignity, which may have contributed to give it among widely severed nations, and in remote ages, a character for preternatural knowledge. Its black hue — the hue of night and of mourning — its recluse, solitary suspicion, and its harsh croak have no doubt increased its uncanny reputation. Certain it is that the "infausta cornix" has long been feared and hated as the messenger of evil and the prognosticator of death, while the Romans dedicated it to Apollo as the god of divination. An anonymous writer familiar with the habits of the bird has ingeniously suggested an explanation of its divining power. "The smell of death is so grateful to them that they utter a loud croak of satisfaction instantly on perceiving it. In passing over sheep, if a tainted smell is perceptible, they cry vehemently. From this propensity in the raven to announce his satisfaction in the smell of death has probably arisen the common notion that he is aware of its approach among the human race, and foretells it by his croakings. I have no doubt the idea is founded in truth, although I think the coming event is not communicated to the raven by any immediate or supernatural impulse, but *that* in passing over a human habitation from which a sickly or cadaverous smell may escape, it is perfectly natural for him to announce his perception of it by his cries" (*Zoologist*, p. 217). The shepherd has a better reason for calling the raven a bird of ill omen. A more vigilant or more cruel enemy to the flock can hardly exist, and it

frequently makes its ferocious assaults on the yet living victim. See Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 439 sq.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 198 sq.

Ravenna

an important city of Central Italy, fortythree miles east-southeast from Bologna, and four and a half miles from the Adriatic, with a population of nearly 60,000 people, was once the capital of the empire (from A.D. 401), and is not only a very ancient city, whose history is of great interest to Christianity on account of its early relation to the Church, but more particularly on account of the different ecclesiastical councils which have been held there, and the disputes which the metropolitanate of Ravenna maintained in early medieval days with the bishopric of Rome, especially in the 7th century, under Constans (666), in the 8th against pope Hadrian, and in the 9th, when in 861 the strife was finally put at rest at a synod in Rome. Aside from the council of bishops in 419, called by Honorius to decide upon the choice of popes between Boniface and Eulalius, the following councils of Ravenna (*Concilia Ravennata*) are noteworthy:

(I.) Held July 22, 877, by pope John VIII, at the head of forty-nine bishops (Holstenius and Labbe say the number of bishops was 130). The object of this council was to remedy the disorders of the Church. Nineteen chapters remain to us, relating to the discipline and privileges of the Church; also a letter confirming the possession of a monastery to the bishop of Autun.

Chap. 1. Enjoins the metropolitan to send to Rome for the pallium within three months after his consecration, and forbids him to exercise any of the functions of his office until that be done.

2. Enjoins that all bishops elect shall be consecrated by their metropolitans within three months after election, under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids metropolitans to make use of the pallium except on great festivals and during mass.

5, 6,7, and 8. Excommunicate and anathematize those who rob the Church, injure ecclesiastics, and commit various other crimes.

9. Declares those persons to be themselves excommunicated who voluntarily communicate with the excommunicated.

12. Excommunicates those who absent themselves from their parish church on three Sundays successively.

19. Forbids judges and royal commissioners to hold courts and to lodge in churches. — Labbe, *Concil.* 9:299.

(II.) Held in 898 (or 904, according to Labbe) by John IX, in the matter of Formosus and Stephen; the emperor Lambert being present and seventy-four bishops. Ten regulations were approved.

1. Enacts the observation of the canons of the fathers, and all that is contained in the capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonaire, Lothaire, and Louis II.

3. Confirms the privileges granted to the Church of Rome by the emperors.

4. Approves all that had been done in the Council of Rome, A.D. 898, in the matter of Formosus.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and **10.** Relate to the political circumstances of the Roman see. — Labbe, *Concil.* 9:507.

(III.) Held in April, 967. In this council the emperor, Otho I, yielded to the pope, John XIII, the city and territory of Ravenna. Heroldus, archbishop of Salzburg, was deposed and excommunicated; the act of deposition being subscribed on April 25 by the emperor and fifty-seven bishops, including the pope. Lastly, Magdeburg was erected into an archbishopric: this, however, was not completed until the following year. — Labbe, *Concil.* 9:674.

(IV.) Held May 1, 997, by Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight suffragans. Three canons remain, of which

1. Condemns an infamous custom which existed in the cathedral of Ravenna of selling the holy eucharist and chrism. — Labbe, *Concil.* 9:766.

(V.) Held April 30, 1014, by the new archbishop, Arnold, to remedy the abuses caused by the long vacancy of eleven years, and the intrusion of Adalbert, who had unlawfully conferred holy orders and dedicated certain churches. It was determined that those upon whom orders had been thus conferred should remain suspended until the matter could be minutely considered; and that the consecrations of churches and oratories made by Adalbert were null and void. — Labbe, *Concil.* 9:833.

(VI.) Held by Peter, cardinal of St. Anastasia, in 1128. Here the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, or Grade, were deposed, having been convicted of favoring schismatics. — Pagi; Labbe, *Concil.* 10:936.

(VII.) Held in 1286, July 8, by Bonifacius the archbishop, who presided, assisted by eight bishops, his suffragans. Nine canons were published.

2. Exhorts the clergy to almsgiving, and grants indulgences to those who feed and clothe the the poor.

3. Relates to the dress of the clergy; and forbids them to carry arms without the bishop's permission.

5. Orders that the usual daily distributions shall be made only to those canons who attend the holy office. — Labbe, *Concil.* 11. 1238.

(VIII.) Held in 1310 by Rainaldus the archbishop, in the matter of the Templars. Present, eight bishops of the province, three inquisitors, two preaching friars, and one Minorite: seven Templars were brought before them, who constantly affirmed their innocence. On the following day it was determined that they who had confessed from a fear of torture only should be considered innocent; nevertheless, there were five who went through the canonical ordeal. — Labbe, *Concil.* 11:1533.

(IX.) Held in 1311 by Rainaldus the archbishop, five bishops and six proctors attending. Thirty-two canons were published.

2. Orders mass to be said daily for a month by the other bishops in behalf of a bishop deceased.

3. Orders that yearly, on July 20, a solemn service shall be said for the deceased bishops; and that on that day twelve poor persons shall be fed.

4. Enjoins the same thing on behalf of patrons and benefactors of churches.

6. Orders that the sacraments be administered fasting.

10. Enjoins curates to warn the people every Sunday, after the gospel and offertory, of the festivals and fastdays in the coming week.

11. Orders that the form of baptism shall be publicly said in church three times a year.

15. Orders that the canon “omunnis utriusque sexus” shall be published at Advent and Lent. That medical men shall not visit a patient a second time if he have not called in the priest.

16. Forbids to give a benefice to any one who cannot read or chant.

18. Orders annual synods.

23. Orders that Jews shall wear a distinguishing badge.

26. Reviews the canonical penalties for striking, maltreating, and driving the clergy from their churches. — Labbe, *Concil.* 11:1569.

(X.) Held in 1314 by the same archbishop, assisted by six bishops and four deputies. Twenty canons were published.

2. Forbids to ordain to the priesthood persons under twenty-five years of age; also to ordain a deacon under twenty, and a sub-deacon under sixteen years.

6. Orders that the church bells shall be rung when a bishop passes, that the people may come out to receive his blessing upon their knees; also regulates the form to be observed by the chapter of a cathedral upon the bishop’s visit.

8. Declares, unuer pain of excommunication, that no monks, or other persons, can claim exemption from episcopal visitation upon plea of prescriptive right, or any other plea.

10. Enacts that the clergy shall be soberly dressed; that they shall not carry arms, nor dress in colored clothes; that they shall wear a close cassock, observe the tonsure, and keep their hair cut short, etc.

11. Forbids men to enter the monastic houses of females.

14. Orders curates to teach their people the form of baptism at least once a year.

16. Orders fasting and almsgiving on the three days before the meeting of provincial councils.

29. Revokes the permission given to monks to preach indulgences.

— Labbe, *Concil.* 11:1603. See also Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. v, et al.; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v. For the Council of Ravenna held in 1317, *SEE BOLOGNA*.

Ravenscroft, John Stark

D.D., an Episcopal minister in America, afterwards bishop of North Carolina, was born near Blandford, Prince George County, Va. in 1772. He entered William and Mary College in 1789, but with little profit, and, on his return from Scotland soon after, settled in Lunenburg County. In 1810 his mind changed, and he joined the "Republican Methodists," and became a lay elder in their Church. He was subsequently ordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church, became assistant minister at Richmond, and was elected bishop the same year. In 1828 he retired to Williamsburgh from ill-health, and, on his return to North Carolina, died March 5, 1830. He published several *Sermons and Charges*: — also, *The Doctrine of the Church Vindicated, etc.*: — *Revealed Religion Defended against the Non-Comment Principle*. Sixty-one *Sermons* and a *Memoir* (2 vols. 8vo) were also published after his death. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 617.

Ravenscroft, Stephens

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of pious and respectable parentage in Staffordshire, England, March 6, 1803, was converted very young, and licensed to preach in his eighteenth year by the Wesleyans. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States. He was a great admirer of republican institutions, and as loyal a citizen as ever breathed the free air of America. In 1839 he was admitted into the Indiana Conference, and appointed to Booneville. His subsequent appointments were Mount Vernon, New Lebanon, Carlisle, Spencer, Bloomfield, and Bowling Green. While on the last-named charge his health failed, and he was located at his own request. He moved with his family to Point Commerce, and supplied Linton and New Albany circuits. He afterwards travelled as a Bible agent in Clark and Floyd counties until his health became so poor that he had to give up the work entirely. He then moved to Rockport, Ind., where, as a supply, he ended his nine years' service as a local preacher. In 1859 he was readmitted into conference and placed on the superannuated list, which relation he sustained until his death. In 1869 he moved to Worthington, Ind., and in 1870 to Petersburg, Ind., where he

was appointed postmaster, and where he died, Oct. 20, 1871. See *Minutes of Conf.* 1872, p. 79.

Ravenscroft, Thomas

an eminent English musical composer, deserves a place here for his devotion to sacred subjects. He was born in 1592, received his musical education in St. Paul's choir, and had the degree of bachelor of music conferred on him when only fifteen years of age. In 1611 appeared his *Melismata, Musical Phansies*, a collection of twenty-three party-songs, some of them of great beauty; and three years later he brought out another collection of part-songs under the title of *Brief Discourses*, with an essay on the old musical modes. Turning his attention to psalmody, he published in 1621 a collection of psalm-tunes for four voices, entitled *The Whole Book of Psalms, composed into Four Parts by Sundry Authors to such Tunes as have been and are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands*. This was the first publication of its kind, and all similar works of later date have been largely indebted to it. Among the contributors to this collection were Tallis Morley, Dowland, and all the great masters of the day, the name of John Milton, the father of the poet, appears as the composer of York and Norwich tunes; while St. David's, Canterbury, Bangor, and many others which have since become popular, are by Ravenscroft himself. Each of the 150 Psalms has a distinct melody assigned to it. Two collections of secular songs similar to the *Melismata*, and entitled *Pammelia* and *Deuteromelia*, have been assigned to Ravenscroft; but it is probable that only a few of these songs were composed by him, while he may have revised and edited the whole. A selection from the *Melismata, Brief Discourses, Pammelia*, and *Deuteromelia* was printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1823. He died about 1640. — Chambers. See also *Engl. Ch. Register*, vol. i; *Amer. Quar. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1871, p. 526.

Ravesteyn, Josse

(in Latin *Tiletanus*), a Belgian theologian, was born about 1506 at Tielt, Flanders. He was educated at Louvain, and taught theology there. He was sent by Charles V to the Council of Trent (1551), then to the Colloquy of Worms (1557), and distinguished himself at these ecclesiastical councils by his knowledge and moderation. In 1559 he replaced Ruard Tapper in the charge of the nuns who had the care of the hospital of Louvain. He had

twice been elected rector of the university of that city, and held divers benefices of imperial munificence. "He was," said Paquot, "a wise doctor, quick at controversy, a zealous defender of the Church, and much opposed to the errors of Baius, whom he regarded as his most ardent adversary." He died at Louvain Feb. 7, 1571. His principal writings are, *Confessionis editoe a Ministris Antwerpiensibus Confutatio* (Louvain, 1567, 8vo); the Confession of the pastors had already been refuted by William of Linda: — *Apologia Catholicoe Confutationis*, etc. (ibid. 1568, 8vo); directed against the *Centuries de Magdeborg*, of which Matthew Flach Francowitz was the principal author: — *Apologice Decretorum Concilii Tridentini de Sacramentis* (ibid. 1568-70, 2 vols. 12mo). He left several works in manuscript. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ravignan, Gustavus Francis Xavier Delacroix De,

one of the most celebrated of Roman Catholic preachers of our times, and also a distinguished member of the Jesuit Order, was born at Bayonne Dec. 2, 1795. He studied in the Lyce Bonaparte at Paris, and was by his parents intended for the legal profession, which he also entered by obtaining his degree and being named auditor of the Cour Royale at Paris. In 1821 he received an appointment in the Tribunal of the Seine. The prospect thus opened for him, however, lost its attraction after a change of views in religion had made him serious about the future, and in 1822 he formed the resolution of relinquishing his career at the bar, and entering the Church. Having spent some time in the College of St. Sulpice, he soon passed into the novitiate of the Jesuits at Mlontrouge, and thence to Dole and St. Acheul for his theological studies, at the termination of which he was himself appointed a professor. The religious fervor of his soul found expression in many of the material forms which prevail so generally among the Romanists of his order. Thus, for example, he wore for a long time, as a mark of penance, a leather girdle stuck full of needles, around his waist, on the bare body. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1830, father Ravignan withdrew to Freiburg, in Switzerland, where he continued to teach in the schools of his own order; but after some time, when he was supposed to have gained sufficient notoriety by the afflictive discipline of his body, he was transferred to the more congenial duty of preaching, first in several of the Swiss towns, and afterwards in Savoy, at Chambery, at St. Maurice, and other places. At length, in 1835, he appeared in the pulpit of the cathedral of Amiens. In the following year he was chosen to preach the Lenten sermons at the church of St. Thomas d'Aquin in Paris; and finally,

in 1837, was selected to replace Lacordaire (q.v.) at Notre Dame in the duty of conducting the special "conferences" for men which had been opened in that church. For ten years father Ravignan occupied this pulpit with a success which has rarely been equalled, and his *Conferences* are regarded as models of ecclesiastical eloquence. In 1842 he undertook, in addition, to preach each evening during the entire Lent; and it is to the excessive fatigue thus induced, as well as to the many trials imposed, that the premature break-down of his strength is ascribed. To the labors of the pulpit he added those also of the press. He published an *Apology* of his order in 1844; and in 1854 a more extended work with the same view. *Clement XIII et Clement XIV* (2 vols. 8vo), which was intended as a reply to the *Life of Clement XIV* by the Oratorian father Theiner. These, with some occasional *Sermons* and *Conferences*, constitute the sum of the publications issued during his life. In 1855 he was invited by the emperor Napoleon III to preach the Lent at the Tuileries. He died Feb. 26, 1858, in the convent of his order at Paris. None of the Jesuit preachers of our times have so zealously labored among the Protestants as father Ravignan, but, alas! too frequently he employed measures in no way adding honor to the already overcast name of the Jesuitical order. His *Memoirs* have been published by his brethren, and a collected edition of his works and remains has been for some time in progress. The *Memoir* has been translated into English, under the title of *The Life of Father Ravignan*, by father De Ponlevoy (Dublin, 1869; N. Y. 1869).

Ravle

is, in ecclesiastical language, the name of a cloak worn by women mourners. *SEE MOURNING*.

Rawlett, John

an English theologian, was born about 1642, and was a lecturer in divinity at Newcastle-upon-Tyne at the time of his death, in 1686. He published, *Explication of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer* (Lond. 1672, 8vo; 1769, 8vo): *Dialogue between Two Protestants* (1686, 8vo): — *Christian Monitor*, in Welsh (Oxon. 1689. 8vo): — *Treatise of Sacramental Covenanting* (5th ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo).

Rawley, William

an Anglican divine of some note, was born about 1588, and was educated at Bene't College, Cambridge, of which he was made fellow in 1609. He finally took holy orders, and in 1612 became rector of Bowthorpe, Norfolk; in 1616, vicar of Landbeach, Cambridge. He was chaplain and amanuensis to lord Bacon, and subsequently chaplain to Charles I and Charles II. He wrote prefaces and dedications to some of Bacon's works, and translated several of them into Latin. In 1638, after Bacon's death, he published them in folio form — and in 1657 he published, under the title of *Resuscitatio*, several other of Bacon's tracts, with a memoir of the author prefixed. In 1661 he republished the *Resuscitatio*, with additions. He died in 1667.

Rawlin, Richard

an English Independent divine, was born in 1687, and flourished as pastor of an Independent congregation in Fetter Lane, London. He died in 1757. He published, *Christ the Righteousness of his People, seven Discourses on Justification by Faith in Him* (1741, 8vo; 1722, 1797, 12mo).

Rawlings, Charles

a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born May 24, 1813, at Cheltenham. He was destined for mercantile life, but finally, brought under the influence of the Wesleyans, he was converted and taken into the Church. In 1836 he entered the ministry, and for twenty-nine years filled some of the best circuits in the connection. He last held the appointment of superintendent of the Swansea (English) Circuit. He died July 14, 1865. See *Cambria Daily Leader* (of that date).

Rawlinson, George

an English divine, noted also as a scientist, was born in 1828, and was educated at King's College and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In 1854 he was made curate of St. Mary's, Vincent Square, London. In 1856 he was appointed professor of applied sciences at Elphinstone College, Bombay, mwhere he remained until his death in September following. He published in 1857, at Bombay, a work on dynamics. His *Elementary Statics*, edited by Edw. Sturgis, was published at Cambridge and London (1861, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Rawlinson, John

D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. He was at one time principal of St. Edmund's Hall. He published, *Three Sermons* (Lond. 1609-11; Oxon. 1612, 4to): — *Sermon on* ~~<100>~~1 Samuel 10:24 (ibid. 1616, 4to): — *Sermons on* ~~<1228>~~Luke 22:48 (Lond. 1616, 4to): — *Four Lent Sermons* (1625, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Rawson, Grindal

an early American preacher, was born in 1658, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1678. He entered the ministry, and was pastor of a Presbyterian congregation at Mendon, Mass., from 1680 until his death, in 1715. He published *Election Sermons* (Bost. 1709, 16mo). See Mather, *Deaths of Good Men*.

Rawson, Joseph

D.D., an English divine, flourished near the opening of last century as canon of Lichfield. He published nine single *Sermons* (1703-16), and a *Narrative* of his case (Lond. 1737, 8vo). See Watt, *Bib. Brit.* s.v.

Ray, Benjamin

an English clergyman, flourished in the first half of the last century. He was perpetual curate of Surfleet and curate of Cowbitt, and died in 1760. He contributed to the *Trans. of the Spalding Society*, to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1744 (on an ancient coin, etc.), and to the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1751 (on a water-spout), and left some works in manuscript. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Ray, John

a celebrated English naturalist, of humble origin, but indomitable perseverance, was the author of two works showing the relation of science to religion (*The Wisdom of God in the Works of Creation* [Lond. 1691, and often since]; and *Three Physico-Theological Discourses* [ibid. 1693, and later]). He was born in 1628 at Black Notley, in Essex; was educated at Braintree School, and at Catharine Hall and Trinity College, Cambridge; lost his fellowship in the latter college by refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity; travelled on the Continent for three years with Mr.

Willoughby and other friends; became a fellow of the Royal Society, and died in 1705. His works are numerous and valuable, chiefly on scientific and literary subjects. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Ray, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pennsylvania, Oct. 18, 1794, became a Christian in early life, and, after preaching for several years, in 1833 joined the Indiana Conference, within whose limits he travelled until his death, Jan. 31, 1871, at Inwood, *Ind.* — *Minutes of Amer. Conf.* 1871, p. 184.

Raybold, George A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 18, 1802. He was converted in April, 1822, and began to preach in 1825. In April, 1829, he withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church, but reunited with the Methodist Episcopal Church in September, 1831. In 1833 he was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, ordained deacon in 1835, and elder in 1837. When the New Jersey Conference was formed, he was set off with it, and continued to fill the several appointments to which he was assigned until 1847, when he was granted a supernumerary relation. For over thirty years he was a great sufferer from disease, and yet maintained a devout, patient spirit until his death, at Haddonfield, N. J., Dec. 4, 1876. — *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church*, 1877, p. 159.

Rayland, John, D.D.

a learned minister of the Baptist denomination in England, was born at Warwick Jan. 29, 1753. In his childhood he developed remarkable talents as a scholar. Having been thoroughly trained under the tuition of his father. he became his assistant in the school under his charge, and his successor when he retired from his official duties. He began to preach in 1771 at Northampton and its vicinity. In 1781 he became colleague with his father in the pastorate of the Northampton church, and sole pastor on the removal of his father to Enfield. He occupied this position for ten years, and then became pastor of the Broadmead Chapel in Bristol, and at the same time president of the Baptist Institute in that place. Here he continued until his death, May 25, 1825. Brown University conferred the degree of D.D. on Dr. Rayland in 1772. His *Sermons*, etc., were collected after his death, and

published in two octavo volumes. The funeral sermon of Dr. Rayland by Robert Hall presents a most charming portraiture of this excellent man. (J. C. S.)

Raymond, St.

(Spanish, *San Ramon*), a Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in Spain in the first half of the 13th century, is frequently called by his surname *Nonnattus*, which he owes to the fact that he was taken out of the body of his mother after her death by the Cesarean operation. He was thus born at Portel, in Catalonia, in 1204, and was of a gentleman's family of small fortune. His early life was spent in the mountain fastnesses of his native country; but when he had attained to the years of a maturer youth, he set out for the court, and there attracted attention. The dissipation of his royal associates disgusted him, and he sought the retirement of the cloister. He joined the Order of Mercy, which aimed at the redemption of captives from the Moors, and was admitted by the founder himself, St. Peter Nolasco (q.v.). While in Algiers he was taken up by the authorities, and punished with excruciating tortures of the body; but he bore all meekly, and even continued his work after his release. The story goes that the governor, when informed of the incurability of Raymond's zeal of propagandism, had him seized anew, and his lips were bored through with a red-hot iron and fastened with a padlock. He was released after eight months' imprisonment, and taken back to Spain by friends of his, and under direction of the pope of Rome, who shortly after made him a cardinal. He was also made the general of his order, and as such was invited to visit Rome. On his way thither he fell sick at Cardona, only six miles from Barcelona, and died Aug. 31, 1240. Both pope Gregory IX and king James of Aragon assisted at his funeral. Pope Alexander VII inserted Raymond's name in the *Martyrology* in 1657. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 8:567 sq.

Raymond Of Maguelonne

a French medieval prelate, flourished near the opening of the 12th century. It is supposed that he was of the family of the nobles of Montpellier. He was bishop from 1129, but not without opposition. Bernard, count of Substantion, finding the choice of Raymond contrary to his views, for revenge, tried to destroy the church of Maguelonne; but the constancy of Raymond triumphed over this opposition, and forced the same Bernard to make public confession of his fault. The name of this bishop is cited in

many of the acts mentioned or published by the *Gallia Christianna* and *L'Histoire de Languedoc* of M. Vaissette. He died in November, 1159. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Raymond Of Penafort

(*Saint*), a Spanish Dominican, was born in 1175 at the chateau of Penafort. in Catalonia, and belonged to one of the noble families of Spain allied to the royal house of Aragon. He was educated at Barcelona, and made such progress that at the age of twenty he taught the liberal arts at that place. He went to perfect himself at the University of Bologna, where he received the title of doctor in civil and canonical law. Attracted by his reputation, which was still rising, Beranger, bishop of Barcelona, on his returning to his church from Rome, went to see him at Bologna, and succeeded in persuading him to return with him to Spain. He did not, however, content himself with the mere discharge of the duties of his canonicate and his archdeaconry in the Barcelona cathedral, but was very much occupied with all manner of good works. He finally felt persuaded to take the Dominican habit, April 1, 1222. His example was followed by several persons distinguished for their knowledge and birth. Pope Gregory IX called him to Rome, and employed him in 1228 in the collection of the *Decretals*: he wished even to raise him to the metropolitan see of Tarragona, but Raymond preferred the solitude of Barcelona to all the advantages which his friends had hoped for him. Nominated general of his order in 1238, he gave up his charge two years later, and contributed much by his zeal and counsel to the establishment of the Order of Mercy. Peter Nolascus was one of his converts, and so were many other distinguished characters of that period. Indeed, his influence is said to have been so great that the expulsion of the Moors from Spain is principally attributed to him. Raymond was also made the spiritual director of the king of Aragon, and he persuaded his royal master James to favor the establishment of the Inquisition in his kingdom and in Languedoc, and the popes permitted him to provide for the offices of this tribunal. Pope Clement VIII canonized him in 1601. We have of his works a collection of *Decretals*, which forms the fifth volume of the canon law. This collection is in five books, and the author has joined several decrees of the councils to the constitutions of the popes: — a *Summa* on penitence and marriage, which he had printed many times: — an abridgment of this work, and divers other works which have not been printed, and which do not merit it. Raymond de Penafort died at Barcelona Jan. 6, 1275. He is commemorated Jan. 23. — Hoefer, *Nouv.*

Biog. Generale, s.v. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, i, 200 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legendary and Mythological Art* (see Index).

Raymond Of Sabunde (Or Sebunde),

a French ecclesiastic, who was a native of Spain, but flourished in the first half of the 15th century at Toulouse, is noted as a philosopher and theologian. About 1436 he taught medicine at Toulouse, and perhaps also theology. He is especially noteworthy as the author of *Liber Naturloe s. Creaturam*, etc., which has had several emendations and translations. Raymond sought in a rational, yet in some respects rather mystical, manner to demonstrate the harmony between the book of nature and the Bible. He asserts that man has received from the Almighty two books, wherein he may discover the important facts which concern his relation to his Creator, viz. the book of Revelation and that of Nature; affirming the latter to be the most universal in its contents, and the most perspicuous. He endeavored by specious rather than solid arguments to deduce the theology of his age, even in its more peculiar doctrines, from the contemplation of nature and of man. "Setting out with the consideration of the four stages designated as mere being, life, sensation, and reason, Raymond (who agrees with the Nominalists in regarding self-knowledge as the most certain kind of knowledge) proves by ontological, physico-teleological, and moral arguments (the latter based on the principle of retribution) the existence and trinity of God, and the duty of grateful love to God, who first loved us. His work culminates in the mystical conception of a kind of love to God by which the lover is enabled to grow into the essence of the loved" (Ueberweg). This attempt of Raymond of Sabunde to prove the doctrines of Christianity from the revelation of God in nature has no imitators. It certainly deserved, from its just observations on many subjects, especially on morals, greater success than it met with. Montaigne directed to it the attention of his contemporaries by a translation he made of it. (See Montaigne's observations in his *Essays*, lib. 2, ch. xii.) The best Latin editions of the *Liber Naturloe* are those of Frankfort, 1635, and Amsterdam, 1761. See Matzke, *Die naturl. Theol. des R. v. Sab.* (Breslau, 1846); Nitzsch, *Qucest. Raimundance*, in *Zeitsch. fur hist. Theol.* 1859. No. 3; Zockler, *Theol. Natur.* (Frankf. 1860), vol. i; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Ritter, *Christl. Philos.* ii, 747-754; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 465467. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Raymond, Lully

SEE LULLY.

Raymond, Martin

a Spanish Dominican who flourished in the 13th century, near its middle, was in 1250 presiding officer of the eight colleges which the kings of Castile and Aragon had erected in the Dominican convents for the study of the Oriental tongues. The principal object of these schools was to fit out missionaries, and to aid the work of missions in all possible ways. Our Raymond was one of the greatest promoters of that work in his time, and his name deserves to be commemorated in the annals of Christian missions. He died after 1286. He is especially known by his *Pugio Fidei contra Mauros et Judeos*, ed. by De Voisin (Paris, 1651), and by Carpzov (Leipsic, 1687). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 383; ii, 17.

Raynaud, (Rainaldi), Theophilus

a celebrated Italian Jesuit, was born Nov. 15, 1583, at Sospello, near Nice. He studied at Avignon, and became quite accomplished as a student of philosophy. In 1602 he entered the Society of Jesus, and was made one of their teachers at Lyons. At first he taught elementary branches, but soon found advancement. and was finally given a professorship of philosophy and theology. In 1631 he was chosen confessor to prince Maurice of Savoy, and repaired to Paris. Here he was made uncomfortable by unpleasant relations to Richelieu, who, having been attacked by a Spanish theologian for the alliance of the French government with the German Protestants, had asked Raynaud for a reply and been refused. Raynaud was, at his request to the order, transferred to Chambery, and this bishopric soon becoming vacant, he was solicited to fill it. But he was far from being pleased, and even prepared to return to Lyons. He did not again revisit Savoy until 1639, and then only to his unhappiness. He had, during his sojourn at Chambery, contracted a close friendship with father Pierre Monod, his companion; and when he heard of his detention in the fortress of Montmelian, he tried in every way to have it brought to an end. Richelieu took offence at this ardent affection, which was natural between friends, and, not being willing to permit relations between Raynaud and a prisoner of the state, he solicited and obtained from the court of Savoy the arrest of the unfortunate Jesuit. At the end of three months he was released, and sought refuge at Carpentras, which then belonged to the

Papal States. But the aversion of his enemies would not leave him long undisturbed. By order of the cardinal-legate Antonio Barberini, he was conducted to Avignon, and locked in a chamber of the pontifical palace. With difficulty released, he left for Rome, with the manuscript of *Heteroclita Spiritualia*, of which the impression had been suspended, submitted it for examination to father Alegambe, and obtained the authority to publish. In 1645 he returned to Rome in company with cardinal Federigo Sforza, and was presented to the pope and the Sacred College as one of the most ardent champions of the papal rights. He afterwards made two journeys to the Eternal City, the first time in 1647, and there occupied for some time a theological chair; the second time in 1651, when he assisted at the general assembly of his order. He afterwards obtained permission to establish himself at Lyons, and there passed the rest of his life in teaching and composing his works. He died Oct. 31, 1663. Father Raynaud had all the qualities of a good friar: he was sober, pious, and very charitable; but by his pen he did not spare his adversaries, and showed himself severe and irascible. He wrote a great many works, which, though extravagant in style, tedious, and trivial, were nearly all received with favor. Tiraboschi was unable to forbear comparing them “to one of those vast magazines full of merchandise of all kinds, good and bad, ancient and modern, useful and useless, in which every one could find, with taste and patience, everything which suited him.” The writings of pere Raynaud worth mentioning here are, *Theologia Naturalis* (Lyons, 1622, 1637, 4to): — *Splendor Veritatis Moralis* (ibid. 1627, 8vo; under the name of Stephanus Emonecus): — *Moralis Disciplina* (ibid. 1629, fol.): — *Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunensium* (ibid. 1629, 12mo): *Culcinismus, Vestiareum Religio* (Paris, 1630, 12mo; under the name of Riviere): — *De Communionem pro Alortuzis* (Lyons, 1630, 8vo); he pretends that the sacraments have no virtue except for those who receive them uncensured by the Church of Rome: — *De Martyrio per Postem* (ibid. 1630, 8vo); in the index of this book he tried to show that those who exposed themselves voluntarily to the plague in assisting those who had it were the real martyrs: — *Nova Libertatis Explicatio* (Paris, 1632, 4to); against father Gibieuf, an Orator: — *Metamorphosis Latronis in Apostolum Apostolique in Latronem*, (Lyons, 1634, 2 vols. 8vo); followed by several other treatises: — *De Ortu Infantium contra Naturam, per Sectionem Caesaream* (ibid. 1637, 8vo); a singular and curious bohor: — *Hipiparchus de Religioso Neyotiattore* (Francopolis [Chambery], 1642, 8vo); a satirical work, translated into French (Chambery, 1645, 8vo) by

Tripier, teacher of the natural children of the duke of Savoy; and Amsterdam (1761, 12mo): — *Dypticha Mariana* (Grenoble, 1643, 4to): — *Malal Bonorum Ecclesiasticorum* (Lyons, 1644, 4to): — *De Incorrutione Cadaverum* (Avignon, 1645, Svo); a dissertation written upon the dead body of a woman which was found in 1642 at Carpentras wwithout any signs of decomposition, although it had been buried for a long time; Raynaund pretended that the incorruption of the body was not due to natural causes, nor to the artifices of the devil, but to God himself; but, adds he, as this last supposition is far from being demonstrateid, it will be well to find what God himself has decreed on this subject: — *Heteroclitia Spiritualia* (Grenoble, 1646, 8vo; Lyons, 1654, 4to); a collection of the extraordinary practices which superstition and ignorance have introduced into religion: — *Vitae ac Mortis Humanae Terminalia* (Orange, 1646, 8vo); he had not then reason to doubt, following the author, that God has fixed the term of life for the good and the wicked; but ordinarily the length of the life of men and their death depend upon natural causes: — *Trinitas Patrilarcharum* (Lyons, 1647, 8vo); notices upon Simeon Stylites, Francis de Paulo, and Ignatius de Loyola: — *Erotemata de Malis ac Bonis Libris, ceque Justa natt justa eornmodem Confixione* (ibid. 1650, 4to); this work, fulll of research, is an answer to an attack on his *De Martyrio per Pestem: - Theologia Patrum* (Antwerp, 1652, fol.): — *De Sobria Alterius Sexuts Frenuentatione per Sacros et Religiosos Homines* (Lyons, 1653, 8vo): — *Scapulare il Marianum* (Paris, 1653, 8vo): — *De Pileo Exteriusque Ceapitis Tegminiibus, tam Sacris quam Profanis* (Lyons, 1655, 4to): — *Eunuchi, Nati, Facti, Alystici, ex Sacra et Humlana Literatura Illustrati; Puerorum Enmasculatores ob Musicam quo Loco Habendi* (Dijon, 1655, 4to); under the name of Jean Heribert. he treated in a very diffuse manner, the subject of eunuchs; but he had forgotten the most essential point, whether they were able to marry; this question was very fully treated in his work *Traite des Eunuques* (1707, 4to): — *Hercules Commodiclus* (Aix, 1565, 8vo); under the name Honorat Leotard; it is a virulent satire against Jean de Launoi: — *Trias Fortium David* (Lyons, 1657, 4to); remarks upon Robert d'Arbrissel, St. Bernard, and Cesar of Bus: — *Missi Evangelici cad Siwas. Japionam et Oras Confines* (Antw. [Lyons] 1659, 8vo); under the name of Leger Quintin: — *0 Parascevasticum* (Lyons, 1661, 4tc): — *Iagiologiun Luydunennse* (ibid. 1662, 8vo): — *De Immunnitate Autorum Cyriacorum a Censura* (ibid. 1662, 8vo). See Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclus.*; Niceron, *Memoires*, vol. 26. *His Life*, written by himself, is preserved in

the Jesuit Library at Lyons. See also Sotwei, *Script. Soc. Jesu.* — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Ra'zis

(**Ραζείζ**, Vulg. *Razias*), “one of the elders of Jerusalem,” who killed himself under peculiarly terrible circumstances, that he might not fall “into the hands of the wicked” (2 Maccabees 14:37-46). In dying he is reported to have expressed his faith in a resurrection (ver. 46) — a belief elsewhere characteristic of the Maccabean conflict. This act of suicide, which was wholly alien to the spirit of the Jewish law and people (^{<0082>}John 8:22; comp. Elwald, *Alterth.* p. 198; Grotius, *De Jure Belli*, II, 19:5), has been the subject of considerable discussion. It was quoted by the Donatists as the single fact in Scripture which supported their fanatical contempt of life (Augustine, *Ep.* 104, 6). Augustine denies the fitness of the model, and condemns the deed as that of a man “non cligende mortis sapiens, sed ferendae humilitatis impatiens” (Augustine, *l.c.*; comp. *c. Gaud.* i, 36-39). At a later time the favor with which the writer of 2 Maccabees views the conduct of Razis — a fact which Augustine vainly denies — was urged rightly by Protestant writers as an argument against the inspiration of the book. Indeed the whole narrative breathes the spirit of pagan heroism, or of the later zealots (comp. Josephus, *War*, 3:7; 4:1, 10), and the deaths of Samson and Saul offer no satisfactory parallel (comp. Grimm, *ad loc.*

Razor

is the rendering in the A.V. of the following words:

1. **hrwā**, *morahle* (Sept. **σίδηρος**, **ξύρον**; Vulg. *novacula, ferrum*: from **hrm**; “scrape,” or “sweep.” Gesenius connects it with the root **arg**; “to fear” [*Thesatur.* p. 819j). This word occurs in ^{<0135>}Judges 13:5; 16:17; ^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:11.

2. **r [Ἰ]** *ta'ar* (Sept. **ρόμφαία**; Vulg. *gladius*: from **hr[]**; to lay bare), a more general term (^{<0015>}Numbers 6:5; ^{<0312>}Psalms 52:2; ^{<0371>}Isaiah 7:20; ^{<0011>}Ezekiel 5:1) for a sharp *knife* (as rendered in ^{<0023>}Jeremiah 26:23) or *sword* (“sheath,” ^{<0175>}1 Samuel 17:51, etc.; although many regard this as a different word of the same form). The *barber* is designated by **BLḡj** *gallab'* (Sept. **κουρεύς**; Vulg. *tonsor*, ^{<0018>}2 Samuel 20:8). “Besides other usages, the practice of shaving the head after the completion of a vow must

have created among the Jews a necessity for the special trade of a barber (~~404B~~ Numbers 6:9, 18; 8:7; ~~684B~~ Leviticus 14:8; ~~073B~~ Judges 13:5; ~~207D~~ Isaiah 7:20; ~~410B~~ Ezekiel 5:1; ~~448B~~ Acts 18:18). The instruments of his work were probably, as in modern times, the razor, the basin, the mirror, and perhaps, also, the scissors, such as are described by Lucian (*Adv. Indoct.* ii, 395, ed. Amst.; see ~~1046~~ 2 Samuel 14:26). The process of Oriental shaving, and especially of the head, is minutely described by Chardin (*Voy.* 4:144). It may be remarked that, like the Levites, the Egyptian priests were accustomed to shave their whole bodies (Herod. ii, 36, 37).” The Psalmist compares the tongue of Doeg to a sharp razor (~~1651D~~ Psalm 52:2) starting aside from what should be its true operation to a cruel purpose and effect. In the denunciation of the woes that were to be brought upon Judah in the time of Ahaz by the instrumentality of the Assyrians, we have the remarkable expression, “In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard” (~~237D~~ Isaiah 7:20). It seems likely that there is here an implication of contempt as well as suffering, as the office of a barber ambulant has seldom been esteemed of any dignity either in the East or West. To shave with the hired razor the head, the feet, and the beard is an expression highly parabolical, to denote the utter devastation of the country from one end to the other, and the plundering of the people from the highest to the lowest by the Assyrians, whom God employed as his instrument to punish the rebellious Jews. *SEE BARBER.*

Rea, John, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in the village of Tully, Ireland, in 1772. He emigrated to the United States in 1799, and, after remaining at Philadelphia a short time, “I left on foot,” he says, “travelled mostly alone through the wilderness, sad, gloomy, and dispirited, until, after many days, I arrived west of the Alleghany Mountains, stopping at the house of Mr. Porter, a Presbyterian minister.” He now labored and struggled amid many adverse circumstances to secure a literary course of education, teaching school and studying alternately, until he graduated with honor at Jefferson College, when it was only a small school kept in a log-cabin near Canonsburg, Pa. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. John M’Millan, was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery in June, 1803, and, after itinerating awhile in the wilderness of Eastern Ohio among some Indian camps, he was appointed to supply the newly organized churches of Beechsprings and

Crabapple, over which he was ordained and installed pastor in 1805. The country was settled rapidly, and his charges grew as fast, so that it soon became necessary to have the relation between these two churches dissolved, that he might labor all his time at the Beechsprings. "So untiring and devoted was this servant of Christ that, besides constantly ministering to his own large congregation, he found time to be instrumental in raising up some six or seven separate societies that went out as colonies from the mother Church. and are now self-sustaining and prominent congregations." He died, after a ministry of fifty-two years, Feb. 12. 1855. Dr. Rea was pastor of the Church at Beechsprings forty-five years, and the history of the Presbyterian Church in Eastern Ohio is closely connected with his biography. He was a close, persevering student, clear in the arrangement of his subject. original in his thinking, and independent in thought and expression. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 193. (J. L. S.)

Read, Francis H.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harrison County, Va., Nov. 25, 1812, was converted in his youth, joined the Church promptly in 1829, and in 1834, feeling called of God to the holy ministry, entered the travelling connection within the bounds of the Pittsburgh Conference, Pa. When the West Virginia Conference was formed, he became united with it, and there labored until 1855, when he was located. He removed to Illinois, and shortly after entered the ocke River Conference, and was appointed to the Newark Circuit. After two years he again took a location, and removed to Iowa. In 1858 he was admitted into the Iowa Conference, and afterwards, by the formation and division of territory, he fell first into the Western Iowa, and then into the Des Moines Conference. His appointments in these conferences were Hopeville Circuit, Osceola, Chariton, Ottawa Circuit, Corning, and the Atlantic District. In this field truly "he died at his post." His death occurred July 13, 1871, at Panora, Guthrie County, Iowa. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 218, 219.

Read, Henry Clay

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stanford, Lincoln County, Ky., Jan. 30, 1826. He graduated at Centre College, Danville, Ky., in 1849, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1850; was licensed by Transylvania Presbytery June 27, 1850, and began his labors at Westport,

Lagrange, and Ballardsville. Ky. In 1851 he moved to Glasgow, Ky., and was ordained over that Church April 9, 1852. In 1858 he moved to Columbia, Ky., and engaged as joint principal of the high-school in that place, during which period he preached half of his time to the Church there, and the churches of Edmonton and Munfordsville. In 1859 he took full charge of the Church and school, but discontinued the school in 1862. He was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church which met in Peoria, Ill., in 1863. He died Oct. 23, 1863. Mr. Read was a most exemplary Christian, aman of sound judgment, and a good preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 191. (J. L. S.)

Read, Thomas Buchanan

an American artist of some renown, deserves a place here for his distinction in works on sacred subjects. He was born in Chester County, Pa., March 12, 1822. When but seventeen years old he entered the studio of a sculptor in Cincinnati, intending to devote himself to sculpture for life; but painting soon proved the more attractive to him, and he practiced sculpture only as an amateur. In 1841 he went to New York, then to Boston, and settled in Philadelphia in 1846. He visited Europe first in 1850, since which time he has lived in Florence and Rome, passing some interval in Cincinnati. His pictures and his poems have the same characteristics, as might be expected. They are full of aerial grace and delicacy; anl exquisite refinement anan ideal charm mingle in all he did. And yet he sometimes wrote with the spirit we find in *Sheridan's Ride*, and painted with such force as is seen in *Sheridan and his Horse*. Among his most charming pictures is his *Star of Bethlehem*. He died in Europe, where he had resided for over five years, while on his way home, May 11, 1872.

Reader

one of the five inferior orders of the Church of Rome. The office of reader is of great antiquity in the Church, dating as far back as the 3d century. It is, however, abundantly evident that it was not a distinct order, the reader (in the Latin Church at least) never having been admitted to his office by imposition of hands. According to the Council of Carthage, the Bible was put into the hands of the appointee, in presence of the people, with these words: "Take this book, and be thou a reader of the Word of God, which office thou shalt faithfully and profitably perform. Thou shalt have part with those who minister in the Word of God." At the time of the

Reformation, readers were admitted in churches and chapels for which no clergyman could be procured, to the end that divine service in such places might not be altogether neglected. The office, or rather the name, is still continued in the Church of England. The following is the pledge to which, at the time of the Reformation, the *readers* were obliged to subscribe:

“*Imprimis*, I shall not preach or interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority. I shall not minister the sacraments or other public rites of the Church, but bury the dead, and purify women after their childbirth. I shall keep the register-book according to the injunctions. I shall use sobriety in apparel, and especially in the church at common prayer. I shall move men to quiet and concord, and not give them cause of offence. I shall bring in to my ordinary testimony of my behavior from the honest of the parish where I dwell, within one half year next following. I shall give place, upon convenient warning, so thought by the ordinary, if any learned minister shall be placed there at the suit of the patron of the parish. I shall claim no more of the fruits sequestered of such cure where I shall serve but as it shall be thought meet to the wisdom of the ordinary. I shall daily, at the least, read one chapter of the Old Testament, and one other of the new, with good advisement, to the increase of my knowledge. I shall not appoint in my room, by reason of my absence or sickness, any other man, but shall leave it to the suit of the parish to the ordinary for assigning some other able man. I shall not read but in poorer parishes, destitute of incumbents, except in the time of sickness, or for other good considerations to be allowed by the ordinary. I shall not openly intermeddle with any artificer’s occupations, as covetously to seek a gain thereby, having in ecclesiastical living the sum of twenty nobles, or above, by the year.”

In Scotland also, at the Reformation, readers were appointed to read the Scriptures and the common prayers — that is, the forms of the Church of Geneva. They were not allowed to preach or administer the sacraments. The readers were tempted now and then to overstep these limits, and were as often forbidden by the General Assembly, till, in 1581, the office was formally abolished. The *First Book of Discipline* says:

“To the churches where no ministers can be had presentlie must be appointed the most apt men that distinctlie can read the common

prayers and the Scriptures, to exercise both themselves and the Church, till they grow to greater perfection: and in process of time he that is but a reader may attain to a farther degree, and, by consent of the Church and discreet ministers, may be permitted to minister the sacraments; but not before that he be able somewhat to persuade by wholesome doctrine, beside his reading, and be admitted to the ministerie, as before is said... Nothing have we spoken of the stipend of readers, because, if they can do nothing but read, they neither can be called nor judged true ministers, and yet regard must be had to their labors; but so that they may be spurred forward to vertue, and not by any stipend appointed for their reading to be retained in that estate. To a reader, therefore, that is newly entered, fourty merkes, or more or lesse, as parishioners and readers can agree, is sufficient: provided that he teach the children of the parish, which he must doe, besides the reading of the common prayers, and bookes of the Old and New Testament. If from reading he begin to exhort and explain the Scriptures, then ought his stipend to be augmented, till finally he come to the honour of a minister. But if he be found unable after two yeares, then must he be removed from that office, and discharged of all stipend, that another may be proved as long; for this alwaies is to be avoided, that none who is judged unable to come at any time to some reasonable knowledge, whereby he may edifie the Kirk, shall be perpetually sustained upon the charge of the Kirk. Farther, it must be avoided that no child, nor person within age—that is, within twentie-one yeares of age — be admitted to the office of a reader.”

The name occurs, however, in Church records long after that period, for in many places the office was tacitly permitted. The precentor sometimes bore it; and exhorters — persons who read the Scriptures and added a few words of remark — were found in various towns. *SEE PRENTOR.*

Reading, Oriental Mode Of

(Heb. *arq*; to call aloud; ἀναγινώσκω). Mr. Jowett remarks, in his *Christian Researches in Syria*, etc., that “when persons are reading privately in a book, they usually go on reading aloud with a kind of singing voice, moving their heads and bodies in time, and making a monotonous cadence at regular intervals, thus giving emphasis, although not such an

emphasis as would please an English ear. Very often they seem to read without perceiving the sense, and to be pleased with themselves merely because they can go through the mechanical art of reading in any way.” This practice may enable us to “understand how it was that Philip should hear at what passage in Isaiah the Ethiopian eunuch was reading before he was invited to come up and sit with him in the chariot (^{<48B>}Acts 8:30, 31). The eunuch, though probably reading to himself, and not particularly designing to be heard by his attendants, would read loud enough to be understood by a person at some distance.” *SEE BOOK.*

Reading, Councils Of

(*Concilia Redingesia*). The first of these was held in July, 1279, by archbishop Peckham of Canterbury, assisted by his suffragans. The twelve following constitutions were published:

- 1.** Renews the twenty-ninth constitution of Othobon against pluralities, and directs bishops to cause a register to be kept of all incumbents in their dioceses, with all particulars relating to them and their livings.
- 2.** Relates to commendairies, and declares such as are held otherwise than the constitution of Gregory, made in the Council of Lyons, 1273, permits, to be vacant.
- 3.** Orders all priests, on the Sunday after every rural chapter, to explain to the people the sentences of excommunication decreed by the Council of Oxford in 1222; and to publish four times in each year the constitutions of Othobon concerning baptism at Easter and Pentecost, and that concerning concubinaries at the four principal rural chapters, the laity being first dismissed.
- 4.** Orders that children born within eight days of Pentecost and Easter shall be reserved to be baptized at these times; but that children born at other times shall be baptized at once, for fear of sudden death.
- 5.** Orders the eighth constitution of Othobon (1268) against concubinary priests to be read openly in the four principal rural chapters, and declares that such readings shall be taken as a monition. If the dean or his deputy neglect this, he is directed to fast every Friday on bread and water until the next chapter.

- 6.** Relates to the chrism orders that what remains of the old chrism shall be burned when the new is consecrated; directs that priests shall be bound to fetch the chrism for their churches every year from their bishops before Easter; forbids to use any other than the new chrism, under the heaviest penalties.
- 7.** Orders that the consecrated host be kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounded, that the people may "make humble adoration wheresoever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread."
- 8.** Declares the custom of praying for the dead to be "holy and wholesome;" and ordains that upon the death of any bishop of the province of Canterbury his surviving brethren shall perform a solemn office for the dead, both singly in their chapels, and together, when called to assemble in council or otherwise, after the death of the said bishop; orders, farther, every priest to say one mass for the soul of his deceased diocesan, and entreats all exempt religious priests and seculars to do likewise.
- 9.** Relates to the preaching of indulgences, and orders caution in so doing, "lest the keys of the Church be despised."
- 10.** Forbids to set free, or admit to purgation, on slight grounds, clerks who, having been put in prison for their crimes, are delivered to the Church as convicts.
- 11.** Enjoins that care be taken to preserve the chastity of friars and nuns; forbids them to sojourn long in the houses of their parents and friends.
- 12.** Forbids parishioners to dispose of the grass, trees, or roots growing in consecrated ground; leaves such produce at the disposal of the rectors; forbids the latter, without sufficient cause, to spoil or grub up such trees as are an ornament to the churchyards and places thereabouts.

Then follows (in some copies) an injunction that the clergy of each diocese should send at least *two* deputies to the next congregation, to treat with the bishops for the common interests of the Church of England. This injunction, however, is by some persons said to be not genuine. In this same council a deed protecting the liberties of the scholars at Oxford was drawn up, in which the archbishop declared that, "moved by their devout prayers, he received under his protection their persons and property, and

confirmed to them and their successors the liberties and immunities granted to them by bishops, kings, and others of the faithful;” it is also provided that sentences of suspension and excommunication passed by the chancellor, or his deputies, etc., upon men on account of offences committed by them in the university shall be put into execution throughout the province of Canterbury; further, it is ordered that the benefices of clerks found in arms by day or night, to the disturbance of the peace of the university, shall be sequestered for three years; and if the clerks so offending be unbeneficed, they shall be incapable of holding any benefice for five years, unless they shall make competent satisfaction in the interim.

Thirteen prelates attended this council, viz. the archbishop, and the bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Worcester, Bath, Llandaff, Hereford, Norwich, Bangor, and Rochester. — Johnson, *Eccle. Canons*; Labbd, *Concil.* 11:1062; Wilkins, *Concil.* ii, 33.

Reading-desk

the desk or pew from which the minister reads the morning and evening prayer. In the early part of the reign of Edward VI it was the custom of the minister to perform divine service at the upper end of the choir, near the communion-table; towards which, whether standing or kneeling, he always turned his face in the prayers. This being objected to, a new rubric was introduced (in the fifth year of king Edward), directing the minister to turn so that the people might best hear. In some churches, however, the too great distance of the chancel from the body of the church hindered the minister from being distinctly heard by the people; therefore the bishops, at the solicitation of the clergy, allowed them in several places to supersede their former practice, and to have desks or reading-pews in the body of the church; which dispensation, begun at first by some few ordinaries, grew by degrees to be more general, till at last it came to be a universal practice; insomuch that the Convocation, in the beginning of the reign of James I, ordered that in every church there should be a “convenient seat made for the minister to read service in.” It is remarkable that the reading-desk is only once recognised in the Prayer-book, viz. in the rubric prefixed to the Communion; and also that the rubric prefixed to the Communion office supposes the continuance of the old practice of reading the service in the choir or chancel. *SEE AMBO*; *SEE LECTERN*.

Reading-in

a form required of each incumbent on taking possession of his cure in the Church of England. The minute of the procedure is as follows:

“*Memoroandum*, That on Sunday, the — day of in the year of our Lord, the reverend A B, clerk, rector, or vicar of —, in the county of — and diocese of —, did read in this church of — aforesaid the articles of religion commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, agreed upon in Convocation in the year of our Lord 1562, and did declare his unfeigned assent and consent thereto; also, that he did publicly and openly, on the day and year aforesaid, in the tine of divine seil vice, read a declaration in the following mwords, viz. ‘I, A B, declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as it is now by law established.’ Together with a certificate nnder the right hand of the reverend —, by divine permission lord bishop of —, of his having made and subscribed the same before him; and also that the said A B did read in his parish church aforesaid, publicly and solemnly, the morning and evening prayer, according to the form prescribed in and by the book intituled the *Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*; and that immediately after reading the evening service, the said A B did openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all things therein contained and prescribed, in these words, viz. ‘I, A B, do declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled the *Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; according to the Use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*.’ And these things we promise to testify upon our corporal oaths, if at any time we should be duly called upon so to do. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, the day and year first above written.”

Reading, John

an English theologian, was born in 1588, in the county of Buckingham. He was curate at Dover, and afterwards chaplain of Charles I, but he manifested so much zeal in defending the cause of the king that in 1642 he was cast into prison, where he remained seventeen months. Archbishop Laud having conferred upon him, during his detention at the Tower, the parish of Chatham and a prebend at Canterbury, the king would not allow him to take possession of either of these benefices; and he even had a new imprisonment to undergo. When in 1660 Charles II landed at Dover, it was Reading who was first congratulated, upon his return, on the renown of the city. We have several religious works written by Reading, among others, *A Guide to the Holy City* (Oxford, 1651, 4to): — *An Antidote to Anabaptism* (1654, 4to); also several sermons. Reading died Oct. 26, 1667, at Chatham, Kent. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Reading, William

an Anglican divine, flourished in the early opening of last century as keeper of the Library of Sion College, London. He prepared an edition of the early ecclesiastical historians (Eusebius, etc.) in Greek and Latin, with notes (Cantab. 1720, 3 vols.). He also wrote, *Sermons* (1714, 8vo): — *Hist. of Jesus Christ* (Lond. 1716, 12mo; 1851, 32mo; 1852, 32mo): — *Sermons — Mortification, Holiness, etc.* (1724, 8vo): — *Bibliothecae Cleri Londinensis in Collegio Sionesi Catalogus Duplici Formas concinnatus* (1724, fol.): — *Sermons Preached out of the First Lessons of Every Sunday in the Year, with an Appendix of Six Sermons* (4 vols. 8vo-i, ii, 1728; 3:4:1730; 1755, 4 vols. 8vo); very rare; commended by D'Oyle and Maret in their *Commentary on the Bible*: — *Sermons* (1731, 8vo): — *Tracts on Government* (1739, 8vo).

Readings, Various.

SEE VARIOUS READINGS.

Reai'a

(~~1385~~ 1 Chronicles 5:5). *SEE REAIAH.*

Reai'ah

(Heb. *Reayah'*, **hyar**] *seen of Jehovah*), the name of three Hebrews.

1. (Sept. **ῚΡάδα** v. r. **ῚΡείά**) A “son” of Shobal son of Judah (**ῚῚῚῚ** 1 Chronicles 4:2). B.C. post 1658. He is apparently designated by the epithet *Haroeh* (**harb**; *ha-Roeh, the seer*; Sept. **ῚΡαά**, Vulg. *qui videbat*; evidently a mere corruption of *Reaiah*). **SEE SHOBAL**.

2. (Sept. **ῚΡηχά**) The son of Micah and father of Baal, apparently phylarchs of the tribe of Reuben not long before the invasion of Tiglath-Pileser (**ῚῚῚῚ** 1 Chronicles 5:5, A.V. “Reaia”). B.C. ante 720.

3. (Sept. **ῚΡαία** v. r. **ῚΡααία**, etc.) One of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (**ῚῚῚῚ** Ezra 2:47; **ῚῚῚῚ** Nehemiah 7:50). B.C. ante 536.

Real Presence

in the eucharist, is a doctrine forming an article in the belief of the Roman, the Greek, and other Eastern churches, and of some bodies or individuals in other Christian communions. Those who espouse the *real presence* in the eucharist hold that, under the appearance of the eucharistic bread and wine, after consecration by the minister, Christ himself is really and substantially present, body and blood, soul and divinity. The word *really* is used in opposition to “figuratively;” and the decree of the Council of Trent, which is the authoritative expositor of the Roman Catholic belief, conjoins with that word the terms “truly” and “substantially,” the former being used in order to exclude the notion of a barely *typical* representation, such as is recognisable in the Paschal Lamb and the other Messianic types of the old law; and the latter for the purpose of meeting the view ascribed to Calvin, that Christ, as apprehended by the faith of the believer, was, for such believer, rendered virtually present in the eucharist, and that his body and blood were received in virtue and efficacy, although not in corporal substance. **SEE LORDS SUPPER**.

In the Protestant churches of the Reformation, this question became a matter of serious conflict between Lutherans and Zwinglians. The belief of the Roman and Eastern churches as to the reality of the presence was shared by Luther, who, however, differed from Catholics as to the mode. One school of divines in the Anglican Church, whose doctrine became very

prominent in the time of Laud, and has been revived in the late Tractarian movement, also hold to transubstantiation in such a forbidding form to the Protestants as to stand entirely alone within the fold of Protestantism. Yet it must be remarked that between Roman Catholics and all other theological schools, of whatever class, one marked difference exists. According to the former, the presence of Christ in the consecrated eucharist is *permanent*; so that he is believed to be present not alone for the communicant who receives the eucharist during the time of his communion, but also remains present in the consecrated hosts reserved after communion. On the contrary, all the Lutherans, and almost all Anglicans, confine their belief of the presence to the time of communion, and all, with hardly an exception, repudiate the worship of the reserved elements, as it is practiced by Catholics. *SEE CONSUBSTANTIATION; SEE LUTHERANISM.*

In the Protestant Episcopal Church, while the “real presence” is undoubtedly held, yet it is considered as of a spiritual and heavenly character. The homily on the sacrament expressly asserts, “Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but the communion of the body and blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful,” etc. In the Office of the Communion, the elements are repeatedly designated as the body and blood of Christ; and after their reception we give thanks that God “doth vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of [his] Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.” The Catechism, in agreement with this, defines the “inward part” of this sacrament to be “the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s supper.” The 28th Article asserts, respecting the eucharist, that “to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and, likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.” “By maintaining this view,” says Stoughton, “the Church supports the dignity of this holy sacrament without involving the dogma of transubstantiation, which she everywhere repudiates, asserting that it cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament. and hath given occasion to many superstitions.” Instead of this-i.e. a corporal presence by the

change of the elements into the natural body and blood of Christ—she goes on to assert that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith” (Article XXVIII). See Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Willet, *Syn. Pap.*; Wheatley, *Common Prayer*; Hooker, *Ch. Polity*; *North Brit. Rev.* Jan. 1870, p. 272. **SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.**

Realino, Bernardino

an Italian Jesuit scholar, was born Dec. 1, 1530, at Carpi. Son of a gentleman in the service of Luigi di Gonzaga, he received an excellent education at Modena, and graduated at Bologna. He studied jurisprudence, and made himself known by a commentary upon the *Nuptials of Thetis and Peleus* of Catullus (Bologna, 1551, 4to), when one of his parents began an unjust lawsuit to take away part of his fortune. The affair lasted a long time, and was finally left to the verdict of an arbitrator, who hastened to decide against Realino without even hearing him. About the time of the encounter at Carpi, this arbitrator addressed him in very strong terms, and, in great wrath, Realino gave him a sword-cut in the face. Condemned for this bold action, the young man fled to Bologna. Made doctor of law in 1556, he obtained in the same year the office of magistrate of Felizzano, a borough of Milan; after this he became attorney of Alessandria; then the marquis of Peschiera gave him control of the vast domains which he possessed in the kingdom of Naples. At the age of thirty-four he grew weary of the world, arranged his affairs, and entered, at Naples, the Society of Jesus (1564). He there distinguished himself by a zeal, a patience, and a charity for the poor in which he was always consistent. Having received, in 1574, the order to lay the foundation of a college at Lecce, he did it just before his death. An inquiry was started to establish his rights to canonization, but the court of Rome refused the application. Realino composed quite a number of small books, mentioned by Sotwel; his notes upon ancient authors have been inserted in vol. ii of the *Thesaurus Criticus* of Gruter. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Realism

is a distinct and readily apprehended doctrine in the higher ranges of metaphysics, characterizing the whole scheme of speculation with which it may be associated. A Realist is one who maintains this doctrine. Realism

asserts that *General Terms*, or *Ideas*, as they are called by Plato, such as *Man, Horse, Plant*, have a substantive, or real, existence independent of their actual and individual manifestations. This dogma early encountered opposition, which became so violent in the 12th and ensuing centuries as to distract philosophy, and to excite controversies that disturbed creeds and kingdoms, and that still survive, though in disguised forms and with greatly diminished virulence. The war of words frequently proceeded to blows and slaughter. Excommunication often attended the less popular side. Tracts, pamphlets, and formidable volumes were sustained or resisted with carnal and sanguinary weapons. Communities were divided by the bitter logomachy into hostile factions. The Church swarmed with discords. Universities were arrayed against each other, or were torn by intestine dissensions. Cities were opposed to cities; states to states; one religious order to another; and the conflict between the temporal and spiritual sovereignty was exacerbated and widened by the metaphysical strife. Brucker, and multitudes less cognizant than he of the influence of metaphysical conclusions on the condition and conduct of governments and societies, have superciliously sneered at these envenomed and long-enduring contentions, as merely the blind sophistries of men bewildered by vain abstractions or futile fantasies. But a philosophical problem which has remained unsolved for thousands of years, which engrossed and embattled the most acute intellects for centuries, and which has not yet ceased to produce perplexity and division; which enlisted the zeal alike of the scholar and the people, the priest and the prince, can be regarded as frivolous only by those who fail to discern the intellectual forces and associations by which the progress of the world is moulded. Sir William Hamilton, indeed, doubts the continued existence of any Realist doctrine, and regards it “as curious only in a historical point of view;” but this opinion apparently results from inattention to the transformations which speculative tenets undergo, and to the vitality of old doctrines through the instrumentality of new disguises. There is a true metempsychosis of metaphysical questions:

*“Nec manet nt fuerat, nec formas seivat easdem,
Sed tamen ipsa eaden est: aaniam sic sc emper candem
Esse, sed in varias dooceo misaree figuras.”*

Sir William Hamilton’s scant notices of Realism and Nominalism are ingenious, subtle, delicate, but they want compass, completeness, and depth.

Twin-born with Realism was *Nominalism* (q.v.), its direct opposite, which strenuously denies the reality of *General Terms*, and maintains that they are names only, logical entities, convenient artifices of expression (*nomidna mera, voces nudce, flatus vocis*, articulated air, “*vox et praeterea nihil*”). Springing, as these antagonist views do, from the weakness of the human mind, which is unable to comprehend the primordial origin of being, and which is inevitably inclined to consider its imperfect knowledge complete and conclusive, the opposition began with the beginning of systematic speculation, accompanied its development, and acquired predominance in the ages characterized by dialectical earnestness and verbal precision. The contradictory tenets were upheld by rival sects of Hindui philosophers; they produced a wide severance of opinion in the brightest aera of Greek philosophy; they remained irreconcilable, though at times indistinct, in the schools of Alexandria: they burst out into clamorous fury in the Middle Ages, when the loftiest intellects were employed in laying the foundations of systematic theology and of orthodox expression.

Between the extreme and contradictory schemes of Realism and Nominalism was interposed, chiefly by the keen perspicacity of Abelard, but in accordance with the probable views of Aristotle. a doctrine of compromise which has been designated Conceptualism. The Conceptualist theory holds that *General Notions*, or *Universals*, have a real existence in individuals, but no real or substantial being without them. It recognises their positive existence in the mind, which derives them by abstraction and generalization from particulars, and employs them as the signs or names of the classes of concrete realities to which they are applicable. The Realist doctrine is that, before Socrates, Plato, and Phedo, or any other individual men existed, *Man*, as an abstract idea, had an essential and immutable reality, and that Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo were men solely in consequence of possessing this ideal manhood — *κατά μέθεξι*v. The Nominalist, on the other hand, alleged that humanity existed only in Socrates, Plato, Phaedo, and other individuals; that the term was only an intellectual device for indicating the common properties characteristic of Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo by giving them the general name *Man*, and thus embracing them in one class. The Conceptualist agreed with the Nominalist in refusing an absolute existence to the general term *Man*, and in assigning to it a *real* existence only in conjunction with Socrates, Plato, Phnedo, etc., but he endeavored to satisfy the demands of the Realist by admitting that the conception *Man*, attained by abstraction and

generalization from individuals, had an actual existence, and was an intelligible reality in the mind apprehending it. Thus Abelard was antagonist at once to William of Champeaux and to Roscellinus. Employing the quaint but precise language of the schoolmen, the idealists held *universalia esse ante rem*; the Nominalists, *universalia esse post rem*; the Conceptualists of various types, *universalia esse in rem*. To the last should be added *et etiam in intellectu*. These distinctions may appear shadowy and impalpable, but metaphysics dwells amid such "airy shapes," and these have had a marked influence and serious consequences in politics, law, morals, philosophy, and religion: "inclusas animas, superumque ad lumen ituras."

Nominalism has already met with due consideration. *SEE NOMINALISM*. The present notice will consequently be confined to Realism, except so far as Nominalism and Conceptualism may be inextricably entwined with it.

I. Origin of Realism. — It would be misplaced industry, and inconsistent with the brevity required here, to investigate the Realist doctrines which were entertained and developed in the philosophy of the Hindus. But the mediaeval dogma is so intimately connected with the tenor of Greek speculation that a reference to its remote source in the schools of Athens cannot be avoided. The controversy between Realism and Nominalism did not become predominant in speculation till the close of the 11th century, but the antagonism was distinctly declared from the times of Plato and Aristotle. The wide differences which separated the schemes of the great teacher and his greater pupil in their explanation of the intelligible universe (*mundus intelligibilis*) were plainly manifest to the successors of those great heresiarchs. The doctrine of Plato and the earnest opposition of Aristotle may be best appreciated by the careful consideration of the multitudinous passages in the text of Aristotle referred to in the index of Bonlitz (*Aristotelis Opera* [ed. Acad. Berolin.], vol. iv) under the head of "Plato, 2." Evidences not merely of the continued antagonism of the Academic and Peripatetic schools, but also of the recognition of the gravity and the consequences of this antagonism, are abundant in the subsequent ages. It may suffice to refer to Plotinus (*Emnnead.* III, 9:1; V, v, 1; IX, 3:10), to a passage in Porphyry, which will soon require to be cited, and to Hesychius Milesius (Fr. 7, ii, 53, *Fragm. Histor. Grasc.* 4:173), who has stated clearly and precisely the Platonic thesis ("Ἔστω δὲ τῶν εἰδῶν ἡ ἕκαστον αἰδιόν τε καὶ νόημα καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἀπαθές. Διὸ καὶ φησιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τὰς ἰδεὰς ἐστάναι καθάπερ παραδείγματα, τὰ δ' ἄλλὰ τούτοις εἰκέναι, τούτων ὁμοιώματα καθεστῶτα). But the

divergence of the schools in regard to *Universals, or genera generalissima*, and to abstract notions generally, remained an indeterminate disputation in the Hellenic world, and was not raised to supreme importance till it passed, in the mediaeval period, from transcendental ontology to dialectics and theology. The germ of the grand debate is found in one of the associates of the Neo-Platonic schools, but it scarcely vegetated till the scholastic period. Porphyry had said, in his introduction to the *Categories* of Aristotle (*Schol. Aristot.* ap. Aristot. *Opera* [ed. Acad. Berlin.], 3:1), that he would abstain from the more recondite inquiries, and aim only at a concise presentation of the simpler topics. "For," he proceeds, "I will decline to speak of the essential character of genera and species, or to inquire whether they are substantially corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable or existent only in perception, since this is a most profound investigation, and requires other and deeper examination." The Greek of Porphyry was almost entirely unknown to mediseval speculators, but the Latin paraphrase of Boethius was familiar to them, and constituted, as it were, a text-book of elementary logic. Thus the question of the nature of *Universals* was distinctly raised, and the opposite views which were entertained on the subject divided reasoners into hostile camps, and led to those passionate controversies which have been already alluded to. It was only gradually, however, that the opposition became clear and well marked, and connected itself closely with the gravest interests that have occupied the minds of men. In the first half of the 9th century, Rabanus Mnaurus, commenting on the text of Porphyry just quoted, but using the version of Boethius, recognises the conflict of opinion (Cousin, *Introd. aux OEuvres Inedits d'Abelard*, p. 77), and is supposed to have inclined to the Nominalistic side (Caraman, *Hist. des Rev. de lac Philosophie*, i, 249). It would probably be more correct to conclude that he sought a ground of conciliation between the two extremes. The difficult problem was, however, brought forward into distinct contemplation. If there was any tendency in Rabanus Maurus to what was afterwards known as Nominalism, the reaction showed itself promptly. In the next generation, the philosophy of Johannes Scotus Erigena, which was founded on an imperfect acquaintance with the Neo-Platonic teachings, ran into decided Pantheism, in accordance with the results of those teachings, as developed by Plotinus. Regarding God as the source whence all things proceed, by which all things are sustained, and to which all things return — representing creation as the self-evolution of the Creator, and destruction as the self-reabsorption, he rendered God all

things and all things God. The basis of his whole scheme was involved in the Platonic theory of ideas, *SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY*, and in the Realist tenet *universalia ante rem*. Not merely were the body and spirit of Scotus's philosophy heterodox, but it contained several particular conclusions which were deemed heretical, and which provoked the ecclesiastical censure which they received. The Pantheistic doctrines of Scotus Erigena naturally excited opposition when the results to which they led became apparent. If God were all things, then necessarily all things would be essentially God — being the external and phenomenal manifestations of the divine activity, and constituting, at the same time, the divine essence, inasmuch as their whole support was a real existence in the divine substance. It is the inevitable tendency of a metaphysical dogma to be unfolded by its acolytes into its ultimate logical consequences, which reveal the extravagances and the hazards of the position. It is the inevitable tendency of such revelation to arouse antagonism, and to suggest security in the opposite extreme. By such oscillation between contradictory tenets, the human intellect is kept from stagnation, and research and meditation are constantly stimulated. The Pantheism of Scotus Erigena annihilated independent individual existence and individual responsibility; and it obliterated the distinction between the Creator and the creation. The refutation of his errors was sought in the examination and denial of his premises, as well as in the repudiation of his conclusions. His views had been founded on the supposititious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which were steeped in Neo-Platonism (q.v.). Their antidote was expected from the school of Aristotle, whose logical opinions were gradually disseminated throughout Western Europe, through Saracenic and Jewish channels, and which had been partially known through Boethius during nearly all mediæval times.

But the latter part of the 9th, the whole of the 10th, and most of the 11th century were eminently unfavorable to diligent study and tranquil speculation. It was the period of Arab ravage and encroachment in the Eastern Empire; the period of the ruthless descents of Danes and Northmen in the Western; the period when the reigning dynasties of France and England were changed; when Italy was distracted by invasions and by wars between contending emperors; and when the fierce strife between the secular and spiritual authority became peculiarly acrimonious. As the result of these wide-spread disturbances, discord and anarchy, lawlessness and rapine, general wretchedness and insecurity prevailed. Two centuries thus

elapsed before the great question of *Universals* distinctly emerged out of the earlier discordances of opinion. Towards their conclusion, a purely theological question had arisen, which recalled eager inquiry into the nature of *Universals*. This was the denial of transubstantiation by Berengarius on grounds which implied Nominalism.

About the same time, the doctrine of Nominalism was explicitly asserted by Roscellinus, a canon of Compiègne. He has been usually regarded as the founder of the sect, but may have been preceded by his master, Johannes Surdus (John the Deaf), of whom very little is known. Roscellinus held that “generat and *species* are not realities, but only words denoting, abstractions;” that, consequently, “there are no such things as universals, but only individuals.” Realism is thus directly contradicted. These speculations pointed towards dangerous heresies in theology. Roscellinus, denying all but individual existences, assailed the unity of persons in the Trinity, and thus maintained Tritheism. The Church was at once aroused. Numerous confutations were propounded, the most celebrated of which was the tractate of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, *De Fide Trinitatis*. Anselm holds the Realist doctrine of *Universals*, and is occasionally betrayed into extravagance. His polemic is, however, theological rather than dialectical or metaphysical. He attacks perilous errors in religious belief; and assails speculative opinions only incidentally. Remusat, while considering him a decided Realist, deems that his prominence in the controversy between Realism and Nominalism has been exaggerated (Remusat, *St. Anselme*, pt. ii, ch. 3:p. 494). Efforts were made to reconcile the conflict between the discordant doctrines. but they only rendered the issue and the antagonism more pronounced. William de Champeaux (De Campbellis) held that “the *Universal* or *genus* is something real; the individuals composing the genus have no diversity of essence, but only of accidental elements.” This is the first precise asseveration of Realism in medineval philosophy. With William de Champeaux the essence of things is ascribed to the *genera*, the individual is reduced to a simple accident. With Roscellinus, the individuals alone exist, and they constitute the essence of things. With Champeaux, the essence of things is in the *genera* to which they belong, for so far as they are individuals they are only accidents” (Caraman, *Hist. des Rev. de la Philippians* vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 48).

Thenceforward the great controversy proceeds with increasing ardor, and furnishes the battle-field for the rival schools and rival schoolmen of the Middle Ages. The further consideration of these dissensions belongs,

however, more appropriately to the discussion of the development of scholasticism. *SEE SCHOLASTICISM.*

II. Nature of Realism. — The general character of Realism has been exhibited sufficiently to render its origin and evolution intelligible. A fuller explanation is needed to enable us to understand the importance which it assumed in medineval speculation. Cicero has said that “there is nothing so absurd as not to have been maintained by some of the philosophers.” It is easier to ridicule than to appreciate the reveries of philosophy. The aberrations of metaphysics and the paradoxes of dialectics are only the zealous and inadequate expression of far-reaching truths imperfectly apprehended. We certainly should not complain of either the excesses or the blindness of the schoolmen, in an age which is inclined to accept protoplasm as a sufficient explanation of all life, and evolution as a complete exposition of creation, or a substitute for it. Yet, even in these cases, much is charged upon the hierophants which they do not accept as part of their doctrines. Realism was the mediaeval and dialectical reproduction of the Platonic ideas. It asserted that general terms, such as *Man, Horse, Tree, Flower*, etc., were not merely logical devices, creatures of abstraction, ingenuities of language, but were realities, separable (*χωριστά*) from the being of individual *men, horses, trees, flowers*, etc. In Plato and the Platonic school these ideas were supposed to have a real, primordial, changeless, and eternal existence in the Divine Mind, as the archetypes of all things that are made. It demands no extraordinary range of intellect to point out the presumption of attempting to determine the contents of the Divine Mind and the modes of its procedure in ordering the creation. It needs no great intellectual effort to dilate upon the practical incongruities of representing Socrates as a transitory accident; having no real existence except so far as he partakes of the one, universal, ideal *Man*, who is immortal, incorporeal, immaterial, and unchangeable; communicated and communicable to all men, past, present, and future; completely contained in each, yet abundant for all, and independent of each and of all. These objections blink or evade the subtleties of the problem. These sneers do not reach the difficulty with which the greatest philosophers have struggled, and struggled in vain. No doubt our knowledge of general and *special*s is attained (so far as the human mind is capable of ascertaining the process of attaining knowledge) by abstraction from individual things observed, and by recombination of their accordant characteristics. No doubt the abstract terms, so arrived at, are

the instruments of linguistic and logical classification, which we employ unsuspectingly in reasoning and conversation. But is this all? Is this a complete solution of the enigma? Is it not a mere screen which conceals the real enigma from us? There is a general, not an individual, resemblance between all men — *homo simillimus homini* — *nihil similius homini quam homo*. They are alike in consequence of their participation in a common humanity. Our knowledge of this humanity may be — must be — derived by generalization from the common characteristics of all men. But, again, it should be asked, Is this all? Does our knowledge precede or follow this possession of a common humanity? Does it do anything more than recognise its presence? How does the common humanity come into existence? How does it continue in existence? How is it to be interpreted? Is there no plan or order in creation? No eternal design in the purposes of the Creator? Is everything spasmodical, momentary creation, with observance of antecedent forms? Whence, then, such observance, and the maintenance of uniformity, and all the characteristics of preordination? How does it occur that the earth proceeds ever to “bring forth the living creature *after his kind*, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth *after his kind*,” if the several kinds and genera and species are mere abstractions, pure figments of the generalizing faculty? Did this unvarying observance of the type arise, without any reality of the type, by the accidental collision of atoms in all the infinite variety of their hypothetical contacts, and by survival of the fittest, through self-adaptation to their shifting surroundings? No permanent forms, transmitted from generation to generation, from age to age, could thus be maintained. The unmitigated repudiation of Realism leads straight to the acceptance of the creed of Lucretius and Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

Nam certe neque consilio Primordia rerum
 Ordini se quaeque, atque sagaci mente locarunt:
 Nec quos neque darent motus pelpise e ilrofecto;
 Sed qnia mnulltimnodis, mnultis, mutatal, per Omne
 Ex in-fillito vexantur percita plagis,
 Omne genus motus, et coetus experinmlo,
 Tandem devenient in taleis dispositnras,
 Qualibus hec rebus consistit summa cieata;
 Et multos etiam magnos servata per mannos,
 Ut semel in motus coniecta ‘st convenieuteis.”

The answer of the Epicurean herd will not solve the riddles proposed. Realism offered a very different solution, which, however inadequate and unsatisfactory it may be deemed, did not affect to treat the questions as shallow or unimportant. But may there not be some genuine truth, obscured, disguised, mutilated, lame, yet, nevertheless, struggling into meaning, in the theory of Realism? Is there not a plan, a divine order, throughout all creation? Are there not types — intelligible, potential, not actual types — to be accounted for? Has a conception of the reason — never varying, but persisting as long as the reason and the objects of reason endure — has such a conception a less real existence than the concrete and material, or individual forms which correspond to the conception, but which are changing at all times during their existence, and are born to perish? The existence is of very different character, but is it less truly existence? The ambiguity and vagueness of their terms may not have been recognised by the mediaeval Idealists and Idealists. Are they always clearly apprehended by their critics? Have the censors of Realism fully appreciated the incomprehensibility and variability of the Realist doctrine without loss of its distinctive character and without sacrifice of its essential tenet? Doubtless the theory of Realism was indistinct, not rigorously determined, and scarcely palpable. Doubtless the modes of its statement were obnoxious to grave exceptions, and led to misapprehensions and misconceptions on the part even of its advocates. The subjects with which the theory dealt may very well lie beyond any determinate grasp of the human faculties. But an earnest effort was made to interpret the great mysteries of existence — the permanence of type, with the variability and fragility of all embodiments of the type. This world may be “all a fleeting show, for man’s illusion given;” but is there nothing unseen behind it which is true, and which furnishes its unalterable patterns? There is some justification, or at least some elucidation, of the thesis of the Realists to be deduced from the conclusions of comparative anatomy. Aristotle taught that the skeletons of the beast, the bird, and the fish revealed a common type, with characteristic deviations (*De Part. Animal.*). Six centuries later, Lactantius, or the Pseudo-Lactantius, reproduced the same tenet in a remarkable passage: “Una dispositio, et unus habitus, innumerabiles imaginis proferat varietates” (*De Opific. Dei*, c. vii). In our own day, the distinguished comparative anatomist Owen has demonstrated the validity of the conjecture of Aristotle by his work *On the Achetypal Skeleton of Vertebrate Animals*; and Dr. M’Cosh has given, perhaps without full recognition of its import, a most instructive application of the principle in

his *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*. Is there no truth, no validity, no reality in the types?

Is Realism, then, to be regarded as true? By no means. It only contains an element, an unsegregated element, of truth. It is a very important element, but it is dimly entertained and extravagantly expressed. Is its opposite, Nominalism, true? Again the answer must be, By no means. It contemplates only one side of the truth; runs into equal extravagance, and excludes utterly the indispensable particle of truth contained in the adverse doctrine. Is the truth attained by combining the antagonistic views? Not so. The two schemes cannot be united, and can scarcely be reconciled, except by regarding them as imperfect expositions from opposite points of view. Moreover, two partial and fragmentary truths can never make the whole truth. Truth is a consistent, harmonious, organic whole. It can never be attained by dovetailing patches of truth, or by forming a mosaic.

Philosophy, in its development, is a series of erroneous and conflicting positions. One extreme provokes another extreme; but the conception of first principles, and the range of deductions from them, become enlarged and cleared with the progress and succession of errors, although the full and precise truth may never be reached.

The truth which seems to be involved in Realism is this: Universals, genera, species, represent the permanent forms of the intelligible creation. They attest a settled and regular order in the sensible universe. They reveal a preordained, or predetermined, plan in the several classes of existence; an enduring truth; an abiding uniformity in the midst of individual deviations and transitory manifestations; a design habitually fulfilled; types which subsist, though actualities vanish. A part, at least, of the error of Realism — for neither its whole truth nor its whole error can be distinctly grasped and perspicuously expressed — consisted in presenting these important conclusions in an exaggerated form, so that they contradicted the partial truth equally involved in Nominalism: that individuals have a real as well as an actual existence, and that the generic and specific terms which are habitually employed, and are indispensable in language, are modes of classifying our perceptions and conceptions, and are used altogether independently of any ulterior suggestions which may be implicated in them.

The Nominalist denied a metaphysical truth because it was not embraced within the sphere of his logical requirements. The Realist assailed the

logical truth because it failed to embrace an ontological explanation, and appeared to be at variance with it.

Bitter contradictions and acrimonious hostilities necessarily resulted from the antagonism, in consequence of the inevitable association of the conflicting doctrines with adverse parties and interests in theology, in Church and in State.

III. Literature. — The historians of philosophy, who embrace the philosophy of the Middle Ages, necessarily pay much attention to Realism and Nominalism. More special sources of information are, Caraman, *Hist. des Revolutions de la Philosophie en France*; Baumgarten Crusius, *De Vero Scholast. Retal. et Nominal. Discrimine* (Jena, 1821); Cousin, *Fragments Philosophiques* (Paris, 1840); id. *Introd. aux ouvres inedites d'Abelard*; Exner, *Nominalismus und Reallismus* (Prague, 1842); Kohler, *Realismus and Nominalismus in ihrem ifuss auf die dogmat. Syst. des Mittelalt.* (Gotha, 1857); Hautreau, *Philosophie Scolastique* (Paris, 1858); Cupely, *Espirit de la Philosophie Scolastique* (ibid. 1868). Much valuable suggestion may also be obtained from Rdmusat, *Abelard* (ibid. 1845, 2 vols.); id. *St. Anselme* (ibid. 1853). To these may be added, Emerson, *Realism and Nominalism.* (G. F. H.)

Reanointers

is the name of a Russian sect, which dates from about the year 1770. They do not rebaptize those who join them from the Greek Church, but they insist upon their having the chrism again administered to them. They are said to be especially numerous in Moscow. *SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.*

Reaping

Picture for Reaping

(*rxq̄*; kts, ts, to cult if; *θερίζω*). Reaping in Palestine was usually done by the sickle, to which reference is occasionally made in Scripture. *SEE SICKLE.* But there can be little doubt that the modern practice of pulling up by the roots, instead of cutting the corn, also prevailed to a considerable extent in ancient times. The corn seldom yields so much straw as in this country, and pulling is resorted to in order to obtain a larger supply of fodder. Maundrell thus describes the practice as he noticed it in 1697: "All that occurred to us new in these days' travel was a particular way used by

the country people in gathering their corn, it being now harvest-time. They plucked it up by handfuls from the roots, leaving the most fruitful fields as naked as if nothing had ever grown on them. This was their practice in all the places of the East that I have seen; and the reason is that they may lose none of their straw, which is generally very short, and necessary for the sustenance of their cattle, no hay being here made. I mention this," he adds, "because it seems to give light to that expression of the ^{<BC06>}Psalm 129:6 'which withereth before it be plucked up,' where there seems to be a manifest allusion to the custom." This undoubtedly is the correct meaning of the expression; and the real allusion is lost sight of by the rendering in the A.V., 'before it groweth up.' It grows, but withers before the plucking-time comes — an emblem of the premature decay and fruitlessness of the wicked. *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Reason

denotes that function of our intelligence which has reference to the attainment of a particular class of truths. We know a great many things by immediate or actual experience. Our senses tell us that we are thirsty, that we hear a sound, that we are affected by light. These facts are truths of sense or of immediate knowledge, and do not involve the reason. Reason comes into play when we know a thing not immediately, but by some indirect process; as when, from seeing a river unusually swollen, we believe that there have been heavy rains at its sources. Here the mere sense tells us only that the river is high. It is by certain transitions of thought, or by the employment of our thinking powers, that we come to know the other circumstance — that in a remote part of the country there have been heavy rains.

In ascertaining these truths of reason or of inference, as they are called, there are various steps or operations, described under (different names. Thus we have (1) *Deduction*, or *Syllogism*; (2) *Induction*; and (3) *Generalization* of notions, of which *Abstraction* and *Definition* are various phases. These are well represented by their several designations. The nature of the function or faculty denominated Reason, or the Reasoning Faculty, can be explained by showing how it results from the fundamental powers of the intelligence.

There is another and peculiar signification attached to the word reason, growing out of the philosophy of Kant (q.v.), which maintains a distinction between *reason* and *understanding*, the latter being that faculty called by

the Greeks $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and by Hamilton called the “Regulative Faculty.” See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s.v.

Reason, Use Of, In Religion.

The sublime, incomprehensible nature of some of the Christian doctrines has so completely subdued the understanding of many pious men as to make them think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God; and the many instances in which the simplicity of truth has been corrupted by an alliance with philosophy confirm them in the belief that it is safer, as well as more respectable, to resign their minds to devout impressions than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects. Enthusiasts and fanatics of all different names and sects agree in decrying the use of reason, because it is the very essence of fanaticism to substitute, in place of the sober deductions of reason, the extravasant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God. Insidious writers in the deistical controversy have pretended to adopt those sentiments of humility and reverence which are inseparable from true Christians, and even that total subjection of reason to faith which characterizes enthusiasts. A pamphlet was published about the middle of the last century that made a noise in its day, although it is now forgotten, entitled *Christianity not Founded on Argument*, which, while to a careless reader it may seem to magnify the Gospel, does in reality tend to undermine our faith by separating it from a rational assent; and Mr. Hume, in the spirit of this pamphlet, concludes his *Essay on Miracles* with calling those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. “Our most holy religion,” he says, with a disingenuity very unbecoming his respectable talents, “founded on faith, not on reason;” and “mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity.” The Church of Rome, in order to subject the minds of her votaries to her authority, has reprobated the use of reason in matters of religion. She has revived an ancient position, that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy; and she has, in some instances, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

The extravagance of these positions has produced, since the reformation, an opposite extreme. While those who deny the truth of revelation consider reason as in all respects a sufficient guide, the Socinians, who admit that a

revelation has been made, employ reason as the supreme judge of its doctrines, and boldly strike out of their creed every article that is not altogether conformable to those notions which may be derived from the exercise of reason. These controversies concerning the use of reason in matters of religion are disputes. not about words, but about the essence of Christianity. But a few plain observations are sufficient to ascertain where the truth lies in this subject.

The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation; for, the more entire the submission which we consider as due to everything that is revealed, we have the more need to be satisfied that any system which professes to be a divine revelation does really come from God. *SEE FAITH AND REASON.*

After the exercise of reason has established in our minds a firm belief that Christianity is of divine origin, the second use of reason is to learn what are the truths revealed. As these truths are not in our days communicated to any by immediate inspiration, the knowledge of them is to be acquired only from books transmitted to us with satisfying evidence that they were written above seventeen hundred years ago, in a remote country and foreign language, under the direction of the Spirit of God. In order to attain the meaning of these books, we must study the language in which they were written; and we must study, also, the manners of the times and the state of the countries in which the writers lived because these are circumstances to which an original author is often alluding, and by which his phraseology is generally affected; we must lay together different passages in which the same word or phrase occurs, because without this labor we cannot obtain its precise signification; and we must mark the difference of style and manner which characterizes different writers, because a right apprehension of their meaning often depends upon attention to this difference. All this supposes the application of grammar, history, geography, chronology, and criticism in matters of religion that is, it supposes that the reason of man had been previously exercised in pursuing these different branches of knowledge, and that our success in attaining the true sense of Scripture depends upon the diligence with which we avail ourselves of the progress that has been made in them. It is obvious that every Christian is not capable of making this application. But this is no argument against the use of reason, of which we are now speaking; for they who use translations and commentaries rely only upon the reason of others instead of exercising their own. The several branches

of knowledge have been applied in every age by some persons for the benefit of others; and the progress in sacred criticism which distinguishes the present times is nothing else than the continued application, in elucidating the Scripture, of reason enlightened by every kind of subsidiary knowledge, and very much improved in this kind of exercise by the employment which the ancient classics have given it since the revival of letters.

After the two uses of reason that have been illustrated, a third comes to be mentioned, which may be considered as compounded of both. Reason is of eminent use in repelling the attacks of the adversaries of Christianity. When men of erudition, of philosophical acuteness, and of accomplished taste, direct their talents against our religion, the cause is very much hurt by an unskillful defender. He cannot unravel their sophistry; he does not see the amount and the effect of the concessions which he makes to them; he is bewildered by their quotations; and he is often led, by their artifice, upon dangerous ground. In all ages of the Church there have been weak defenders of Christianity; and the only triumphs of the enemies of our religion have arisen from their being able to expose the defects of those methods of defending the truth which some of its advocates had unwarily chosen. A mind trained to accurate and philosophical views of the nature and the amount of evidence, enriched with historical knowledge, accustomed to throw out of a subject all that is minute and irrelative, to collect what is of importance within a short compass, and to form the comprehension of a whole, is the mind qualified to contend with the learning, the wit, and the sophistry of infidelity. Many such minds have appeared in this honorable controversy during the course of this and the last century; and the success has corresponded to the completeness of the furniture with which they engaged in the combat. The Christian doctrine has been vindicated by their masterly exposition from various misrepresentations; the arguments for its divine original have been placed in their true light; and the attempts to confound the miracles and prophecies upon which Christianity rests its claim with the delusions of imposture have been effectually repelled. Christianity has in this way received the most important advantages from the attacks of its enemies; and it is not improbable that its doctrines would never have been so thoroughly cleared from all the corruptions and subtleties which had attached to them in the progress of ages, nor the evidences of its truths have been so accurately understood, nor its peculiar character been so

perfectly discriminated, had not the zeal and abilities which have been employed against it called forth in its defence some of the most distinguished masters of reason. They brought into the service of Christianity the same weapons which had been drawn for her destruction, and, wielding them with confidence and skill in a good cause, became the successful champions of the truth. *SEE RATIONALISM.*

The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truths of religion. Everything which is revealed by God comes to his creatures from so high an authority that it may be rested in with perfect assurance as true. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible for us to receive at the same time the truth and the falsehood of a proposition. But many things are true which we do not fully comprehend; and many propositions, which appear incredible when they are first enunciated, are found, upon examination, such as our understandings can readily admit. These principles embrace the whole of the subject, and they mark out the steps by which reason is to proceed in judging of the truths of religion. We first examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understandings, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion and the dictates of right reason. If any such contradiction appear, there must be some mistake. By not making a proper use of our reason in the interpretation of the Gospel, we suppose that it contains doctrines which it does not teach; or we give the name of right reason to some narrow prejudices which deeper reflection and more enlarged knowledge will dissipate; or we consider a proposition as implying a contradiction, when, in truth, it is only imperfectly understood. Here, as in every other case, mistakes are to be corrected by measuring back our steps. We must examine closely and impartially the meaning of those passages which appear to contain the doctrine; we must compare them with one another; we must endeavor to derive light from the general phraseology of Scripture and the analogy of faith; and we shall generally be able, in this way, to separate the doctrine from all those adventitious circumstances which give it the appearance of absurdity. If a doctrine which, upon the closest examination, appears unquestionably to be taught in Scripture, still does not approve itself to our understanding, we must consider carefully what it is that prevents us from receiving it. There may be preconceived notions hastily taken up which that doctrine opposes; there may be pride of understanding that does not readily submit to the views which it

communicates; or reason may need to be reminded that we must expect to find in religion many things which we are not able to comprehend. One of the most important offices of reason is to recognise her own limits. She never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd. But if she has formed a just estimate of human knowledge, she will not shelter her presumption in rejecting the truths of revelation under the pretence of contradictions that do not really exist; she will readily admit that there may be in a subject some points which she knows, and others of which she is ignorant; she will not allow her ignorance of the latter to shake the evidence of the former, but will yield a firm assent to that which she does understand without presuming to deny what is beyond her comprehension. Thus, availing herself of all the light which she now has, she will wait in humble hope for the time when a larger measure shall be imparted.

Reay, Stephen

an Anglican divine, was born at Montrose, New Brunswick, in 1782, was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and was Laudian professor of Arabic from 1840 till his death. He published, *Observations on the Defence of the Church Missionary Society against the Objections of the Archdeacon of Bath*, by Pileus Quadratus (1818, 8vo): — *Narratio de Josepho e Sacro Codice* (1822): — *Textus Hebraicus* (Lond. 1822, 1840, 12mo).

Reay, William

an English divine of the Establishment, flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was curate and lecturer of Wordsworth in 1755. He died in 1756. He published *Sermons*, with Preface by T. Church, D.D., prebend of St. Paul's (Lond. 1755, 8vo).

Re'ba

(Heb. *id.* [רֵבָע]; Sept. ῥοβόκ in Numbers, ῥοβέ in Josh.; Vulg. *Iebe*), one of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the children of Israel in their avenging expedition when Balaam fell (^{<0610>}Numbers 31:8; ^{<0612>}Joshua 13:21). B.C. 1858.

Rebaptism

The ancient Church, if it did not openly declare against the repetition of baptism, certainly refused to rebaptize, and supported its position by

assigning, not one, but many reasons. It especially maintained that there is no example of rebaptization in Scripture; and as baptism succeeds to circumcision, which was the entrance and seal of the old covenant, and could not be repeated, so baptism, being the sign and seal of admission to the new covenant, the breaches of this covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms. There were in the early Church some heretics who rebaptized, such as the Marcionites; but the Catholic Church disapproved of the practice. In one of Cyprian's epistles there is a question referred to Stephen, bishop of Rome, whether it was necessary to rebaptize heretics who sought admission to the Catholic Church; or whether it should be deemed sufficient, proceeding upon the acknowledged validity of their baptism, to receive them with the simple ceremony of imposition of hands and ecclesiastical benediction. The Roman bishop acceded to the latter opinion. The African bishops, on the other hand, declared the baptism of heretics to be null and void, and would not recognise their confirmation at the hands of a Catholic bishop as sufficient for their reception into the Church. They demanded another baptism, to be followed by the usual confirmation, notwithstanding the Church of Rome persevered in maintaining that the baptism of heretics, provided only that it had been administered in due form, was valid and sufficient and ought not to be repeated. Farrar, *Theol. Dict.* s.v. In the modern Church rebaptism is practiced by the Romanists and the Anglicans. The latter deny the validity of other Protestant bodies if such oppose the divine right of apostolical succession. The Baptists, of course, recognise as valid only immersion, and not infrequently repeat this ordinance if it has been performed by persons known as *Paedobaptists* (q.v.). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 364 sq.; Hofling, *Lehre von der Taufe* (Erlang. 1846). **SEE ALSO ANABAPTISTS; SEE BAPTISM.**

Rebec'ca

(Ῥεβέκκα), the Graecized form (<8910>Romans 9:10) of the name REBEKAH (q.v.).

Rebek'ah

(Heb. *Ribkah'*, ἡβηῖα *a noose, i.e. ensnarer*; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, Ῥεβέκκα), the daughter of Bethuel (<0223>Genesis 22:23) and sister of Laban, married to Isaac, who stood in the relation of a first cousin to her father and to Lot. She is first presented to us in the account of the

mission of Eliezer to Padanaram (ch. 24), in which his interview with Rebekah, her consent and marriage, are related. B.C. 2023. The elder branch of the family remained at Haran when Abraham removed to the land of Canaan, and it is there that we first meet with Laban, as taking the leading part in the betrothal of his sister Rebekah to her cousin Isaac (24:10, 29-60; 27:43; 29:4). Bethuel, his father, plays so insignificant a part in the whole transaction, being in fact only mentioned once, and that *after* his son (24:50), that various conjectures have been formed to explain it. Josephus asserts that Bethuel was (lead, and that Laban was the head of the house and his sister's natural guardian (*Ant.* i, 16, 2), in which case "Bethuel" must have crept into the text inadvertently, or be supposed, with some (Adam Clarke, *ad loc.*), to be the name of another brother of Rebekah. Le Clerc (*in Pent.*) mentions the conjecture that Bethuel was absent at first, but returned in time to give his consent to the marriage. The mode adopted by Prof. Blunt (*Undesigned Coincidences*, p. 35) to explain what he terms "the consistent insignificance of Bethutel," viz. that he was incapacitated from taking the management of his family by age or imbecility, is most ingenious; but the prominence of Laban may be sufficiently explained by the custom of the country, which then, as now (see Niebuhr, quoted by Rosenmuller, *ad loc.*), gave the brothers the main share in the arrangement of their sister's marriage and the defence of her honor (comp. ^{<0134>}Genesis 34:13; ^{<0122>}Judges 21:22 ^{<0130>}2 Samuel 13:20-29).

SEE BETHUEL. The whole chapter has been pointed out as uniting most of the circumstances of a pattern marriage — the sanction of parents, the guidance of God, the domestic occupation of Rebekah, her beauty, courteous kindness, willing consent and modesty, and success in retaining her husband's love. For nineteen years she was childless; then, after the prayers of Isaac and her journey to inquire of the Lord, Esau and Jacob were born; and, while the younger was more particularly the companion and favorite of his mother (^{<0259>}Genesis 25:19-28), the elder became a grief of mind to her (26:35). When Isaac was driven by a famine into the lawless country of the Philistines, Rebekah's beauty became, as was apprehended, a source of danger to her husband. But Abimelech was restrained by a sense of justice such as the conduct of his predecessor (ch. 20) in the case of Sarah would not lead Isaac to expect. It was probably a considerable time afterwards when Rebekah suggested the deceit that was practiced by Jacob on his blind father. She directed and aided him in carrying it out, foresaw the probable consequence of Esau's anger, and prevented it by moving Isaac to send Jacob away to Padan-aram (ch. 27) to her own

kindred (^{<01292>}Genesis 29:12). B.C. 1927. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. states (^{<01318>}Genesis 35:8) that the news of her death was brought to Jacob at Allon-bachuth. It has been conjectured that she died during his sojourn in Padan-aram; for her nurse appears to have left Isaac's dwelling and gone back to Padan-aram before that period (comp. ^{<01249>}Genesis 24:59, and 25:8), and Rebekah is not mentioned when Jacob returns to his father, nor do we hear of her burial till it is incidentally mentioned by Jacob on his death-bed (^{<01443>}Genesis 49:31). Paul (^{<01590>}Romans 9:10) refers to her as being made acquainted with the purpose of God regarding her children before they were born. For comments on the whole history of Rebekah, see Origen, *Hom. in Genesis* 10 and 12; Chrysostom, *Hom. in Genesis*, p. 48-54. Rebekah's inquiry of God, and the answer given to her, are discussed by Deyling, *Obser. Sac.* i, 12, p. 53 sq., and in an essay by J. A. Schmid in *Nov. Thes. Theol. -philolog.* i, 188; also by Ebersbach (Helmst. 1712). The agreement of the description of Rebekah in Genesis 22 with modern Eastern customs and scenes is well noticed by Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 403. *SEE ISAAC; SEE JACOB.*

Reber, Joel L.

a minister of the German Reformed Church. was born in Berks County, Pa., Nov. 8, 1816. He spent his youth on a farm, and afterwards learned the printing business. He pursued his studies in the college and seminarv at Mercersburg, Pa., from 1837 to 1842, and was ordained in May, 1843. He was pastor successively in Brush Valley, Centre County, Pa.; Jonestown, Lebanon County, Pa.; Millersville, Lancaster County, Pa.; Codorus, York County, Pa. He died Aug. 15, 1856. In 1850 Mr. Reber published a small work in German entitled *An Earnest Word on the Sect-Spirit and Sect-Work*, which passed through two editions. He also wrote much for the periodicals of the day in German and English, in both of which languages he was able to write with equal vigor and correctness. He was possessed of a strong, original mind. was an earnest and powerful preacher, and manifested a laborious, self-sacrificing spirit.

Recanati, Menahem Di,

a Jewish writer, was born in Recanati (the ancient Recinetum) about 1290, and is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch ([çwrp hrwth I \[\]](#)), which is little else than a commentary on the *Sohar*. This commentary, which was first published by Jacob ben-Chajim in Bomberg's celebrated

printing establishment (Venice, 1523; then again *ibid.* 1545; and in Lublin, 1595), has been translated into Latin by the famous Pico della Mirandola. He also wrote **μynydh s**, a treatise forensic, moral, and ceremonial (Bononia, 1538): — — **twxmh ym[f**, an exposition of the precepts of the law (Constantinople, 1544). Besides these works, he wrote a number of others, which are still unpublished. See Fiirst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:135 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 275; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodlei.* col. 1733-37.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature*, p. 286; Ginsburg, *Kabbalah*, p. 118 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, 3:77. (B. P.)

Receipt Of Custom.

SEE CUSTOM.

Recensions Of The Old Testament.

Under this head we present an outline of the history of the printed Hebrew text, not in the manner of Bartolucci, Wolf, and Le-Long-Mash, who give a long list of editions, but according to the different recensions which the Hebrew text underwent from time to time. The history of the unprinted text in its different periods has already been treated in the article OLD TESTAMENT *SEE OLD TESTAMENT* (q.v.). From the article MANUSCRIPTS *SEE MANUSCRIPTS* (q.v.) it will be seen that some of the most important MSS. are lost, and that they are only known to us from quotations. Yet a great many MSS. of the Old Test. existed in the different countries where Jews resided; and, as certain rules and regulations were laid down by the scribes according to which MSS. were to be written, it is but natural to infer that the MSS. of the different countries would, in the main, correspond with each other. After the invention of printing, many were desirous of publishing corrected editions of the Holy Scriptures, though they seldom gave an account of the materials they used. The history of the printed text is important as showing the manner in which our present copies of the Hebrew Bible were edited, and the sources available for obtaining the exact words of the original. In order to do this we must examine the different editions according to the text which they contain; we must know the different degrees of relationship in which the editions stand to each other; in a word, we must have the genealogy of the present editions.

Before entering upon the history of the printed text, we must mention, first, the editions of different parts of the Old Test. which formed the basis of later editions. The first part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was published is

(I.) $\mu\gamma\lambda\ ht$, i.e. *Psalterium Hebraicum cume Commentario Kimchii* (237 [i.e. A.D. 1477], 4to, or sm. fol., sine loco). This very rare edition is printed on 149 folios, each page containing forty lines, but without division of verses, in majuscular and minuscular letters. Only the first four psalms have the vowel-points, and these but clumsily expressed. Each verse is accompanied by Kimchi's commentary. The pages and psalms are not numbered. The *Soph Pasuk* (i.e.:) is often omitted, especially when two verses stand by each other. For $hw\text{hy}$, often an empty space is left, sometimes omitted; in the space we often find an inverted *he*, h , or an iuverted erted *vav*, w , in the word $hw\text{hy}$; often the word is expressed by a sign of abbreviation, “, which generally occurs in the commentary. In ~~BOOK~~ Psalm 119:1 we find $hy\text{hy}$, i.e. a *yod* for a *vav*. The letters k and b ,! and d , r and d , \wedge and z , g and n ; y [and ζ can hardly be distinguished from each other. The text is far from being correct, as a few examples will show. Thus, inl

~~BOOK~~ Psalm 1:3 we read $hyr\text{p}$, inn Van der Hooght, $wyr\text{p}$

~~BOOK~~ Psalm 1:5 “ $\mu qyr\text{x}$ “ $\mu yqydx$

~~BOOK~~ Psalm 2:1 $qyr\text{e}$ “ $qyr\text{ae}$

~~BOOK~~ Psalm 2:2 “ $wmyt\text{wb}$ [“ $wmyt\text{b}$ [

~~BOOK~~ Psalm 4:1 $ry\zeta$ $rwmz\text{m}$ dwdl $rwmz\text{m}$

It is divided into five books, as can be seen from superscriptions to Psalm 41, 42, 89, and 106. As to the commentary, it is very valuable, because it contains all the anti-Christian passages of Kimich, which are not found in later editions. At the end two epigraphs are printed, one in rhyme, the other in prose. See on this edition, Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, 6:134 sq.; De Iossi, *Annales Hebraeo-typogrcaphica*, p. 14; and *De Hebl aicce Typographice Origine ac Primitiis*, etc., p. 13; Kennicott, *Diss. Genesis in V. T.* p. 91.

(II.) $w\zeta r$ $\zeta wry\text{pw}$ swl $qnwa$ $\mu wgr\text{t}$ μ [ζmwj bmr $ayynwl$ wb , i. *Pentateuchus Hebraicus cum Punctis et cum Paraphrasi Chaldaica et*

Commentario Rabbi Salomonis Jarchi (Bonononie, 242 [i.e. A.D. 1482], fol.). This copy is printed on 21S parchment leaves. Above and below the Hebrew Rashi's commentary is given, while the Chaldee is printed on the side of the Hebrew. The text is very correct, and when compared with Van der Hooght's, the latter seems to be a reprint of this Pentateuch. The harmony of this Pentateuch with that found in Van der Hooght's edition is of the utmost importance for the printed text. In the first place, it corroborates the fact that, prior to the year 1520, the beginning had already been made to print the Hebrew text according to recent MSS. and the Masorah; in the second place, we must admit that all variations which are found in the Pentateuch printed at Soncino in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but negligences of the printer and corrector, in so far as these variations are not supported by the Masorah, and hence cannot be regarded as a testimony against the Masoretic text. In the third place, we see that all MSS. and editions which were prepared by Jews are of the utmost correctness, and that the variations are nothing but an oversight of either the copyist or printer. At the end is a very lengthy epigraph in Hebrew, to give which in an English translation space forbids. See Eichhorn, *Repertorium*. v, 92 sq., where the variations of this Pentateuch from Van der Hooght's text are given.

(III.) *Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Threni cum Comm. Jarchi, et Esther cum Comm. Aben-Ezrae* (sine anno et loco [but probably Bononiae, 1482], fol.). See De Rossi, *De Ignotis Nonnullis Anticuiissimis Hebr. Textus Editionibus* (Erlangen, 1782).

(IV.) *Phrophetoe Priores ac Posteriores cum Comm. Kimchii* (Soncino, 1485-86, 2 vols. fol.). On this, see Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, 8:51 sq.

(V.) *Quinque Megilloth et Psalterium* (Soncini et Casali, 1486).

(VI.) *Quatuor Sacra Volumina, sen Riuth, Canticum, Threni et Ecclesiastes* (ibid. 1486), with vowel-points, but with no accents.

(VII.) *Hagiographa*, with different commentaries (Neapoli, 1487).

(VIII.) *Biblia Hebraica Integra cum Punctis et Accentibus* (Soncilli, 248 [i.e. A.D. 1488], fol.). This is the first complete Hebrew Bible, with vowel-points and accents. It is very rare; only nine copies are known to be extant, viz. one at Exeter College, Oxford; two at Rome, two at Florence, two at Parma, one at Vienna, and one in the Baden-Durlach Library.

According to Bruns (*Dissertat. General. in V. Test.* p. 442 sq.), the text is printed neither from ancient nor good MSS., but is full of blunders; and Kennicott asserts that it contains more than 12,000 variations (“*qñue una editio ab exemplaribus hodiernis discrepat in locis plus quam 12,000*”). How carelessly the printing was executed may be seen from the fact that ver. 16 of ^{<1746>}Psalm 74:16 was interpolated after ver. 12 of ^{<1892>}Psalm 89:12.

(IX.) *Pentateuchus Hebraicus absque Punctis*, etc. (1490).

(X.) *Pentateuchus cum Haphtaroth et Megilloth Hebraice* (sine loco et anuo, 4to [1490-95?]). For a long time only two copies were known to be extant; one in the Library of St. Mark at Florence, and one in the library of the cardinal Zelada. De Rossi, however, procured some copies.

Between 1490 and 1494 twelve other editions of different books were published, which we will not enumerate for want of space. In 1494 the *Biblia Hebraica cum Punctis* (4to) was published at Brescia; remarkable as being the one from which Luther's Geiman translation was made. The Royal Library at Berlin preserves that copy in a case. This edition has many various readings. As it cannot historically be proved that in the edition of this Bible MSS. have been used — on the contrary, in its *lectionibus singularibus* it agrees with the edition of Soncino (1488) — it is very probable that it was reprinted from the Soncinian text. A full description of this Bible is given by Schunlze, *Vollstandigere Kritik* (Berlin, 1766). A collection of various readings is given by le-Long-Mash in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Between 1494 and 1497 four other editions of different parts of the Hebrew Old Test. were published, which would make the number either of entire editions of the Old Test. or of single parts thereof about twenty-eight, and which all belong to the 15th century.

I. The first main recension was the Complutensian text of 1514-17. The editions which were published in the following centuries are mainly taken from one of the three main sources: the *Complutensian Bible*, the *Soncinian Text* of 1488, and *Bomberg's* (1525); yet there is a fourth class, which contains a mixed text, composed of many old editions. The Complutensian text was entitled *Biblia Sacra polyglotta*, etc. (in Complutensi Universitate, 1514-17). **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES**. This was followed by the *Heidelberg* or *Bertram's Polyglot* (*Sacra Biblia Hebraice*,

etc.) (ex officina Sanctandreaana, 1586, 3 vols. fol.; republished in 1599, 3 vols. fol. ex officia Commeliniana, and in 1616, 3 vols. fol. ibid.).

II. The second main recension, or the Soncinian text of 1488, was the basis of:

1. *Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana I*, curavit F. Pratensis (Venice, 1517-18S). *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*.
2. *Bomberg's Editions* (4to): α . the first published in 1518; β . the second in 1521; γ . the third in 1525-28; δ . the fourth in 1533; ϵ . the fifth in 1544.
3. *Munster's Editions* of 1534, 1536, and 1546. The first contains the Hebrew text only, and was published by Froben at Basle. This edition is very rare and valuable on account of a collection of various readings, partly taken from MSS., which must have been collected by a Jewish editor. The other two editions have, besides the Hebrew, a Latin translation.
4. *Robert Stephens's* first edition (Paris, 1539-44, 4 vols.). This was not published as a whole, but in parts, each having a title. The first part that was published was *rps hy[çy*, or *Prophetia Isaice* (ibid. 1539). Of variations, we subjoin the following: 1, 25, !ygys; ve. 29, $\mu y l$ am 3:16, $t w o q y i m$ 6:5, $y t m d n$; 8:6, $j L \dot{c} h$ (dagesh in l); ren. 13, $\mu k x r$ [m ; 10:15, $t a w$; ver. 16, $w d w b k$; ver. 18, $\mu w s m k$; ver. 33, $w r p ç y$, etc. The second part contained the twelve minor prophets (1539); the third, the Psalms (1540); the fourth, the Proverbs (1540); in the same year also Jeremiah, Daniel, the five Megilloth; in 1541, Job, Ezra, Ezekiel; in 1543, Chronicles, the former prophets, and the Pentateuch. Richard Simon, in his *Histoire Critique du V. T.* p. 513, makes this remark on that edition: "Si l'on a egard a la beaute des caracteres, il n'y a gueres de Bibles qini approchent de celle de Robert Estienne in *quarto*; an moins d'une partie de cette Bible; mains elle iest pas fort correcte." The same is confirmed by Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*, p. 421: "Plurimis autem scaterere vitiis, non in punctis niodo vocalibus et accenturnm, sed etiam in literis, imo in integris nonnunquam vocibus deprehenditur," etc.; and Samuel Ockley, in his *Introduct. ad Linguas Orient.* cap. ii, p. 34, says: "Haec Roberti Stephani editio pulchris quidem characteribus est impressa... sed pluribus mendis scatet, qun libri pulcherrimi nitoarem turpiter foedarunt."

III. The third main recension was the Bombergian text of 1525. A new recension of the text, which has had more influence than any on the text of later times, was Bomberg's second edition of the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Jacob ben-Chajim (Venice, 1525-26, 4 vols. fol.). *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*. This edition was followed by —

1. *R. Stephens's* second edition, published in parts, like the first (Paris, 1544-46, 16mo).

2. *Boumberg's third Rabbinical Bible* (1547-49). *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*.

3. *M. A. Justinian's Editions*, published at Venice in 1551, 1552, 1563, and 1573.

4. *J. de Gara's Editions*, published at Venice, viz.:

- a.** an edition in 4to, 1566;
- b.** an edition in 8vo, 1568;
- c.** a *Rabbinic Bible* (1568, 4 vols. fol.) *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*;
- d.** an edition in 8vo, 1570;
- e.** an edition in 4to, 1582;
- f.** an edition with Rashi's commentary (1595, 4to);
- g.** the same edition, published in 1607.

5. *Plantin's Manual Editions*, published at Antwerp, viz.: *a.* an edition in 4to, 8vo, and 16mo, in 1566; *b.* a 4to edition in 1580; *c.* an 8vo edition in 1590.

6. *Crato's Editions*, published at Wittenberg in 1586 and 1587.

7. *Hartmann's Editions*, published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1595-98.

8. *Bragadin's Editions*, published at Venice, viz.:

- a.** an edition in 4to and 12mno (1614-15);
- b.** a *Rabbinic Bible*, *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES* (1617-18, 4 vols. fol.);
- c.** a 4to edition (1619);
- d.** a 4to edition (1625);
- e.** a 4to edition, with Italian notes (1678);
- f.** *Biblia Hebraica ad usum Judaeorum* (1707, 4to);
- g.** *Biblia Hebraica*, with a Spanish commentary in Rabbinic letters, "con licenza de' superiori" (1730, 4to).

9. . *de la Rouviere's*, or *Celphas Elon's Editions*, published at Geneva in 1618, in 4to, 8vo, and 18mo, are but a reprint of No. 3.

IV. The fourth main recension, or mixed text, was formed from Nos. II and III above, and was the Antwerp Polyglot, or *Biblia Sacra Hebraice* (Antwerp, 1567) **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES**, which was followed by

1. *The Paris Polyglot.* **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES.**

2. *The London, or Walton's Polyglot.* **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES.**

3. *Plantin's Hebrew-Latin Editions* (Antwerp, 1571, 1583). In the first edition, in ^{◀OIBIS}Genesis 3:15, where the Vulg. has "ipsa conteret caput," with reference to the Virgin Mary, we read **tw̄h**, instead of **awh**, with a little circle above to indicate a different reading in the passage (**ayh**). But this corruption was not made by Arias Montanus, the Latin translator.

4. *The Burgos Edition*, a very rare reprint of Plantin's first edition, published at Burgos, inn Spain, in 1581 (fol.).

5. *The Geneva Editions*, in Hebrew and Latin, published in 1609 and 1618 (fol.).

6. *The Leyden Edition*, published in 1613 (large 8vo).

7. *The Vienna Edition*, published in 1743 (large 8vo).

8. *Reineccius's Polyglot and Manual Editions.* See Reineccius.

V. *Hutter's Text.* Several older editions contributed to Hutter's Bibles:

a. *Biblia Sacra*, etc. (Hamburg, 1587, fol.). The outward appearance of this edition is splendid. In the margin the number of chapters is marked, and every fifth verse. From the preface we see that Hutter perused the editions of Bomberg, Munster, Stephens, etc. This edition was only printed once, but was published in 1588, 1596, and 1603 with new title-pages.

b. *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (incomplete; only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth) (Nuremberg, 1599). Hutter's Hebrew Bible was reprinted in Nissel's edition (Lugduni Batavorum, 1662, large 8vo), with the title *Sacra Biblia Hebraea ex Optimis Editionibus*, etc.

VI. *Buxtorf's Editions.* A text revised accurately after the Masorah, and therefore deviating here and there from the earlier editions, is furnished by Buxtorf's editions, viz.:

a. *The Manual Edition* (Basle, 1611, 8vo), which was followed by

1. *Janssun's Edition* (Amst. 1639), or [h\[braw μyrç\]](#).

2. *Menasseh ben-Israel's Edition* (ibid. 1635, 4to). It would have been well if the editor had stated which four editions he perused, and to which the mistakes, which are not a few in this edition, are to be ascribed. Each page has two columns. The order of the books is rather uncommon; the Hagiographa and five Megilloth come before the earlier amid her prophets. As to the edition itself, R. Simon, in his *Histoire Critique*, p. 514, remarks. "L'edition en quarto de Menassa ben-Israel, a Amsterdam en 1635, a cette commodite, qu'elle est non seulement co'recte, mais aussi a deux colonnes; au lieu que les editions de Robert Estienne et de Plantin sont a longues lignes et par consequent incommodes pour la lecture."

b. *Buxtorf's Rabbinic Bible*, *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*, which was followed by 1. *Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible*. *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*.

VII. *Joseph Athias's Text.* Neither the text of Hutter nor that of Buxtorf was without its permanent influence; but the Hebrew Bible which became the standard to subsequent generations was that of Joseph Athias, a learned rabbi and printer at Amsterdam. His text was based on a comparison of the previous editions with two MSS.; one bearing the date 1209, the other a Spanish MS., boasting an antiquity of 900 years. The first edition of this new text was published at Amsterdam (1661, 2 vols. 8vo), with the title, *Biblia Hebraica correcta et collata cum Antigonissimis et Accuatissimis Exemplaribus Manuscriptis et hactenus impressis*. This is the first edition in which each verse is numbered. A second edition, with a preface by Lensden, was published in 1667. These editions were much prized for their beauty and correctness, and a gold medal and chain were conferred on Athias in token of their appreciation by the States-General of Holland.

VIII. *Clodius's Editions* were based upon the text of Athias.

a. *Biblia Testamenti Veteris*, etc. Opera et studio Clodii (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1677).

b. *Biblia Hebraica*, etc.; recognita a J. H. Majo (ibid. 1692).

c. *Biblia Hebraica*, etc.; ed. G. Chr. Burcklin (ibid. 1716, 4to). In spite of all the care which Burcklin bestowed upon this edition, some mistakes were left, as: ^{<2016>}Isaiah 1:16, **wqj r** for **wxj r**; 41:22, **twnqrh** for **tynqarh**; ^{<2448>}Jeremiah 4:18, **l [** for **d [**; 23:21, **μhyl [** for **μhyl a**: ^{<3425>}Ezekiel 40:25, **[ybs** for **bybs**; ^{<3716>}Hosea 7:16, **μgal** for **μg [l**; ^{<1070>}Amos 7:10, **μyb** for **tyb**; ^{<2822>}Lamentations 5:22, **yk** for **μα yk**; ^{<9731>}Psalms 75:1, **āma** for **āsa**, etc.

IX. *Jablonski's Editions*, or —

a. *Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Hebraicis*, etc. (Berolini, 1699, large 8vo or 4to). For this edition Jablonski collated all the cardinal editions, together with several MSS., and bestowed particular care on the vowel-points and accents, as he expresses himself more fully in his preface, § 6, 7.

b. *Biblia Hebraica in Gratiam*, etc.. (ibid. 1712, 12mo). This is the last of Jablonski's editions, but less correct; and the same may be said of the one published in 1711 (24mo) without the vowel-points.

X. *H. Michaelis's Bible* was based on Jablonski's first edition of 1699, and was entitled **yrps [braw μyrq [qrqh** (Halle, 1720, 8vo and 4to). For this edition Michaelis compared five Erfurt MSS. and nineteen printed editions, which are all enumerated in the preface. This edition is much esteemed, partly for its correctness and partly for its notes, which, on account of the very small type, are a task to the eyes.

Michaelis's text is said to have been the basis of the so-called *Mantuan Bible*, edited, with a critical commentary, by Norzi (q.v.) (Mantua, 1742-44).

XI. *Van der Hooght's Text, or Biblia Hebraica, secundum ultimam Editionem Jos. Athia*, etc. (Amst. 1705, 2 vols. Svo). This edition — of good reputation for its accuracy, but above all for the beauty and distinctness of its type — deserves special attention as constituting our present *textus receptus*. The text was chiefly formed on that of Athias; no MSS. were used for it, but it has a collection of various readings from printed editions at the end. The Masoretic readings are given in the margin. In spite of all the excellences which this edition has above others, there are

still a great many mistakes to be found therein, as Bruns has shown in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 12:225 sq. The following editions are either printed from or based on Van der Hooght's text:

1. *Proop's Editions*, published at Amsterdam (1724, 1762).
2. *The Leipsic Edition*, with Seb. Schmid's Latin translation (1740, 4to).
3. *Forstem's Biblia Hebraica sine Punctis* (Oxford, 1750, 2 vols. 4to).
4. *Simoni's Editions* (Halle, 1752, 1767, 1822, 1828; the latter two with a preface by Rosenmuller).
5. *Houbigant's* (q.v.) *Edition* (Paris, 1753, 4 vols. fol.).
6. *Bayly's Old Testament*, in Hebrew and English (Lond. 1774, large 8vo).
7. *Kennicott's* (q.v.) *Vetus Testamentum* (Oxford, 1776-80, 2 vols. fol.).
8. *Jahn's Biblia Hebraica*, etc. (Vienna, 1806, 4 vols. 8vo), with readings from De Rossi, Kennicott, etc. With injudicious peculiarity, however, the books are arranged in a new order; the Chronicles are split up into fragments for the purpose of comparison with the parallel books.
9. *Boothroyd's Biblia Hebraica*, with various readings (Pontefract, 1810-16, 2 vols. 4to).
10. *Frey's Biblia Hebraica* (Lond. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo), which was entirely superseded by
11. *D'Allemand's Biblia Hebraica* (ibid. 1822, and often). Van der Hooght's text is found in all English editions of the Hebrew Bible published by Duncan or Bagster, and is also made the basis of
12. *The Hexaglot Bible*, **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES** (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).
13. *The Basle Edition* of 1827.
14. *Hahn's Editions*, published at Leipsic in 1831, 1832, 1833, 1839, and 1867; the last is superior to the former, as can be seen from the preface. Hahn's text has also been reprinted in the polyglot of Stier and Theile (Elberfeld, 1847, and often). There is also a small edition of Hahn's Bible (in 12mo), with a preface by Rosenmuller, in small but clear type. The last of this edition was published in 1868.

15. *Theile's Editions* (ibid 1840; 4th ed. 1873). This edition may be regarded as one of the best Hebrew Bibles according to Van der Hooght's recension. Wright, in his *The Book of Genesis in Hebrew* (Lond. 1859), has followed Theile's text.

XII. *Opitz's Text, or Biblica Hebraica cum Optimis Impressis, etc.* Studio et Opera D. H. Optii (Kiloni, 1709, 4to). Opitz compared for this edition three codices and fourteen printed editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in

1. *Zullichow Biblia cum Praefatione Michaelis* (1741, 4to).
2. *Evangelische deutsche Original-Bibel*, containing the Hebrew and Luther's German translation (Kiloni, 1741).

XIII. *Editions with a Revised Text.* With Van der Hooght's edition a *textus receptus* was given, which was corrected and improved from time to time. But the more the Masorah and ancient Jewish grammarians were studied, the more it was found that the present text, while on the whole correct, did not come up to the requirements and rules laid down by ancient grammarians, for, as Delitzsch observes, in the edition of the Old Test., the minutest points must be observed, trifling and pettifoggish as they may appear to the superficial reader; "yet **יִוְטָא עֵן הִי מִיָּא קַרְאִיא** maximi apud nos ponderis esse debet." Thus it came to pass that from time to time new editions of the Hebrew text were published **הַרְשָׁמָה יְפִי** [, i.e. in accordance with the Masorah. Of such editions we mention, passing over the editions of single parts of the Old Test.,

1. The edition published at Carlsruhe (1836-37) and edited by Epstein, Rosenfeld, and others.
2. *Philippsohn's Israelitische Bibel* (Leipsic, 1844-54). But this edition, says Delitzsch, "quamquam textum **יְפִי אֶל הַרְשָׁמָה** conformatum se exhibere predicat, Masorethica diligentie vix ullum vestigium ostendit et vitii plurimis scatet."
3. *Letteris's Edition*, or **הַרְוֵת אַהֲוֵה עֲדָקָה רַפְס מְיַבְוֹתְכָו מְיַאֲבֹב** (Vienna, 1852, 2 vols. Svo). This edition was reprinted by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Berlin, with the corrections of Theophilus Abramson (1866, and often; latest edition, 1874). With an English title-page, "*The Hebrew Bible*, revised and carefully examined by Myer Levi

Letteris," the society's edition was published (?) by Wiley and Son (N. Y. 1875).

4. A new edition, which, as we hope, will become the standard text for the future, is that commenced by Baur and Delitzsch. As early as 1861, S. Baer, in connection with Prof. Delitzsch, published the *פּוּל הַתּוֹרָה, or Liber Psanlorumn Hebraicus. Textuan Masorethicum accuratimvs quam adhuc factuan est expressit. . .* *פּוֹתוֹת קְרִיבָה* S. Baer. Pruefatus est F. Delitzsch (Lipsiae, 1861). Mr. Baer, who for about twenty years has made Masoretic lore his specialty, the results of which he partly gave to the public in his *תּוֹרַת מִדְבָּר* (Ridelheim, 1852), was best adapted for such a task, and his connection with Prof. Delitzsch, one of the greatest living Hebrew scholars, is the best guarantee that the work is in able hands. An improved edition of the Psalms was published in 1874, under the title *תּוֹרַת הַתְּנַכְ"ךְ, Liber Psanlmorum Hebraicus atque Latinus ab Hieronymo ex Hebrceo conversus*. Consociata opera ediderunt C. de Tischendorf, S. Baer, et Fr. Delitzsch. In the preface, which is prepared by Delitzsch, we get a great deal of instructive matter as to the sources used for this edition. The Hebrew and Latin text is followed by *Appendices Criticoe et Masorethicoe* of great value to the student. Both these editions are published in 12mo. Besides the Psalms, which in their present size are probably not intended for a complete edition of the Old Test., they published —

(1.) *יְצִמְךָ הַמַּיִם לְפָנֶיךָ וְיָרֶם אֶתְּךָ וְיָרֶם אֶתְּךָ וְיָרֶם אֶתְּךָ, Liber Genesis, Texture Masorethicum accuratissime expressit, e Fontibus Masoroe varie illustravit, Notis Criticis confirmavit, S. Baer. Prefatus est edendi operis adjutor Fr. Delitzsch (Lipsie, 1869, gr. Svo). The title fully indicates the contents of the work, which, however, we will specify. The Hebrew text is followed by*

- a.** *Specimen Lectionuum in hac Editione Genesis receptarum.*
- b.** *Loci Genesis Vocalem non productam in Medio Extrema move Versu retinentes.*
- c.** *Scripturoe Genesis inter Scholas Orientales et Occidentales controversoe.*
- d.** *Loci Genesis a Ben-Asher et Ben-Naphtali diverse Punctis signati.*

e. *Loci Genesis Consimiles qui facile confunduntur.*

f. *Loci Genesis Lineola Pasek notati.*

g. *Sectiones Libri Genesis Masorethicoe.*

h. *Conspectus Notarum Masoreticarum*: **α.** Varietas scriptionis et lectionis; **β.** Adnotationes Masoreticæ; **γ.** Clausula libri.

(2.) *Liber Jesaie* .. (Lipsiae, 1872), containing the same critical matter as Genesis.

(3.) *Liber Jobi* . . (ibid. 1875). Opposite the title-page stands a facsimile of the Codex Tshufutkale No. 8 *a*, which gives a good specimen of the Babylonian system of punctuation.

(4.) *Liber Duodecim Prophetarum* . . (ibid. 1878). The prefaces which precede the Hebrew text, in all these volumes give an account of the various MSS, editions, etc., which have been perused for each book, and are full of instruction to the student of the sacred text. When completed, this edition of the Old Test. will form not a recension, but *the* recension of the best Hebrew text with which the student can be furnished.

Literature. — For the different editions of the Old Test., see Le-Long-Mash, Wolf, Bartolucci, Rosenmuller, and introductions to the Old Test., together with Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*, i, 137 sq., and De Rossi, *De nebraicæ Typographiæ Origine*, etc. (Parma, 1776); id. *De Typographiæ Hebraeo-Fue-irariensi*, etc. (ibid. 1780); id. *De Iginotis Nonnullis Antiquissimis Hebr. Textus Editi*. etc. (Erlangen, 1782); id. *Annales Hebraeo - typographici*, etc. (Parma, 1795). For various readings, see the editions of Kennicott, Michaelis, Jahn, Reineccius-Meissner-Doderlein; the *Varice Lectiones* of De Rossi (ibid. 1784, 4 vols.); Davidson, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, etc. (Lond. 1855) — following, as Davidson does, De Rossi and Jahn, his work, besides being deficient, cannot always be relied upon; Pick, *Horæ Samaritanæ, or a Collection of various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other Ancient Versions, in Libl. Sacra* (Andover, 1876-78); Strack, *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschriften in St. Petersburg* (St. Petersburg, 1875). For critical purposes, see, besides the articles QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD and *SEE MASORAH* in this Cyclopaedia, together with the literature given in those articles, Strack, *Peroleuomena Critica in V. T.* (Lipsiae, 1873); id. *Zur*

Textkritik des Jesaias, in *Lutchrusche Zeitschrift* (Leipsic, 1877), p. 17 sq., and his preface to the edition of the *Prophetarum Codex Babilonicus Petropolitanus* (Petrop. 1876); Meir-a-Levi Abulafia (q.v.), *hrwtl gyys trwsm rps* (Florence, 1750; Berlin, 1761), Lonzano, *hrwt rwa* (Venice, 1618; Berlin, 1745); Norzi (q.v.), *yc tj nm* (Vienna, 1813); also in the Warsaw Rabbinic Bible; Heidenheim, *צמח מנין[rwam* (Rodelheim. 1818-21); Kimchi, *Liber Radicum* edd. Lebrecht et Biesenthal (Berlin, 1847); Frensdorff, *Die Massora Miagna* (Hanover and Leipsic, 1876); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 231 sq.; the critical notes appended by Baer and Delitzsch to the different books edited by them; the *Masechet Soferim* (q.v.), best ed. by J. Muller (Leipsic, 1878); the forthcoming work of Ginsburg on the Masorah, which will be published in 4 vols. - viz. vol. i, the Masorah Magna, lexically arranged; vol. ii, the Masorah Parva; vol. 3, an English translation, with explanatory notes; vol. 4, the original Hebrew text of the Bible according to the Masorah; and Delitzsch, *Complutensische Varianten zu den Alttestamentlichen Texte* (ibid. 1878). (B. P.)

Recensions Of The New Testament.

After the critical materials at the basis of the New-Test. text had accumulated in the hands of Mill and Bentley, they began to be examined with care. Important readings in different documents were seen to possess resemblances more or less striking. Passages were found to present the same form, though the MSS. from which they were derived belonged to various times and countries. The thought suggested itself to Bengel that the mass of materials might be definitely classified in conformity with such peculiarities. The same idea afterwards occurred to Semler. Bengel classified all the documents from which various readings are collected into two *nations* or *families* — the Asiatic and the African. To the former belonged the Codex Alexandrinus as the chief; to the latter the Graeco-Latin codices. At first that eminent critic does not seem to have had a very distinct apprehension of the subject; and therefore he speaks in general terms of it in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1734; but in the posthumous edition of the *Apparatus Criticus* (1763, edited by Burlius) he is more explicit. Semler was the first that used the term *recension* of a particular class of MSS., in his *Hiermeneutische Vorbereitung* (1765). This critic, however, though acquainted with Wetstein's labors on the text of the New Test., had nothing more than a dim notion of the subject. He

followed Bengel without clearly understanding or enlarging his views. Griesbach was the first scholar who treated the topic with consummate learning and skill, elaborating it so highly that it became a prominent subject in the criticism of the New Test. But he had the benefit of Wetstein's abundant treasures. The term *recension* applied to MS. quotations by ancient writers, and versions of the Greek Testament bearing an affinity to one another in characteristic readings, became a classical word in his hands, and has continued so. The appellation is not happily chosen. *Family, nation, class, or order* would have been more appropriate; because *recension* suggests the idea of revision, which is inapplicable. If it be remembered, however, that the word denotes nothing more than a certain class of critical documents characterized by distinctive peculiarities in common, it matters little what designation be employed.

The sentiments of Griesbach, like those of Bengel, developed and enlarged with time. Hence we must not look for exactly the same theory in his different publications. In his *Dissertatio Critica de Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origenianis* (pars prima, published in 1771), he says that there are, perhaps, three or four recensions into which all the codices of the New Test. might be divided (*Opuscula Acadenzica*, edited by Gabler, i, 239). In the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1777), he states that at the beginning of the 3d century there were two recensions of the gospels, the Alexandrian and the Western. In the prolegomena to the first volume of his second edition of the Greek Testament, the matured sentiments of this able critic are best set forth. There he illustrates the Alexandrian recension, the Western, and the Constantinopolitan. The first two are the more ancient, belonging to the time in which the two collections of the New-Test. writings, the εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος, were made. The Alexandrian was an actual recension arising at the time when the two portions in question were put together; the Western was simply the accidental result of carelessness and arbitrary procedure on the part of transcribers and others in the MSS. current before the ἀπόστολος, or epistles, were collected. The Constantinopolitan arose from the intermingling of the other two, and, like the Western, is no proper *recension*, but was rather the result of a condition of the documents brought about by the negligence and caprice of copyists or meddling critics. The Alexandrian is presented by the MSS. C, L, 33, 102, 106, and by B in the last chapters of the four gospels; by the Memphitic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Philoxenian versions; and the quotations of Clemens

Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Atbanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Isidore of Pelusium. The Western accords with the Graeco-Latin codices, with the Ante-Hieronymian Latin version, and with B in the gospel of Matthew; also with 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; with the Thebaic and JerusalemSyriac versions, and the quotations of Irenaeus in Latin Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine. The third or Constantinopolitan is shown in A, E, F, G, H, S, of the gospels, the Moscow codices of the Pauline epistles, the Gothic and Slavonic versions; and in the quotations of such fathers as lived during the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries in Greece, Asia Minor, and the neighboring provinces. The text in Chrysostom is described by Griesbaclh as a mixed one; and of P, Q, and T he says that they accord sometimes with the Alexandrian, sometimes with the Western. The Alexandrian recension sought to avoid and change whatever might be offensive to Greek ears; but the Western preserved the harsher genuine readings when opposed to the genius of the Greek language; Hebraizing ones; readings involving solecism or unpleasant to the ear. The Alexandrian sought to illustrate words and phrases rather than the sense; the Western endeavored to render the sense clearer and less involved by means of explanations, circumlocutions, additions gathered from every side, as well as by transpositions of words and sentences. It also preferred the readings which are more full and verbose, as well as supplements taken from parallel passages, sometimes omitting what might render the sense obscure or seem repugnant to the context or parallel passages, in all which respects the Alexandrian is purer. The Alexandrian critic acted the part of a grammarian, the Western that of an interpreter. In all these points Criesbach asserts that the Constantinopolitan commonly agrees with the Alexandrian; but with this difference, that it is still more studious of Greek propriety, admits more glosses into the text, and intermingles either Western readings, which differ from the Alexandrian, or else readings compounded of Alexandrian and Western. No recension is exhibited by any codex in its original purity (*Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum* [3d ed. by Schulz], vol. i, p. lxx sq.).

Michaelis thinks that there have existed four principal editions:

1. The Western, used in countries where the Latin language was spoken.
2. The Alexandrian or Egyptian, with which the quotations of Origen coincide and the Coptic version.

3. The Edessene edition, embracing the MSS. from which the old Syriac was made.

4. The Byzantine, in general use at Constantinople after that city became the capital of the Eastern empire. This last is subdivided into the ancient and the modern (*Introduction to the New Test.*, translated by Marsh, ii, 175 sq., 2d ed.).

Assuredly this classification is no improvement upon Griesbach's.

Somewhat different from Griesbach's system is that of Hug, which was first proposed in his *Einleitung in das neue Testament* (1808).

1. The **κοινή ἔκδοσις**, i.e. the most ancient text, unrevised, which came into existence in the 2d century, found in D, 1,13, 69,124, of the gospels; in D, E, F, G, of Paul's epistles; in D, E, of the Acts; and in the old Latin and Thebaic versions. The Peshito also belongs to this class of text, though it differs in some respects from D.

2. About the middle of the 3d century, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, made a recension of the **κοινή ἔκδοσις**. To this belong B, C, L, of the gospels; A, B, C, 40, 30, 367, in the Acts; A, B, C, 40, 367, in the Catholic epistles; A, B, C, 46, 367, 17, of the Pauline epistles; and A, C, of the Apocalypse. It appears in the citations of Athanasius, Marcus and Macarius the monks, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cosmas Indicopleustes. This recension had ecclesiastical authority in Egypt and Alexandria.

3. About the same time, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, revised the **κοινή ἔκδοσις** as it then existed in the Peshito, comparing different MSS. current in Syria. In this way he produced a text which did not wholly harmonize with the Hesychian because he was less studious of elegant Latinity. It appears in E, F, GI, S, V, of the gospels, and b, h, of the Moscow *Evangelistaria* collated by Matthai, with most of the cursive MSS.; in f, a., b, d, c, m, k (Matthai), of the Acts; in g (Matthai), f, k, l, m, c, d, of the Pauline and Catholic epistles; in r, k, p, l, o, Moscow MSS.. of the Apocalypse; in the Gothic and Slavonic versions, and the quotations of Theophylact, though his text is no longer pure. 4. A fourth recension Hug attributes to Origen during his residence at Tyre. To it belong A, K, NI, 42, 106, 114, 116, and 10 of Matthai in the gospels, the Philoxenian Syriac, the quotations of Theodoret and Chrysostom. From this summary it appears that Hug's **κοιῶν ἔκδοσις** agrees substantially with the Western

recension of Griesbach. It is more comprehensive, as including the Peshito, with the quotations of Clement and Origen. The Hesychian recension of Hug coincides with the Alexandrian of Griesbach.

Eichhorn's system is substantially that of Hug, with one important exception. He assumed an unrevised form of the text in Asia, and, with some differences, in Africa also. This unrevised text may be traced in its two forms as early as the 2d century. Lucian revised the first, Hesychius the second. Hence, from the close of the third century, there was a threefold phase of the text — the African or Alexandrian, the Asiatic or Constantinopolitan, and a mixture of both. Eichhorn denied that Origen made a new recension (*Einleitun in das neue Testament*, vol. 4:§ 35 sq.).

In 1815 Nolan published an *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, in which he propounded a peculiar theory of recensions. He divided all the documents into three classes — the Palestinian, equivalent to Griesbach's Alexandrian; the Egyptian, identical with Griesbach's Western; and the Byzantine. The three forms of the text are represented, as he assumed, by the Codex Vaticanus and Jerome's Vulgate, with the Codices Vercellensis and Brixianus of the Latin version. The last two contained a more ancient text than that represented by the version of Jerome. The Palestinian recension, which he attributes to Eusebius of Cesarea, is greatly censured as having been executed by this father with arbitrariness and dishonesty, since he tampered with passages because of their opposition to his Arian opinions. At the end of the 5th century this recension was introduced into Alexandria by Euthalius, and was circulated there.

Scholz made two classes or families — the Alexandrian or Occidental, and Constantinopolitan or Oriental. Griesbach's Western class is contained in the former. He referred to the Alexandrian several of the ancient MSS., and a few later ones — the Memphitic, Thebaic, Ethiopic, and Latin versions, and the ecclesiastical writers belonging to Western Europe, with those of Africa. To the Constantinopolitan he referred the MSS. belonging to Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Eastern Europe, especially Constantinople, with the Philoxenian, Syriac, Gothic, Georgian, and Slavonic versions, besides the fathers of these regions. To the latter he gave a decided preference, because of their alleged mutual agreement, and also because they were supposed to be written with great care after the most ancient exemplars; whereas the Alexandrian documents were arbitrarily altered by

officious grammarians. Indeed, he traces the Constantinopolitan to the autography of the original writers.

Rinck agrees with Scholz in classifying all documents under two heads — the Occidental and the Oriental; the former exhibited in A, B, C, D, E, F, G, in the epistles, the latter containing the cursive MSS. The former he subdivides into two families — the African (A, B, C) and the Latin codices (D, E, F, G). He finds in it the result of arbitrary correction, ignorance, and carelessness.

Tischendorf's view, given in the prolegomena to the seventh edition of his Greek Testament, is that there are two pairs of classes — the Alexandrian and Latin, the Asiatic and Byzantine. The oldest form of the text, and that which most bears an Alexandrian complexion, is presented in A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z, A, perhaps also R, in the gospels. A later form, bearing more of an Asiatic complexion, is in E, F, G, H, K, M, O, S, U, V, r, A. For the Acts and Catholic epistles the oldest text is given in A, B, C; for Acts probably D and I also. For the Pauline epistles the oldest text is represented by A, B, C, H, I, D, F, G, the first five being Alexandrian, the last two Latin; D standing between the two classes. A and C in the Apocalypse have a more ancient text than B.

Lachmann disregarded all systems of recensions, and proceeded to give a text from ancient documents of a certain definite time — the text which commonly prevailed in the 3d and 4th centuries, drawn from Oriental MSS. — with the aid of Occidental ones in cases where the former disagree among themselves. In his large edition he follows the united evidence of Eastern and Western MSS. His merits are very great in the department of New-Test. criticism; but this is not the place to show them. He does not, however, profess to give a text as near as possible to that which he judges to proceed from the sacred writers themselves, as Griesbach and Tischendorf have done. On the contrary, he has simply undertaken to present that form of the text which is found in documents belonging to a certain period as a basis contributing to the discovery of the authentic text itself. *His* text is an important aid to the work of finding out the original words; not the original itself, as he would have given it. For this reason his edition contains readings which, in his own opinion, could *not* have been original. His object was therefore somewhat different from that of most editors. But he set an example of rigid adherence to the task proposed, and of critical sagacity in eliminating the true text from ancient documents of

the time, evincing the talents and skill of a master. Since his time it has been the fashion among inferior critics and imitators to attach undue weight to antiquity. Uncial MSS. and their readings have been too implicitly followed by some.

Tischendorf more recently adopted the same views as those of Lachmann, holding that the most ancient text alone should be edited, though it may not always be what the sacred authors wrote. This principle being laid at the basis of his eighth edition, lately completed, made a considerable difference between it and the *seventh*. The internal goodness of readings, the context, and sound judgment are thus excluded, and this at the expense of something more valuable; for mere outward and ancient testimony can never elicit what ought to be an editor's chief object — the presentation of a text as near the original one as can be procured. The oldest text of the best MSS. and versions is valuable only so far as it assists in attaining that object. It is owing to the undue elevation of antiquity that such a reading as ὁ μονογενῆς θεός in ^{<RB>}John 1:18 has been given in the text of a recent edition. The same excessive veneration for antiquity has led to the separation of ὁ γέγονεν from οὐδὲ ν “ν (^{<RB>}John 1:3) in modern times. Lachmann is exceeded by smaller followers, not in his own exact line.

To Griesbach all must allow distinguished merit. He was a consummate critic, ingenious, acute, candid, tolerant, and learned. His system was elaborated with great ability. It exhibits the marks of a sagacious mind. But it was assailed by many writers, whose combined attacks weakened its basis. In Germany, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Schulz, Gabler, and Schott made various objections to it. In consequence of Hug's acute remarks, the venerable scholar himself modified his views. He did not, however, give up the three recensions, but still maintained that the Alexandrian and Western were distinct. He admitted that the Syriac, which Hug had put with the κοινή, was nearer to that than to the Alexandrian class; but he hesitated to put it with the Western because it differed so much. He denied that Origen used the κοινή, maintaining that the Alexandrian, which existed before his time, was that which he employed. He conceded, however, that Origen had a Western copy of Mark besides an Alexandrian one; that in his commentary on Matthew, though the readings are chiefly Alexandrian, there is a great number of such as are Western, and which therefore appear in D, 13, 28, 69, 124, 131, 157, the old Italic, Vulgate, and Syriac. Thus Origen had various copies at hand, as he himself repeatedly asserts. Griesbach also conceded that Clemens Alexandrinus had various copies,

differing in the forms of their texts. Hence his citations often agree with the κοινή ἔκδοσις and D. Thus Origen and Clement cease, in some measure, to be standard representatives of the Alexandrian recension. The concessions of Griesbach, resulting from many acute observations made by Hug and others, amounted to this, that the nearness of MSS. and recensions to one another was greater than he had before assumed; that his two ancient recensions had more points of contact with one another in existing documents than he had clearly perceived. The line between his Alexandrian and Western classes became less perceptible. This, indeed, was the weak point of the system, as no proper division can be drawn between the two. In the *application* of his system he professed to follow the consent of the Alexandrian and Western recensions, unless the internal marks of truth in a reading were so strong as to outweigh this argument. But he departed from his principle in several instances, as in ~~400~~1 Corinthians 3:4; Galatians 4:14; ~~400~~Philippians 3:3; ~~400~~1 Thessalonians 2:7; ~~400~~Hebrews 4:2.

In the year 1814 Dr. Laurence published objections to Griesbach's system, many of which are unfounded. Some of his observations are pertinent and fair; more are irrelevant. He does not show much appreciation of the comparative value of MSS. and texts, and reasons in a sort of mechanical method against Griesbach. It is evident that he was somewhat prejudiced against the Alexandrian recension. Observations like the following show an animus against the German critic: "Too much dazzled, perhaps, by the splendor of intricate and perplexing research, he overlooked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own without having first totally demolished theirs, forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text" (*Remarks upon the Systematic Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach*, p. 57). The pamphlet of the Oxford scholar is now almost forgotten, yet it produced considerable effect at the time of its appearance, when the reprinting of Griesbach's Greek Testament in England was associated with the active dissemination of Unitarian tenets, and the accomplished German himself was unjustly charged with leaning to similar views.

In America, Mr. Norton subsequently animadverted upon the same system with considerable acuteness and plausibility. It is evident, however, that he did not fully understand all Griesbach's sentiments; he had not studied the

peculiar readings of MSS., the quotations of the fathers, and the characteristics of ancient versions, yet he has urged some objections forcibly and conclusively against the adoption of the system.

Hug's theory of recensions, so far as it differs from Griesbach's, is without foundation. It makes Origen use the **κοινή ἔκδοσις**, whereas his usual text agrees with the Alexandrian. The Hesychian recension was employed at least a hundred years previously by Clement of Alexandria, and that Hesychius was really the author of a recension is historically baseless; he may have corrected, in some places, a few copies which he used. The recension attributed to Lucian is also destitute of historical proof. The basis of this is supposed to have been the **κοινή ἔκδοσις** as it existed in Syria. Again, it is very improbable that Origen undertook to revise the **κοινή ἔκδοσις**. It is true that Jerome appeals to the *exemplars* of Origen, but this does not imply that the latter made a revision of existing copies. The Alexandrian father used copies of the New Test. selected with care, and probably corrected them in various places, but he did not undertake in his old age the laborious task of making a peculiar revision. The silence of ancient writers, especially of Eusebius, who is most copious in his praises of Origen, speaks strongly against the critical studies of the Alexandrian father in the New-Test. text. We believe, therefore, that the recension system of Hug is unsustained by historical data. Succeeding critics have refused to adopt it. Griesbach himself made several pertinent objections to it. It was also assailed by Schott, Rinck, Gabler, and others. Mr, Norton, too, opposed it.

Nolan's system is fundamentally wrong. There is no evidence that the Codex Brixianus contains the Latin version in its oldest form, and therefore the assumed connection of it with the Byzantine text fails to show that the latter is the most ancient and best representative of the original Greek. The Codex Brixianus, on the contrary, is itself a revision of the old Latin text. Nolan thinks that the Codex Vercellensis has a text corrected by Eusebius of Vercelli after that which he brought from Egypt on his return from exile. But this form of the text circulated in the West before Eusebius, and the Palestinian recension, which he supposes to have been introduced into Alexandria by Euthallus, was there before; thus the system so ingeniously elaborated by the critic is historically erroneous. It introduces arbitrary and baseless conjectures into the department of criticism, ignores facts, and deals in unjust accusations against ancient writers, such as Eusebius of Cmsarea, who were as honest as the zealous upholder himself of the

Byzantine text. All attempts to maintain the most recent in opposition to the most ancient text must necessarily fail. Thoroughly erroneous as Nolan's theory is, it was eagerly welcomed by some advocates of the received text in England. Mr. Horne could say of it, even in the ninth edition of his *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures*, "The integrity of the Greek Vulgate he has confessedly established by a series of proofs and connected arguments the most decisive that can be reasonably desired or expected."

With regard to Scholz's system, which is identical with Bengel's, it may be preferable to Griesbach's so far as it allows but two classes of documents; it is certainly simpler. His estimate, however, of *the value* of families is erroneous. He failed to prove that the particular form of the text current in Asia Minor and Greece during the first three centuries was the same as that presented by the Constantinopolitan MSS. of a much later date. He did not show that the Byzantine family was derived from the autographs of the original writers in a very pure state; and he was obliged to admit that the text which obtained at Constantinople in the reigns of Constantine and Constance was collated with the Alexandrian, a circumstance which would naturally give rise to a mingling of readings belonging to both. Eusebius states that he made out fifty copies of the New Test. for the use of the churches at Constantinople at the request of Constantine; and as we know that he gave a decided preference to Alexandrian copies, it cannot be doubted that he followed those sanctioned by Origen's authority. Constantinopolitan codices differ in their characteristic readings from the Alexandrian, but the preference belongs to the latter, not to the former. Why should junior be placed above older documents? Antiquity may be overbalanced by other considerations, and certainly the Alexandrian MSS. are neither faultless nor pure. But the Byzantine and later MSS. are more corrupt, *Numbers* must not be considered decisive of right readings in opposition to *antiquity*, yet numbers had an undue influence on Scholz's mind. Rinck has refuted his supposed proofs of the superiority of Constantinopolitan MSS., and Tischendorf has more elaborately done the same in the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1841). In fact, Scholz's historical proofs are no better than fictions which true history rejects.

No definite system of recensions such as those of Griesbach, Hug, and Scholz can be made out, because lines of division cannot be drawn with accuracy. Our knowledge of the ways in which the early text was

deteriorated — of the influences to which it was exposed, the corrections it underwent in different places at different times, the methods in which it was copied, the principles, if such there were, on which transcribers proceeded — is too meagre to build up a secure structure. The subject must therefore remain in obscurity. Its nature is such as to give rise to endless speculation without affording much real knowledge; it is vague, indefinite, shadowy, awakening curiosity without satisfying it. Yet we are not disposed to reject the entire system of classification as visionary. It is highly useful to arrange the materials. The existence of certain characteristic readings may be clearly traced in various monuments of the text, however much we may speculate on their causes. It is true that in several cases it is very difficult to distinguish the family to which a particular reading belongs, because its characteristics may be divided between two classes, or they may be so mixed that it is almost impossible to detect the family with which it should be united; the evidences of its relationship may be so obscure as to render the determination of its appropriate recension a subtle problem. It is also unquestionable that no one MS. version or father exhibits a recension in a pure state, but that each form of the text appears more or less corrupted. The speculations of the critics to which we have referred have had one advantage, viz. that they have made the characteristic readings of MSS. better understood, and enabled us to group together certain documents presenting the same form of text. Thus in the gospels, **a**, A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z present an older form of the text than E, F, G, H, K, I, S, U, V, r. Among the former, **a**, B, Z have a text more ancient and correct than that of the others.

Matthai repudiated the whole system of recensions as useless and absurd. We question whether he was warranted by learning, penetration, or judgment to use the contemptuous language which he applied. His industry in collating MSS. and editing their text was praiseworthy, but he had not the genius to construct a good text out of the materials within his reach. He overestimated his Moscow codices, and looked on Griesbach's merits with envious eye; hence his diatribe on recensions shows more ardent zeal than discretion. What sentence can show the spirit of the man better than this? — "Griesbach has been hammering, filing, and polishing for thirty years at this masterpiece of uncriticism, unbelief, and irreligiousness in Semler's recension-manufactory" (*Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen, welche der Terr Abt Begel, der Herr Doctor Semler, und der Herr Geheimz-Kirchenrath Griesbach, in deme*

griechischen Texte des N.T. wollen entdeckt haben, p. 28). Prof. Lee employed language equally strong with Matthai's, but not so scurrilous, though of the same tendency: "Ingeniosae illa familiarum fabricae, ut mihi videtur, in unum tantummodo finem feliciter exstructae sunt; ut rem in seipsa baud valde obscuram, tenebris Aegyptiacis obscuriorem reddant; Editoresque eos qui se omnia rem acu tetigisse putent, supra mortalium labendi statum, nescio quantum, evehere" (*Prolegomena ins Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora*, p. 69). Neither is sufficiently eminent to be justified in the employment of phraseology from which masters in criticism like Griesbach would refrain. Hear the veteran scholar, in his last publication, speaking of Hug: "Dubitationis igitur causas exponere mihi liceat, sed paucis et modeste, nec eo animo, ut cum viro doctissimo quem permagni me facere ingenue profiteor, decertem, sed ut turn alios viros harum rerum peritos, tum in primis ipsum excitem et humanissime invitent ad novum instituendum cause, quae in universa re critica Novi Testamenti maximi momenti est, examen, quo ea, si ullo o mox fieri id possit, ad liquidum tandem perducatur" (*Meletemrata de Vetustis Textus Novi Testamenti Recensionibus*, particula ii, p. 42). The preceding observations will help to account for the varying schemes of different critics. Some may look for greater exactness and nicety than others, hence they will make more families of documents; others, with less acuteness or ingenuity, will rest satisfied with classes more strongly marked by the number of materials they embrace or the breadth of territory over which they were supposed to circulate. There is no possibility of arriving at precision. The commingling of readings has obliterated many peculiarities in the progress of time, though enough has been left to form the basis of a rough classification.

It is more difficult to classify the ancient versions, such as the Peshito-Syriac, because their texts have suffered frequent interpolations and changes. In the quotations of the fathers we must make allowance for *memoriter* citation, without expecting great care or attachment to the letter. Griesbach, however, denies that Origen quoted from memory — and none has investigated the citations of the Alexandrian father with equal labor — but the state of his commentaries is far from being what we could wish, and the original is often lost or corrupted.

The term *recension* is sometimes applied to the Old Test. as well as the New Test. There the materials hitherto collated all belong to one recension, viz. the Masoretic. Some, indeed, have divided them into Masoretic and

Ante-Masoretic, but the latter cannot be traced. At present we are acquainted with only one great family, though it is probable that particular revisions of parts of the Old Test. preceded the labors of the Masorettes. Whether the Karaite Hebrew MSS. — of which many have been recently brought to St. Petersburg — present a different form of the text from the Masoretic will be seen after they have been collated; it is certain that their vowel-system is different from the present one. We expect, therefore, that important readings may be furnished by these very ancient codices.

See Bengel, *Introductio in Crisin N.T.*, prefixed to his edition of the Greek Testament (Tiibingen, 1734, 4to); Semler, *Vo bereitungen zur Hermeneutik* (Halle, 1760-69, 8vo); Michaelis, *Introduction to the N.T.*, by Marsh, ii, 173 sq.; Griesbach, *Optuscula* (edited by Gabler, with the Preface of the latter [Jena, 1824-25, 2 vols. 8vo]); id. *Commentarius Criticus in Textum Gracecum*, particule i and ii (ibid. 1798, 1811, 8vo); id. *Prolegomenae* to the second edition of his Greek Testament (1796, 8vo); Eichhorne, *Einleitung* (Gott. 1827, 8vo), vol. iv; Bertholdt, *Einleitung* (Erlangen, 1812, 8vo), vol. i; Schulz, *Prolegomena* to the third edition of Griesbach (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Hug, *inzleif.* (4th ed. Stuttgart, 1847, 8vo), vol. i; De Wette, *Binleit. in dus neue Testament* (6th ed. Berl. 1860, 8vo); Schott, *Isagoye Historicocritica* (Jena, 1830, 8vo); Iatthdii, *Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen*, etc. (Leips. 1804, 8vo); Scholz, *Biblichkritische Reise*, etc. (ibid. 1823, 8vo); id. *Prolegomena to the N.T.* (1830), vol. i; Laurence, remarks on Griesbach's *Systematic Classification of MSS.* (Oxford, 1814, 8vo); Rinck, *Luclubratio Critica in Actat Apost., Epp. Cathol. et Pulinz.* etc. (Basil. 1830, 8vo); Tischendorf, *Prolegomena* to his edition of the Greek Testament (Leips. 1841, 8vo), with the *Prolegomena* to his seventh edition (ibid. 1859), and his article *Bibeltext* in Herzog's *Enzcyklopadie*; Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments* (4th ed. Brunswick, 1864); Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels* (Boston. 1837, 8vo), vol. i; Davidson, *Treatise on Biblical Criticism* (Edinburgh, 1852), vol. ii. **SEE CRITICISM; SEE MANUSCRIPTS; SEE VARIOUS READINGS.**

Reception of the Holy Ghost

In the act of conferring the orders of the ministry simple, or of its higher functions, such as the eldership or bishopric, the solemn words are used, "Receive the Holy Ghost." Having been originally used by Jesus when he commissioned his apostles, the expression has been retained by the Church

as the most proper and authoritative form in which the powers of the Christian priesthood can be conveyed. “That the Church is vindicated,” says Stoughton, “in employing them at the consecration of bishops is manifest from the fact that the ministerial powers of office are identically the same with those held by the apostles, and if given at all must proceed from the same source — i.e. the Holy Ghost.” In the ordination of priests the same principle will apply. “Those under the designation of presbyters or elders also received their authority from this divine source, notwithstanding that there might be one or more intermediate links in the chain of transmission.” “Take heed,” said Paul to the elders of Ephesus, “unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.” If, therefore, it be granted that the bishop has the power of ordaining, it follows that he stands as an agent between the heavenly source of authority and the candidate to whom that authority is to be given, and is qualified to pronounce, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest [or bishop] in the Church of God,” etc.

We have quoted Stoughton because he fully exhibits the High-Church notion of *ordination* (q.v.), but we do not wish to be understood as its endorsers. Even the Low-Church clergy of the Anglican communion and the Protestant Episcopal Church refuse to give it approval. *SEE EPISCOPACY*. In the Methodist Episcopal Church bishops are not regarded as the successors of the apostles, and the apostolical succession of its ministry is not maintained. *SEE EPISCOPACY*, § iv. The form of ordination is very like in the different churches, and its variability of opinion depends upon the interpretation of the language employed.

Reception, Religious,

of monks, nuns, and other religious persons, is the ceremonial whereby they are admitted to the probationary state called the novitiate (q.v.). Before the ceremony of reception a short preparatory stage must be passed through by the candidate (called at this stage a “postulant”), the duration of which usually ranges from two to six months. The ceremony of the reception, called also “clothing,” is performed by a bishop, or a priest delegated by a bishop, and consists in blessing the religious dress or habit and investing the postulant therein with appropriate prayers, the hair being at the same time cut off and the secular dress laid aside, in token of the renunciation of the world and its pomps and pleasures. The reception,

however, is understood to be only a provisional step, and the novice remains free to return to secular life at any time during the novitiate.

Receptorium

was the name of an ecclesiastical outer building, a kind of speaking-room, a parlor contiguous to the ancient churches; it is sometimes called *salutatorium* (q.v.). Mention of it occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris (1. v, epist. 17), Sulpitius Severus (*Dial.* ii, 1), the first Council of Macon (can. ii), Theodoretus, and many other authors. Theodoretus relates that Theodosius, when he came to request absolution from St. Ambrose, found the saint sitting *in salutatorio*. Scaliger is wrong in supposing this to be a room in the bishop's mansion; it adjoined the church, and was a part of the church building. In the receptorium the sacred utensils, the ornaments, and robes of the (medieval) clergy were deposited for safe-keeping. Here the clergy were accustomed to retire for private devotions, preparatory to their engaging in public exercises. It was also a general audience-room, where friends and acquaintances met to exchange their affectionate salutations and inquiries, and where the bishop or the priests received the people who came to ask their blessing or recommend themselves to their prayers, or to take their advice in matters of importance. Sulpitius Severus (*Dial.* ii, 1) shows us St. Martin sitting in a kind of sacristy, and his priests in another, receiving visitors and transacting business.

Receveur, Francois Joseph Xavier

a French priest and historian, was born at Longeville (Doubs) April 30, 1800. Hardly had he received his orders when he was called to Paris (Oct., 1824) to fill a subordinate position in the cabinet of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs and of public instruction. From June, 1828, to June, 1829, he was head of the bureau of secretary-ship to the same minister. Afterwards appointed a teacher in the theological faculty of Paris (May 1, 1831), he became titular professor of moral philosophy March 1, 1841, and dean of the faculty Dec. 6, 1850. He had not long been relieved from these last duties when he died in his native country, May 7, 1854. The various positions which he filled permitted him to devote his labors to several important works. We have: *Recherches Philosophiques sur le Fondement de la Certitude* (Paris, 1821, 12mo): — *Accord de la Foi avec la Raison, ou Exposition des Principes sur lesquels repose la Foi Catholique* (ibid. 1830-33, 12mo): — *Essai sur la Nature de l'Ane, sur l'Origine des Idees*

et le Fondement de la Certitude (ibid. 1834, 8vo): — *Tractatus Theologicus de Justitia et Contractibus* (ibid. 1835, 12mo): — *Introduction i la Theologie* (Besançon, 1839, 8vo): — *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis son Etablissement jusqu'au Pontificat de Gregegoire XVI* (Paris, 1840-47, 8 vols. 8vo). As an editor, abbe Receveur has given a new edition of the *Theologie Dogmatique et Morale* of Bailly (1830), and another of the *Theologie Morale* of Liguori, to which he has added some notes (1833). Collector for the *Nouvelle Biographie Generale*, he died a short time after having contributed the articles *Saint-Cyprien* and *Saint-Cyrille*. — *Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Re'chab

(Heb. *Recchab'*, **בְּכָרְעָא** *rider*; Sept. **Ῥηχάβ**), the name of three men.

1. The first named of the two “sons of Rimmon the Beerothite,” “captains of bands,” who murdered Ishbosheth in his bed in order to gain favor with David, but were put to death by him, with expressions of abhorrence for their crime (^{<1015>}2 Samuel 4:5-12). B.C. 1046. Josephus calls him *Thannus* (**Θάννος**, *Ant.* 7:2, 1). The other's name was Baanah (q.v.).
2. The “father” of Jehonadab (or Jonadab, ^{<2816>}Jeremiah 35:6), who was Jehu's companion in destroying the worshippers of Baal (^{<12015>}2 Kings 10:15, 23). **SEE JEHONADAB**. B.C. ante 882. He was the ancestor of the Rechabites (q.v.).
3. The father of Malchiah, which latter was ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, and is named as repairing the dung-gate in the fortifications of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (^{<4614>}Nehemiah 3:14). B.C. ante 446.

Rech'abite

[properly *Re'chabite*] (Heb. always in the plur. and with the art., *ha-Rekabin'*, **רֵכָבִי**; a patrial from *Rechab*; Sept. **Ῥηχάβειν**, **Ῥαχάβειν**, etc.), a tribe who appear only in one memorable scene of Scripture (^{<2816>}Jeremiah 35:2-18). Their history before and after it lies in some obscurity. We are left to search out and combine some scattered notices, and to get from them what light we can.

I. In ^{<4125>}1 Chronicles 2:55 the house of Rechab is identified with a section of the Kenites who came into Canaan with the Israelites and retained their nomadic habits, and the name of Hemath is mentioned as the patriarch of

the whole tribe. *SEE HEMIATH; SEE KENITE*. It has been inferred from this passage that the descendants of Rechab belonged to a branch of the Kenites settled from the first at Jabez, in Judah. *SEE JEHONADAB*. The fact, however, that Jehonadab took an active part in the revolution which placed Jehu on the throne seems to indicate that he and his tribe belonged to Israel rather than to Judah, and the late date of I Chronicles, taken together with other facts (*infra*), makes it more probable that this passage refers to the locality occupied by the Rechabites after their return from the captivity. In confirmation of this view, it may be noticed that the “shearing-house” of ^{<1204>}2 Kings 10:14 was probably the known rendezvous of the nomad tribe of the Kenites with their flocks of sheep. *SEE SHEARING-HOUSE*.

Of Rechab himself nothing is known. He may have been the father, he may have been the remote ancestor, of Jehonadab. The meaning of the word makes it probable enough that it was an epithet passing into a proper name. It may have pointed, as in the robber-chief of ^{<1012>}2 Samuel 4:2, to a conspicuous form of the wild Bedouin life; and Jehonadab, the son of the *Rider*, may have been, in part at least, for that reason. the companion and friend of the fierce captain of Israel who drives as with the fury of madness (^{<1110>}2 Kings 9:20). Another conjecture as to the meaning of the name is ingenious enough to merit a disinterment from the forgotten learning of the 16th century. Boulduc (*De Ecclesiastes ante Leg.* 3:10) infers from ^{<1112>}2 Kings 2:12; 13:14, that the two great prophets Elijah and Elisha were known, each of them in his time, as the chariot (*bkr*, *Re'keb*) of Israel, i.e. its strength and protection. He infers from this that the special disciples of the prophets, who followed them in all their austerity, were known as the “sons of the chariot,” *Beze-Rekeb*; and that afterwards, when the original meaning had been lost sight of, this was taken as a patronymic, and referred to an unknown Rechab. At present, of course, the different vowel-points of the two words are sufficiently distinctive; but the strange reading of the Sept. in ^{<1019>}Judges 1:19 (ὅτι ῥηγάβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς, where the A.V. has “because they had *chariots of iron*”) shows that one word might easily enough be taken for the other. Apart from the evidence of the name and the obvious probability of the fact, we have the statement (*quantum valeat*) of John of Jerusalem that Jehonadab was a disciple of Elisha (*De Instit. Monach.* c. 25).

II. The personal history of Jehonadab has been dealt with under that name. Here we have to notice the new character which he impressed on the tribe of which he was the head. As his name, his descent, and the part which he played indicate, he and his people had all along been worshippers of Jehovah, circumcised, and so within the covenant of Abraham, though not reckoned as belonging to Israel, and probably therefore not considering themselves bound by the Mosaic law and ritual. The worship of Baal introduced by Jezebel and Ahab was accordingly not less offensive to them than to the Israelites. The luxury and license of Phoenician cities threatened the destruction of the simplicity of their nomadic life (^{310B}Amos 2:7, 8; 6:3-6). A protest was needed against both evils, and, as in the case of Elijah, and of the Nazarites of ^{312B}Amos 2:11, it took the form of asceticism. There was to be a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life. What had been a traditional habit was enforced by a solemn command from the sheikh and prophet of the tribe, the destroyer of idolatry, which no one dared to transgress. They were to drink no wine, nor build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any. All their days they were to dwell in tents, as remembering that they were strangers in the land (^{381B}Jeremiah 35:6, 7). This was to be the condition of their retaining a distinct tribal existence. For two centuries and a half they adhered faithfully to this rule; but we have no record of any part taken by them in the history of the period. We may think of them as presenting the same picture mwhich other tribes, uniting the nomad life with religious austerity, have presented in later periods.

The Nabathbeans, of whom Diodorus Siculus speaks (19, 94) as neither sowing seed, nor planting fruit-tree, nor using nor building house, and enforcing these transmitted customs under pain of death, give us one striking instance. The fact that the Nabathueans habitually drank "wild honey" (μέλι ἄγριον) mixed with water (Diod. Sic. 19:94), and that the Bedouin as habitually still make locusts an article of food (Burckhardt, *Bedouins*, p. 270), shows very strongly that the Baptist's life was fashioned after the Rechabitish as well as the Nazaritish type. Another is found in the prohibition of wine by Mohammed (Sale, *Koran, Prelim. Diss.* § 5). A yet more interesting parallel is found in the rapid growth of the sect of the Wahabis during the last and present century. Abd-ul-Wahab, from whom the sect takes its name, reproduces the old type of character in all its completeness. Anxious to protect his countrymen from the revolting vices of the Turks, as Jelonnadab had been to protect the Kenites from the like

vices of the Phoenicians, the Bedouin reformer felt the necessity of returning to the old austerity of Arab life. What wine had been to the earlier preacher of righteousness, the outward sign and incentive of a fatal corruption, opium and tobacco were to the later prophet, and, as such, were rigidly proscribed. The rapidity with which the Wahabis became a formidable party, the Puritans of Islam, presents a striking analogy to the strong political influence of Jehonadab in ^{<2015>}2 Kings 10:15, 23 (comp. Burckhardt, *Bedouins and Wahabis*, p. 283, etc.).

III. The invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 607 drove the Rechabites from their tents. Possibly some of the previous periods of danger may have led to their settling within the limits of the territory of Judah. Some inferences may be safely drawn from the facts of ^{<2430>}Jeremiah 35. The names of the Rechabites show that they continued to be worshippers of Jehovah. They are already known to the prophet. One of them (ver. 3) bears the same name. Their rigid Nazaritish life gained for them admission into the house of the Lord, into one of the chambers assigned to priests and Levites, within its precincts. They were received by the sons or followers of a "man of God," a prophet or devotee, of special sanctity (ver. 4). Here they are tempted, and are proof against the temptation, and their steadfastness is turned into a reproof for the unfaithfulness of Judah and Jerusalem. *SEE JEREMIAH*. The history of this trial ends with a special blessing, the full import of which has, for the most part, not been adequately apprehended: "Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever" (ver. 19). Whether we look on this as the utterance of a true prophet, or as a *vaticinium e e ventu*, we should hardly expect at this precise point to lose sight altogether of those of whom it was spoken, even if the words pointed only to the perpetuation of the name and tribe. They have, however, a higher meaning. The words "to stand before me" (^{<5191>}יָנִיחַ אֵלַי) are essentially liturgical. The tribe of Levi is chosen to "stand before" the Lord (^{<5108>}Deuteronomy 10:8; 18:5, 7). In ^{<0182>}Genesis 18:22; ^{<0718>}Judges 20:28; ^{<3901>}Psalms 134:1; ^{<2159>}Jeremiah 15:19, the liturgical meaning is equally prominent and unmistakable (comp. Gesenius. *Thesaur.* s.v.; Grotius, *ad loc.*). The fact that this meaning is given ("ministering before me") in the Targum of Jonathan is evidence (1) as to the received meaning of the phrase; (2) that this rendering did not shock the feelings of studious and devout rabbins in our Lord's time; (3) that it was at least probable that there existed representatives of the Rechabites connected with the Temple services in the

time of Jonathan. This, then, may possibly have been the extent of the new blessing. The Rechabites were solemnly adopted into the families of Israel, and were recognised as incorporated into the tribe of Levi. Their purity, their faithfulness, their consecrated life, gained for them, as it gained for other Nazarites, that honor. *SEE PRIEST, HEBREW*. In ^{<2307>}Lamentations 4:7 we may perhaps trace a reference to the Rechabites, who had been the most conspicuous examples of the Nazaritish life in the prophet's time, and most the object of his admiration.

It may be worth while to refer to a few authorities agreeing in the general interpretation here given, though differing as to details. Vatablus (*Crit. Sac. ad loc.*) mentions a Jewish tradition (R. Judah, as cited by Kimchi; comp. Scaliger, *Elench. Trihaeres. Serrar.* p. 26) that the daughters of the Rechabites married Levites, and that thus their children came to minister in the Temple. Clarius (*ibid.*) conjectures that the Rechabites themselves were chosen to sit in the great council. Sanctius and Calmet suppose them to have ministered in the same way as the Nethinim (Calmet, *Diss. sur les Rechab.* 1726). Serrarius (*Trihaeres.*) identifies them with the Essenes; Scaliger (*loc. cit.*) with the Chasidim, in whose name the priests offered special daily sacrifices, and who, in this way, were "standing before the Lord" continually.

IV. It remains for us to see whether there are any traces of their after-history in the Biblical or later writers. It is believed that there are such traces, and that they confirm the statements made in the previous paragraph.

1. We have the singular heading of ^{<1970>}Psalm 71 in the Sept. version (τῷ Δαβὶδ, υἱῶν Ἰωναδάβ, καὶ τῶν πρώτων ἀιχμαλωτισθέντων), which, however, is evidence merely of a tradition in the 3d century B.C. indicating that the "sons of Jonadab" shared the captivity of Israel, and took their place among the Levitical psalmists who gave expression to the sorrows of the people. The psalm itself belongs to David's time. *SEE PSALMS*.

2. There is the significant mention of a son of Rechab in ^{<1684>}Nehemiah 3:14 as co-operating with the priests, Levites, and princes in the restoration of the wall of Jerusalem.

3. The mention of the house of Rechab in ^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 2:55, though not without difficulty, points, there can be little doubt, to the same conclusion. The Rechabites have become scribes (μυροῖς, *sopherim*). They give

themselves to a calling which, at the time of the return from Babylon, was chiefly, if not exclusively, in the hands of Levites. The other names (Tirathites, Shimeathites, and Suchathites in the A.V.) seem to add nothing to our knowledge. The Vulg. rendering, however (evidence of a traditional Jewish interpretation in the time of Jerome), gives a translation based on etymologies, more or less accurate, of the proper names, which strikingly confirms the view now taken: “Cognitiones quoque Scribarum habitantium in Jabes, canentes atque resonantes, et in tabernaculis commorantes.” Thus interpreted, the passage points to a resumption of the outward form of their old life and its union with their new functions. The etymologies on which this version rests are, it must be confessed, very doubtful. Scaliger (*Elench. Tihcer. Serrar.* c. 23) rejects them with scorn. Pellican and Calmet, on the other hand, defend the Vulg. rendering, and Gill (*ad loc.*) does not dispute it. Most modern interpreters follow the A.V. in taking the words as proper names. It deserves notice also that while in ^{<1105>}1 Chronicles 2:54, 55 the Rechabites and Netophathites are mentioned in close connection, the “sons of the singers” in ^{<628>}Nehemiah 12:28 appear as coming in large numbers from the villages of the same Netophathites. The close juxtaposition of the Rechabites with the descendants of David in ^{<1101>}1 Chronicles 3:1 shows also in how honorable an esteem they were held at the time when that book was compiled.

4. The account of the martyrdom of James the Just given by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H.E.* ii; 23) brings the name of the Rechabites once more before us, and in a very strange connection. While the scribes and Pharisees were stoning him, “one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rechabim, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet,” cried out, protesting against the crime. Stanley (*Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 333), struck with the seeming anomaly of a priest, “not only not of Levitical, but not even of Jewish descent,” supposes the name to have been used loosely as indicating the abstemious life of James and other Nazarites, and points to the fact that Epiphanius (*Haer.* 78:14) ascribes to Simeon, the brother of James, the words which Hegesippus puts into the mouth of the Rechabite, as a proof that it denoted merely the Nazaritish form of life. Calmet (*loc. cit.*) supposes the man to have been one of the Rechabite Nethinim, whom the informant of Hegesippus took, in his ignorance, for a priest. The view which has been here taken presents, it is believed, a more satisfactory solution. It was hardly possible that a writer like Hegesippus, living at a time when the details of the Temple services were fresh in the

memories of men, should have thus spoken of the Rechabim unless there had been a body of men to whom the name was commonly applied. He uses it as a man would do to whom it was familiar, without being struck by any apparent or real anomaly. The Targum of Jonathan on ²⁴⁵⁹Jeremiah 35:19 indicates, as has been noticed, the same fact. We may accept Hegesippus therefore as an additional witness to the existence of the Rechabites as a recognised body up to the destruction of Jerusalem, sharing in the ritual of the Temple, partly descended from the old “sons of Jonadab,” partly recruited by the incorporation into their ranks of men devoting themselves, as did James and Simeon, to the same consecrated life. The form of austere holiness presented in the life of Jonadab, and the blessing pronounced on his descendants, found their highest representatives in the two brothers of the Lord.

5. Some later notices are not without interest. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century (ed. Asher, 1840, i, 112-114), mentions that near El Jubar (=Pumbeditha) he found Jews who were named Rechabites. They tilled the ground, kept flocks and herds, abstained from wine and flesh, and gave tithes to teachers who devoted themselves to studying the law and weeping for Jerusalem. They were 100,000 in number, and were governed by a prince, Salomon han-Nasi, who traced his genealogy up to the house of David, and ruled over the city of Thema and Telmas. A later traveller, Dr. Wolff, gives a yet stranger and more detailed report. The Jews of Jerusalem and Yemen told him that he would find the Rechabites of Jeremiah 35 living near Mecca (*Journal*, 1829, ii, 334). When he came near Senaa he came in contact with a tribe, the Beni-Khaibr, who identified themselves with the sons of Jonadab. With one of them, Musa, Wolff conversed, and he reports the dialogue as follows: “I asked him, ‘Whose descendants are you?’ Musa answered, ‘Come, and I will show you,’ and read from an Arabic Bible the words of ²⁴⁵⁵Jeremiah 35:5-11. He then went on. ‘Come, and you will find us 60,000 in number. You see the words of the prophet have been fulfilled: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me forever’“ (*ibid.* p. 335). In a later journal (*ibid.* 1839, p. 389) he mentions a second interview with Musa, describes them as keeping strictly to the old rule, calls them now by the name of the Beni-Arhad, and says that Beni-Israel of the tribe of Dan live with them. A paper *On Recent Notices of the Rechabites*, by Signor Pierotti, was read at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association (October, 1862). He met with a tribe calling themselves by that name near the Dead Sea, about two

miles south-east from it. They had a Hebrew Bible, and said their prayers at the tomb of a Jewish rabbi. They told him precisely the same stories as had been told to Wolff thirty years before. The details, however, whether correct or not, apply to Talmudical Jews more than to Rechabites. They are described as living in caverns and low houses, not in tents—and this in Arabia, where Bedouin habits would cease to be singular; nor are any of the Rechabite rules observable in them except that of refraining from wine — an abstinence which ceases to be remarkable in Arabia, where no one drinks wine, and where, among the strongholds of Islam, it could probably not be obtained without danger and difficulty. There were large numbers of Talmudical Jews in Arabia in the time of Mohammed, and these supposed Rechabites are probably descended from a body of them. See Witsius. *Dissert. de Rechabitis, in Miscell. Sacra*, ii, 176 sq.; Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 148; Calmet, *Dissert. sur les Rechabites, in Commentaire Litterai*, 6:18-21. For the modern temperance organization by this name, **SEE TEMPERANCE.**

Rechac, Jean Giffre De

(whose religious name was *Jean de Sainte-Marie*), a French Dominican, was born at Quillebeuf Aug. 25, 1604. he took the habit of a monk, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Paris, then at Bordeaux. He travelled in the Orient as an apostolic missionary, and visited the isle of Scio and Constantinople. Returning to Paris about the end of 1631, he became in 1637 prior of the convent of the Dominicans at Rouen, and devoted himself with success to preaching. Being sent to Bordeaux in 1640, he collected numerous materials for writing the history of his order; and when, in 1656, the monks of St. Dominic founded several houses in France, he was charged with the erection of divers novitiates. He died April 9, 1660. We have of his works, *Les Vrais Exercices Solides et Pratiques de la Vie Spirituelle et Religieuse* (loulen, 163840, 4 vols. 12mo): — *Vie de Scaint-Hyacinthe* (Paris, 1643. 12mo): — *Les Viies e Trois Bienhaoureux de Bretagne. Ives Malcreuc, Evque de Rennes, Alain de It Roche, Pierre Quinztin* (ibid. 1645, 12mo): — *Vie de Renaud de Saint-Gilles, Doyen de Saint-Agnau d'Orleans* (who died in 1220) (ibid. 1646, 12mo): — *Vie de Saint-Dominique, avec la Foundation de tous les Convents des Freres Precheurs de l'un et de l'autre Sexe en France Ce et dans les Pays-Bas* (ibid. 1647. 4to): — *Les Vies et Actions Minmorables des Sainties et Bienheureuses de l'Ordre des Frires Precheurs* (1635, 2 vols. 4to): — and a great number of other works printed or in MS., among them *Prophties*

de Nostradamus s expliquees (Paris, 1656,12mo), published without the name of the author. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Re'chah

(Heb. *Reklah'*, *hkrēh* *hindermost*; Sept. *ῚΡηῶβ* v. r. *ῚΡηῶ*). In ^{<13412>}1 Chronicles 4:12, Beth-rapha, Paseah, and Tehinnah the father, or founder, of Ir-nahash, are said to have been “the men of Rechah.” In the Targum of R. Joseph they are called “the men of the Great Sanhedrin,” the Targumist apparently reading *hBri* Schwarz regards it as the name of a place inhabited by the posterity of Judah, and identifies it with “a village *Rashsih*, three English miles to the south of Hebron” (*Palest.* p 116).

Reche, Johann Wilhelm

the main representative of the Kantian rationalism in the Lutheran Church of the Rhine countries, was born Nov. 3, 1764, at Lennep. In 1786 he became pastor of the newly organized Lutheran church at Huckleswagen, and in 1796 pastor at Mulheim-on-the-Rhine, where, during the Revolution, he published a translation of Marcus Aurelius's philosophical treatise *Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν* (1797), in order to show how a man should become a stoic. After the taking of the Rhine countries by Prussia, he became a member of the consistory of Cologne, which in 1826 was dissolved. In 1830 he retired from the ministry to his country-seat at Wesseling, between Cologne and Bonn, being dissatisfied with the new religious movement of his time, and died as an angry philosopher Jan. 9, 1835. He published some hymns, which, though of little value, are, however, found in some of the modernized German hymn-books. He also published a collection of sermons in two volumes, which are enumerated in Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 2, 1035 (comp. also Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 6, 259). (B. P.)

Rechenberg, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm

a Lutheran minister, was born Feb. 10, 1817, at Barnickow, near Königsberg, in Prussia. From 1835 to 1840 he studied in the seminary of the Berlin Missionary Society, and in 1841 he came to this country to work among his countrymen. His first pastorate was at Syracuse, N. Y., where he labored for about fifteen years. In the year 1855 he was called to Albany, at which place he remained three years. He then went to Canada, where he labored for thirteen years in Toronto and for five years at

Montreal. Among his co-religionists he was a prominent member, and was the first president of the Canadian synod. He also edited for a long time the paper of his denomination, and as president of the Missionary Board he cared for his countrymen with word and sacrament. His bodily infirmities obliged him to retire from his large field of labor, and he accepted the call of a small congregation at Port Chester, N.Y., in 1875, where he died Dec. 13, 1877. (B. P.)

Recluse

(Lat. *reclusus*, also *inclusus*, shut up”), a class of monks or nuns who, from a motive of special penance, or with a view to the more strict observance of Christian perfection, remained shut up from all converse, even with members of their own order, in a small cell of a hermitage or other place of strict retirement. This practice, which was a kind of voluntary imprisonment, either from motives of devotion or penance, was not allowed except to persons of tried virtue and by special permission of the abbot; and the recluse, who took an oath never to stir out of his retreat, was with due solemnity locked up in the presence of the abbot or the bishop, who placed his seal upon the door, not to be removed without the authority of the bishop himself. Everything necessary for support was conveyed through a window. If the recluse were a priest, he was allowed a small oratory with a window which looked into the church, through which he might make his offerings at mass, hear the singing, and answer those who spoke to him; but this window had curtains before it, so that he could not be seen. In later mediæval times the recluse was allowed a small garden near his cell for the planting of a few herbs and for recreation in fresh air. If he fell sick, his door was opened by the authorities for the sake of affording assistance. The celebrated mediæval theologian Rabanus Maurus was a recluse when elected archbishop of Mentz. Nuns also were found to practice the same voluntary seclusion, especially in the Benedictine, Franciscan, and Cistercian orders. A rule specially designed for female recluses was composed by Ælred of Reresby, and is preserved by Holstenius in his *Codex Regularum Monasticarum*, i, 418 sq. In a wider sense, the name *recluse* is popularly applied to all cloistered persons, whether men or women — even those who live in community with their brethren. The inmates of the celebrated French retreat for Jansenists — Port-Royal — were also called recluses. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon* (art. “Inclusi”); *Cults, Scenes, and Characters of the Middle Ages* (Lond. 1873).

Recognitions

SEE CLEMENTINES.

Recollet

Picture for Recollet

(Lat. *recollectus*, “gathered together”) is the name given to the members of certain reformed bodies of monastic orders, whether of men or women, in the Roman Catholic Church. Among orders of men, an offshoot of the Augustinian hermits, which, under Louis de Montaya, in 1530, obtained considerable popularity in Spain, was called by this name, and the order still exists at Medina Sidonia, Leon, and Pamplona; but outside of Spain, this order is better known under the title of the *Reformed Franciscans*, who originated about 1592, and were established in France under Henry IV and Louis XIV, and spread thence into Belgium, their houses in these countries and Germany becoming so numerous that they reckoned no less than ten provinces. In the French army of Louis XIV the Reformed Franciscans used to administer the sacrament. A reform of the Cistercian order of nuns in Spain was also called by the same name (*Chambers*). See *Histoire du Clergi Seculier et Regulier*, ii, 367 sq.; Wetzter u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 9:71.

Reconciliatio Poenitentium

is the act by which offenders of the Church are restored to ecclesiastical rights and privileges. *SEE PENITENTS.*

Reconciliation

(usually some form of ρῥκ; to cover sin, καταλλαγῆ) is making those friends again who were at variance, or restoring to favor those having fallen under displeasure. Thus the Scriptures describe the disobedient world as having been at enmity with God, but “reconciled” to him by the death of his Son. The expressions “reconciliation” and “making peace” necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this, the oppugners of the doctrine of the atonement have availed themselves to argue that as there can be no such affection in the divine nature, therefore reconciliation in

Scripture does not mean the reconciliation of God to man, but of man to God, whose enmity the example and teaching of Christ, they tell us, are very effectual to subdue. It is, indeed, a sad and humbling truth, and one which the Socinians, in their discussions on the natural innocence of man, are not willing to admit, that by the infection of sin “the carnal mind is enmity to God;” that human nature is malignantly hostile to God and to the control of his law. But this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man in which, in Scripture, he is said to be at enmity with God, and so to need a reconciliation — the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of a sovereign, in his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws and risen up against his authority, and who is therefore treated as an enemy. The word **ἐχθρός** is used in this passive sense, both in the Greek writers and in the New Test. So, in ~~6128~~Romans 11:28, the Jews, rejected and punished for refusing the Gospel, are said by the apostle, “as concerning the Gospel,” to be “enemies for your sakes” — treated and accounted such; “but, as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes.” In the same epistle (v, 10) the term is used precisely in the same sense, and that with reference to the reconciliation by Christ: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” i.e. when we were objects of the divine judicial displeasure, accounted as enemies, and liable to be capitally treated as such. Enmity, in the sense of malignity and the sentiment of hatred, is added to this relation in the case of man; but it is no part of the relation itself, it is rather a case of it, as it is one of the actings of a corrupt nature which render man obnoxious to the displeasure of God and the penalty of his law, and place him in the condition of an enemy. It is this judicial variance and opposition between God and man which is referred to in the term reconciliation, and in the phrase “making peace,” in the New Test.; and the hostility is therefore, in its own nature, mutual.

But that there is no truth in the notion that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God may also be shown from several express passages. The first is the passage we have above cited: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God” (~~6150~~Romans 5:10). Here the act of reconciling is ascribed to God, and not to us; but if this reconciliation consisted in the laying-aside of our own enmity, the act would be ours alone. And, further, that it could not be the laying-aside of our enmity is clear from the text, which speaks of reconciliation while we were yet enemies. The reconciliation spoken of here is not, as Socinus and

his followers have said, our conversion. For that the apostle is speaking of a benefit obtained for us previous to our conversion appears evident from the opposite members of the two sentences — “much more, being justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him;” “much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” The apostle argues from the greater to the less. If God were so benign to us before our conversion, what may we not expect from him now we are converted? To reconcile here cannot mean to convert, for the apostle evidently speaks of something greatly remarkable in the act of Christ. But to convert sinners is nothing remarkable, since none but sinners can be ever converted; whereas it was a rare and singular thing for Christ to die for sinners, and to reconcile sinners to God by his death, when there have been but very few good men who have died for their friends. In the next place, conversion is referred more properly to his glorious life than to his shameful death; but this reconciliation is attributed to his death as contradistinguished from his glorious life, as is evident from the antithesis contained in the two verses. Besides, it is from the latter benefit that we learn the nature of the former. The latter, which belongs only to the converted, consists of the peace of God and salvation from wrath (~~418B~~ Romans 5:9, 10). This the apostle afterwards calls receiving the reconciliation. And what is it to receive the reconciliation but to receive the remission of sins? (~~410B~~ Acts 10:43). To receive conversion is a mode of speaking entirely unknown. If, then, to receive the reconciliation is to receive the remission of sins, and in effect to be delivered from wrath or punishment, to be reconciled must have a corresponding signification.

“God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them” (~~415B~~ 2 Corinthians 5:19). Here the manner of this reconciliation is expressly said to be not our laying aside our enmity, but the non-imputation of our trespasses to us by God; in other words, the pardoning of our offences and restoring us to favor. The promise on God’s part to do this is expressive of his previous reconciliation to the world by the death of Christ; for our actual reconciliation is distinguished from this by what follows, “and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation,” by virtue of which all men were, by the apostles, entreated and besought to be reconciled to God. The reason, too, of this reconciliation of God to the world, by virtue of which he promises not to impute sin, is grounded by the apostle, in the last verse of the chapter, not upon the laying-aside of enmity by men, but upon the sacrifice of Christ: “For he hath made him to be sin” (a sin-offering) “for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the

righteousness of God in him.” “And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby” (Ephesians 2:16). Here the act of reconciling is attributed to Christ. Man is not spoken of as reconciling himself to God; but Christ is said to reconcile Jews and Gentiles together, and both to God, “by his cross.” Thus, says the apostle, “he is our peace;” but in what manner is the peace effected? Not, in the first instance, by subduing the enmity of man’s heart, but by removing the enmity of the law.” “Having abolished in,” or by, “his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments.” The ceremonial law only is here probably meant; for by its abolition, through its fulfilment in Christ, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles was taken away. But still it was not only necessary to reconcile Jew and Gentile together, but to “reconcile both unto God.” This he did by the same act; abolishing the ceremonial law by becoming the antitype of all its sacrifices, and thus, by the sacrifice of himself, effecting the reconciliation of all to God, “slaying the enmity by his cross,” taking away whatever hindered the reconciliation of the guilty to God, which, as we have seen, was not enmity and hatred to God in the human mind only, but that judicial hostility and variance which separated God and man as Judge and criminal. The feeble criticism of Socinus on this passage, in which he has been followed by his adherents to this day, is thus answered by Grotius: “In this passage the dative $\theta\epsilon\omega$, *to God*, can only be governed by the verb $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\eta$, *that he might reconcile*; for the interpretation of Socinus, which makes *to God* stand by itself, or that to reconcile to God is to reconcile them among themselves that they might serve God, is distorted and without example. Nor is the argument valid which is drawn from thence, that in this place Paul properly treats of the peace made between Jews and Gentiles; for neither does it follow from this argument that it was beside his purpose to mention the peace made for each with God. For the two opposites which are joined are so joined among themselves that they should be primarily and chiefly joined by that bond; for they are not united among themselves, except by and for that bond. Gentiles and Jews, therefore, are made friends among themselves by friendship with God.”

Here, also, a critical remark will be appropriate. The above passages will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is nowhere in Scripture said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to God; but the fact is, that the very phrase of *our being reconciled to God* imports the turning-away of his wrath from us. Whitby observes, on the

words *καταλλάττειν* and *καταλλαγή*, “that they naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry or displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers.” When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul by becoming their adversary, they said, “Wherewith should he *reconcile* himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?” Not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master? but how shall he remove his master’s anger against him? — how shall he restore himself to his master’s favor? “If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee,” not that thou hast aught against thy brother, “first be reconciled to thy brother,” i.e. appease and conciliate him; so that the words, in fact, import “See that thy brother be reconciled to thee,” since that which goes before is, not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him. Thus, then, for us to be reconciled to God is to avail ourselves of the means by which the anger of God towards it is to be appeased, which the New Test. expressly declares to be meritoriously “the sin-offering” of him “who knew no sin,” and instrumentally, as to each individual personally, “faith in his blood.” *SEE PROPITIATION.*

“We know,” says Farrar, “that God cannot literally feel anger, or any other passion; nor can he be literally grieved and pained at anything man can do, since (as the 1st article of our [Anglican] Church expresses it) he is without body, parts, or passions; though in Scripture hands and eyes and other bodily members are figuratively attributed to him, as well as anger, repentance, and other passions. But all these are easily understood as spoken in reference to their *effects on us*, which are the same as if the things themselves were literally what they are called. It is well known to astronomers that the sun keeps its place, and yet they, as well as the vulgar, speak familiarly of the sun’s rising and setting without any mistake or perplexity thence arising, because the effects on this earth — the succession of light and darkness — are exactly the same as if the sun did literally move round it daily. In like manner, when the Scriptures speak of God’s wrath, fierce anger, etc., against sinners, it is meant not that *he* literally feels angry passions, but that th *effect* on men will be the same as if he did. And, similarly, when ‘reconciliation’ with God is spoken of, it is to be understood as meaning that the effects of the death of Christ are such as to cause men to be regarded by God with that favor with which he would regard them if literally returned from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation.”

See Nitzsch, *Practische Theologie*; Fletcher, *Works* (see Index); *Presbyterian Confessions*; Pearson, on *the Creed*; Goodwil. *Works*; Knapp, *Christian Theology*; Reynolds [John], *On Reconciliation*; Ritschl, *Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinb. 1872); Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology* (Lond. 1875, 12mo), p. 196-200.

Recordare, Sanctae Crucis

is the beginning of a passion-hymn composed by the “Seraphic Doctor,” St. Bonaventura (q.v.). This is his best poem, and consists of fifteen stanzas, the last bearing a strong resemblance to the next to the last of the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*. There are two English translations of this hymn by Dr. H. Harbaugh in the *Mecersburg Review*, 1858, p. 481 (“Make the Cross your Meditation”); another by Dr. J. X. V. Alexander, of which the first stanza runs thus:

*“Jesus’ holy cross and dying,
Oh, remember! ever eying
Endless pleasure’s pathway here;
At the cross thy mindful station
Keep, and still in meditation
All unsated persevere.”*

It has also been translated into German by Simrock, in his *Lauctda Zion Salvatorem*, p. 269; by Rambach, in his *Anthology*, i, 315, “An des Herrn ircuz zu denken,” which is now generally found in German hymn-books; by Stadelmann, in Blissler’s *Auswahl altchristlicher hymmen*, p. 118, “Woll des heiligen Kilenzes deuken;” by Konigsfeld, in his collection of *Latin Hymns.*, i, 151, “An des Herrn Kreuzesleiden.” The English of Alexander is given in Schaff’s *Christ in Song*, p. 165. (B. P.)

Recorder

(**ryKz**ⲛⲓ *mazkir*, a remembrancer; Sept. ἀναμνησκων, ὑπομνηματογράφος), an officer of high rank in the Jewish state, exercising the functions, not simply of an annalist, but of chancellor or president of the privy council (^{231B}Isaiah 36:3. 22). The title itself may, perhaps, have reference to his office as adviser of the king; at all events, the notices prove that he was more than an annalist, though the superintendence of the records was without doubt intrusted to him. In David’s court the recorder appears among the high officers of his

household (^{<1086>}2 Samuel 8:16; 20:24; ^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 18:15). In Solomon's he is coupled with the three secretaries, and is mentioned last, probably as being their president (^{<1045>}1 Kings 4:3). Under Hezekiah, the recorder, in conjunction with the praefect of the palace and the secretary, represented the king (^{<1288>}2 Kings 18:18, 37). The patronymic of the recorder at this time, Joah the son of Asaph, makes it probable that he was a Levite. Under Josiah, the recorder, the secretary, and the governor of the city were intrusted with the superintendence of the repairs of the Temple (^{<1448>}2 Chronicles 34:8). These notices are sufficient to prove the high position held by him. The same office is mentioned as existing in the Persian court, both ancient and modern, where it is called *wauka nuwish*; and also in the time of the Roman emperors Arcadius and Honorius, under the name of *magiste memorice*. In ^{<1545>}Ezra 4:15, mention is made of "the book of the records," and in ^{<1766>}Esther 6:1; 10:2, of "the book of records of the chronicles," written by officers of this nature. Many of the royal annals of Egypt and Assyria were sculptured on the obelisks, slabs, and monuments, and are still in fine preservation; and already they have contributed to the illustration of the inspired records. *SEE SCRIBE*.

Records

a frequent name for the books and papers of a Church, which contain a record or account of the history and temporal business of the parish. In these books are written, from time to time, all such transactions as relate to the election of officers, — the purchase or sale, etc., of Church property, the erection of buildings, the engaging of ministers, the support of public worship, and other matters connected with the temporal affairs of the Church. Under the name of "parish records," or "Church records," may also be included the *register*, containing the minister's account of baptisms, marriages, etc. *SEE REGISTER*.

Rectitude

(or UPRIGHTNESS) is the choice and pursuit of those things which the mind, after due inquiry and attention, clearly perceives to be fit and good, and the eschewing of those that are evil. "Rectitude of conduct," says Whately, "is intended to express the term *κατόρθωσις*, which Cicero translates *recta effectio*; *κατόρθωμα* he translates *rectumfactum*. Now the definition of *κατόρθωμα* was *νόμου πρόσταγμα*, 'a thing commanded by law' (i.e. by the law of nature, the universal law). Antoninus, speaking of the *reasoning*

faculty, how, without looking further, it rests contented in its own energies, adds, ‘for which reason are all actions of this species called *rectitudes* (κατορθώσεις, κατὰ ὀρθός, right onwards), as denoting the directness of their progression right onwards’“ (Harris, *Dialogue on Happiness*, p. 73, ilote). “Goodness in actions,” says Hooker (*Ecclesiastes Pol.* bi. i, § 8), “is like unto *straightness*; wherefore that which is done well we term *right*, for, as the *straight way* is most acceptable to him that travelleth, because by it he cometh soonest to his journey’s end, so, in action, that which doth lye the evenest between us and the end we desire must needs be the fittest for our use.” If a term is to be selected to denote that in action and in disposition of which the moral faculty approves, perhaps the most precise and appropriate is *rectitude*, or *rightness*. “There are other phrases,” says Dr. Reid (*Active Powers*, Essay v, ch. vii), “which have been used, which I see no reason for adopting, such as, *acting contrary to the relations of things — contrary to the reason of things — to the fitness of things — to the truth of things — to absolute fitness*. These phrases have not the authority of common use, which, in matters of language, is great. They seem to have been invented by some authors with a view to explain the nature of vice; but I do not think they answer that end. If intended as definitions of vice, they are improper; because in the most favorable sense they can bear, they extend to every kind of foolish and absurd conduct as well as to that which is vicious.” But what is *rectitude*, or *rightness*, as the characteristic of an action? According to Price and others, this term denotes a simple and primitive idea, and cannot be explained. “It might as well be asked what is *truth*, as the characteristic of a proposition? It is a capacity of our rational nature to see and acknowledge truth; but we cannot define what truth is. We call it the conformity of our thoughts with the reality of things.” “It may be doubted how far this explanation makes the nature of truth more intelligible. In like manner some explain *rectitude* by saying that it consists in a congruity between an action and the relations of the agent, It is the idea mwe form of an action, when it is in every way conformable to the relations of the agent and the circumstances in which he is placed. On contemplating such an action mve approve of it, and feel that if we were placed in such circumstances and in such relations, we should be under an obligation to perform it. Now the circumstances and relations in which man is placed arise from his nature and from the nature of things in general; and hence it has been said that *rectitude is founded in the nature and fitness of things*, i.e. an action is right when it is fit or suitable to all the relations and

circumstances of the agent, and of this fitness conscience or reason is the judge. Conscience or reason does not constitute the relations; these must arise from the nature of man and the nature of things. But conscience or reason judges and determines as to the conformity of actions to these relations; and these relations arising necessarily from the very nature of things, the conformity with them, which constitutes *rectitude, is said to be eternal and immutable*" (Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos.* s.v.).

Rector

(Lat. *rector*, a ruler), the title of several classes of clerical and collegiate officials, some of which are referred to under their respective heads.

1. As regards clerical rectors, the title, in its most ordinary English use, is applied to the clergyman who holds complete and independent charge of a parish. This use, however, is a departure from the canonical signification of the title, which meant rather a clergyman who was appointed to govern a parish where the chief parochial jurisdiction was vested in a religious corporation or in some non-resident dignitary. The office of vicar is an outgrowth of the rectorate, on the appropriation of benefices to monasteries and other religious houses of old; and the distinction between rector and vicar, which is therefore to be noticed here, is as follows: The rector has the right to all the ecclesiastical dues in his parish, whereas the vicar has generally an appropriator or impropiator over him, who is entitled to part of the profits, and to whom he is, in effect, only perpetual curate, with an appointment of glebe and generally one third of the tithes.
SEE VICAR.

2. In certain of the monastic orders, the name rector is given to the heads of convents, as it is

3. Also given to the heads of universities, colleges, seminaries, and similar educational corporate institutions.

Rectory

"A rectory or parsonage," says Spelman, "is a spiritual living, composed of land, tithe, and other oblations of the people, separate or dedicate to God in any congregation. For the service of his Church there, and for the maintenance of the governor or minister thereof, to whose charge the same is committed."

Recusan

is, in English law, a person, whether Papist or Protestant, who refuses or neglects to attend at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays and other days appointed for the purpose. The offence may be dated back in its origin to 1534, when king Henry became head of the Church; but, as a legal one, may be held to date from 1 Elizabeth, c. 2. "There were four classes punishable under the statutes against recusancy: simple 'recusants;' 'recusants convict,' who asented themselves after conviction; 'popish recusants,' who absented themselves because of their being Roman Catholics; and 'popish recusants convict.' who absented themselves after conviction. It was against the last two classes that the statutes were mainly directed. In addition to the general penalties of recusancy, the popish recusants, for wilfully hearing mass, forfeited 100 marks (£66 13s. 4d.); and for saying mass, 200 marks, or £133 6s. 8d., in addition (in both cases) to a year's imprisonment. They were disabled, unless they renounced popery, from inheriting, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring lands; and they could not keep or teach schools under pain of perpetual imprisonment. Popish recusants convict could not hold any public office; could not keep arms in their houses; could not appear within ten miles of London under penalty of £100; could not travel above five miles from home without license; could not bring any action at law or equity; could not have baptism, marriage, or burial performed except by an Anglican minister — all under penalties of forfeiture and imprisonment. Protestant dissenting recusants were relieved from the penalties of recusation by the Toleration Act of I William and Mary, c. 18. Catholics were partially relieved in the year 1791, and completely by the Emancipation Act of 1829." *SEE MEMBERSHIP (IN THE CHURCH).*

Red

SEE COLOR; SEE RUDDY.

Red Heifer

SEE PURIFICATION, WATER OF; SEE SIN-OFFERING.