

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Red Sea - Rezon

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

Red Sea

the usual designation of the large body of water separating Egypt from Arabia. The following account of it is based upon the Scriptures and other ancient and modern authorities. *SEE SEA*.

I. Names. — The sea known to us as the Red Sea was by the Israelites called *the sea* (μῦθι ^{<0240>}Exodus 14:2, 9, 16, 21, 28; 15:1, 4, 8, 10, 19; ^{<0246>}Joshua 24:6, 7; and many other passages); and specially “the sea of Siph” (ἄλσΑμυῖ ^{<0209>}Exodus 10:19; 13:18; 15:4, 22; 23:31; ^{<0425>}Numbers 14:25; 21:4; 33:10, 11; ^{<0144>}Deuteronomy 1:40; 11:4; ^{<0120>}Joshua 2:10; 4:23; 24:6; ^{<0716>}Judges 11:16; ^{<1025>}1 Kings 9:26; ^{<0909>}Nehemiah 9:9; ^{<0947>}Psalm 106:7, 9, 22; 136:13, 15; ^{<0421>}Jeremiah 49:21). It is also perhaps written *Suphcah*, ἡπῶς (Sept. Ζωόβ), in ^{<0214>}Numbers 21:14, rendered “Red Sea” in the A.V.; and in like manner, in ^{<0101>}Deuteronomy 1:1, ἄλς, without μυῖ (The Sept. always renders it) ἡ ἔρυθρὰ θάλασσα (except in ^{<0716>}Judges 11:16, where ἄλς, Σίφ, is preserved). So, too, in the New Test. (^{<0736>}Acts 7:36; ^{<0812>}Hebrews 11:29); and this name is found in the Apocrypha (1 Maccabees 4:9; Wisdom of Solomon 10:18; 19:7) and Josephus (*Ant.* 8:6, 4). By the classical geographers this appellation, like its Latin equivalent *Mare Rubrum* or *M. Erythroeum*, was extended to all the seas washing the shores of the Arabian peninsula, and even the Indian Ocean: the Red Sea itself, or Arabian Gulf, was οἰάραβιος κόλπος, or Ἀραβικὸς κ., or *Sinus Arabicus*, and its eastern branch, or the Gulf of ‘Akabah, Αἰλανίτης, Ἐλανίτης, Ἐλανιτικὸς κόλπος, *Sinus Elanites*, or *S. Elaniticus*. The Gulf of Suez was specially the Heroopolitic Gulf, Ἡρωπολίτης κόλπος, *Sinus Heroopolites*, or *S. Heroopoliticus*. Dr. Beke (*Sinai in Arabia* [Lond. 1878], p. 361 sq.) contends (in keeping with his wild notion that the Mizraim of the Bible was not Egypt, but the peninsula of Arabia) that the Gulf of ‘Akabah, and not that of Suez, was the Yam-Suph of the Hebrews, chiefly on the rash assumption that the former only was known to the Israelites, whereas the itinerary of Moses clearly distinguishes Eziongeber on the one from the crossing at the other (^{<0438>}Numbers 33:8, 10, 35, 36). Among the peoples of the East, the Red Sea has for many centuries lost its old names: it is now called generally by the Arabs, as it was in mediaeval times, *Bahr-el-Kulzum*, “the Sea of El-Kulzum,” after the ancient Clysma, “the sea-beach,” the site of which is near, or at, the modern Suez. In the Koran, part of its old name is preserved, the rare Arabic word yalmanm

being used in the account of the passage of the Red Sea (see also El-Beydawi, *Comment. on the Kuran*, 7:132, p. 341; 20:81, p. 602). These Biblical names require a more detailed consideration.

1. *Yam*, ⲡⲩ; (Coptic, *iom*; Arabic, *yamm*), signifies “the sea,” or any sea. It is also applied to the Nile (exactly as the Arabic *bahr* is so applied) in ^{<ARB>}Nehemiah 3:8, “Art thou better than populous No, that was situate among the rivers (*yeoraim*), [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea (*yam*), and her wall was from the sea (*yam*)?” See also ^{<ARB>}Isaiah 19:5.

2. *Yam-Suph*, ⲁ̀ⲩⲩⲱⲤⲡⲩⲓ in the Coptic version, *phiom nshapi*; A.V. “Red Sea.” The meaning of *suph*, and the reason of its being applied to this sea, have given rise to much learned controversy. Gesenius renders it *rush*, *reed*, *sea-weed*. It is mentioned in the Old Test. almost always in connection with the sea of the Exodus. It also occurs in the narrative of the exposure of Moses in the ⲣⲁⲓⲛⲓ (*yet* (*yeah*); for he was laid in *supinh*, on the brink of the *yen;r* (^{<ARB>}Exodus 2:3), where (in the *suph*) he was found by Pharaoh’s daughter (ver. 5); and in the “burden of IEgypt” (Isaiah 19), with the drying-up of the waters of Egypt, “And the waters shall fail from the sea (*yam*), and the river (*nahloir*) shall be wasted and dried up. And they shall turn the rivers (*nahar’*, constr. pl.) far away; [and] the brooks (*yeor*) of defence (or of Egypt?) shall be emptied and dried up: the reeds and flags (*suph*) shall wither. The paper reeds by the brooks (*yeor*), by the mouth of the brooks (*yeor*), and everything sown by the brooks (*yeor*) shall wither, be driven away, and be no [more]. The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks (*yeor*) shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish. Moreover, they that work in fine flax, and they that weave net works (white linen?) shall be confounded. And they shall be broken in the purposes thereof, all that make sluices [and] ponds for fish” (ver. 5-10). *Suph* only occurs in one place besides those already referred to. In ^{<ARB>}Jonah 2:5 it is written, “The waters compassed me about, [even] to the soul: the depth closed me round about, the weeds (*suph*) were wrapped about my head.” With this single exception, which shows that this product was also found in the Mediterranean, *suph* is Egyptian, either in the Red Sea or in the *yeor*, and this *yeor* in Exodus 2 was in the land of Goshen.

The signification of ⲁ̀ⲩⲩⲱⲤ, *suph*, must be gathered from the foregoing passages. In Arabic, the word with this signification (which commonly is

“wool”) is found only in one passage in a rare lexicon (the *Mohkam* MS.). The author says, “*Suf-el-bahr* (the *suf* of the sea) is like the wool of sheep. And the Arabs have a proverb, ‘I will come to thee when the sea ceases to wet the *suf*,’ i.e. never. The *āws* of the *μy*; it seems quite certain, is a *sea-weed resembling wool*. Such sea-weed is thrown up abundantly on the shores of the Red Sea. Furst says, s.v. *āws*, “Ab Aethiopicibus herba quaedam *supho* appellabatur, quae in profundo Maris Rubri crescit, quae rubra est, rubrumque colorem continet, pannis tingendis inservientem, teste Hieronymo de qualitate Maris Rubri” (p. 47, etc.). Diodorus (3 c. 19), Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, p. 770), and Agatharchides (ed. Muller, p. 136, 137) speak of the weed of the Arabian Gulf. Ehrenberg enumerates *Fucus latifolius* on the shores of this sea, and at Suez *Fucmus crispus*, *F. trinodis*, *F. turbinatuts*, *F. papillosus*, *F. caiaphamnus*, etc., and the specially red weed *Trichodesmium erythraceum*. The Coptic version renders *siuph* by *shari* (see above), supposed to be the hieroglyphic *sher* (sea?). If this be the same as the *sari* of Pliny (see next paragraph), we must conclude that *shari*, like *suph*, was both marine and fluvial. The passage in Jonah proves it to be a marine product, and that it was found in the Red Sea the numerous passages in which that sea is called the sea of *suph* leave no doubt.

3. The “Red Sea,” ἡ ἔρυθρὰ θάλασσα. The origin of this appellation has been the source of more speculation even than the obscure *suph*, for it lies more within the range of general scholarship. The theories advanced to account for it have been often puerile and generally unworthy of acceptance. Their authors may be divided into two schools. The first have ascribed it to some natural phenomenon, such as the singularly red appearance of the mountains of the western coast, looking as if they were sprinkled with Havana or Brazil snuff, or brick-dust (Bruce), or of which the redness was reflected in the waters of the sea (Gosselin, ii, 78-84); the red color of the water sometimes caused by the presence of zoophytes (Salt; Ehrenberg); the red coral of the sea; the red sea-weed; and the red storks that have been seen in great numbers, etc. Reland (*De Mare Rubro, Diss. Miscell.* i, 59-117) argues that the epithet red was applied to this and the neighboring seas on account of their tropical heat; as, indeed, was said by Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, 16:4, 20), that the sea was called red because of the reflection of the sun. The second have endeavored to find an etymological derivation. Of these the earliest (European) writers proposed a derivation from Edom, “red,” by the Greeks translated literally. Among

them were Fuller (*Miscell. Sacr.* 4 c. 20); before him Scaliger, in his notes to *Festues*, s.v. “Ægyptinos” (ed. 1574); and still earlier Genebrard (*Comment. ad Ps.* 106). Bochart (*Phaleg*, 4:c. 34) adopted this theory (see Reland, *Diss. Miscell.* [ed. 1706] i, 85). The Greeks and Romans tell us that the sea received its name from a great king, Erythras, who reigned in the adjacent country (Strabo, 16:4, § 20; Pliny, *H. N.* 6 c. 23, § 28; Agatharch. i, § 5; Philostr. 3:15; and others). The stories that have come down to us appear to be distortions of the tradition that Himyer was the name of apparently the chief family of Arabia Felix, the great South Arabian kingdom, whence the Himyerites and Homeritæ. Himyer appears to be derived from the Arabic “ahmar,” *red* (Himyer was so called because of the red color of his clothing; “aafar” also signifies “red,” and is the root of the names of several places in the peninsula so called on account of their redness (see *Marasid*, p. 263, etc.); this may point to Ophir: φοίνιξ is red, and the Phoenicians came from the Erythraean Sea (Herod. 7:89).

II. Physical Description. — In extreme length, the Red Sea stretches from the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb (or rather Ras Bab el-Mandeb), in lat. 12° 40' N., to the modern head of the Gulf of Suez, lat. 30° N. Its greatest width may be stated roughly at about 200 geographical miles; this is about lat. 16° 30'. but the navigable channel is here really narrower than in some other portions, groups of islands and rocks stretching out into the sea between thirty and forty miles from the Arabian coast and fifty miles from the African coast. From shore to shore, its narrowest part is at Ras Benlas, lat. 24°, on the African coast, to Rias Beridi opposite, a little north of Yembo', the port of El-Medineh; and thence northwards to Rias Mohammad (i.e. exclusive of the gulfs of Suez and the 'Akabah) the sea maintains about the same average width of 100 geographical miles. Southwards from Ras Benas it opens out in a broad reach; contracts again to nearly the above narrowness at Jiddah (correctly Jeddah), lat. 21° 30', the port of Mekkeh, and opens to its extreme width south of the last-named port.

Picture for Red Sea (1)

At Ras Mohammad the Red Sea is split by the granitic peninsula of Sinai into two gulfs — the westernmost, or Gulf of Suez, is now about 130 geographical miles in length, with an average width of about eighteen, though it contracts to less than ten miles; the easternmost, or Gulf of el-'Akabah, is only about ninety miles long from the Strait of Tiran to

‘Akabah, and of proportionate narrowness. The navigation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Suez near the shores is very difficult from the abundance of shoals, coral-reefs, rocks, and small islands, which render the channel intricate, and cause strong currents often of unknown force and direction; but in mid-channel, exclusive of the Gulf of Suez, there is generally a width of 100 miles clear, except the Dedalus reef (Wellsted, 2, 300). The bottom in deep soundings is in most places sand and stones from Suez as far as Jiddah, and thence to the strait it is commonly mud. The deepest sounding in the excellent Admiralty chart is 1054 fathoms, in lat. 22° 30’.

Journeying southwards from Suez, on our left is the peninsula of Sinai; on the right is the desert coast of Egypt, of limestone formation, like the greater part of the Nile valley in Egypt, the cliffs on the sea-margin stretching landwards in a great rocky plateau, while more inland a chain of volcanic mountains (beginning about lat. 28° 4’ and running south) rear their lofty peaks at intervals above the limestone, generally about fifteen miles distant. Of the most importance is Jebel Ghirib, 6000 feet high; and as the Strait of Jubal is passed, the peaks of the primitive range attain a height of about 4500 to 6900 feet, until the “Elba” group rises in a huge mass about lat. 22°. Farther inland is the Jebel ed Dukhkh an, the “porphyry mountain” of Ptolemy (4, 5, § 27; M. Claudianus, see Muller, *Geogr. Min. Atlas* 7), 6000 feet high, about twenty-seven miles from the coast, where the porphyry quarries formerly supplied Rome, and where are some remains of the time of Trajan (Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, 2, 383); and besides these, along this desert southwards are “quarries of various granites, serpentines, breccia verde, slates, and micaceous, talcose, and other schists” (*ibid.* p. 382). Jebel ez-Zeit, “the mountain of oil,” close to the sea, abounds in petroleum (*ibid.* p. 385). This coast is especially interesting in a Biblical point of view, for here were some of the earliest monasteries of the Eastern Church, and in those secluded and barren mountains lived very early Christian hermits. The convent of St. Anthony (of the Thebais), “Deir Mar Antuniyus,” and that of St. Paul, “Deir Mar Bolus,” are of great renown, and were once important. They are now, like all Eastern monasteries, decayed; but that of St. Anthony gives, from its monks, the patriarch of the Coptic Church, formerly chosen from the Nitrian monasteries (*ibid.* p. 381). South of the “Elba” chain, the country gradually sinks to a plain, until it rises to the highland of Jidan, lat. 15°, and thence to the strait extends a chain of low mountains. The greater part of the African coast of the Red Sea is sterile, sandy, and thinly peopled —

first beyond Suez by Bedouin chiefly of the Ma'azi tribe; south of the Kliseir road are the 'Abab'deh; and beyond, the Bisharis, the southern branch of whom are called by Arab writers Bejt, whose customs, language, and ethnology demand a careful investigation, which would undoubtedly be repaid by curious results (see El-Makrizi's *Khitat, Descr. of the Beja*, and *Descr. of the Desert of Eydhdb*; Quatremree's *Essays*, on these subjects, in his *Memoires Hist. et Geor. sur l'Egypte*, ii, 134, 162: and *The Genesis of the Earth and of Milan*, 2d ed. p. 109); and then, coast-tribes of Abyssinia.

The Gulf of el-'Akabah (i.e. "of the mountain-road") is the termination of the long valley of the Ghor or 'Arabah that runs northwards to the Dead Sea. It is itself a narrow valley; the sides are lofty and precipitous mountains of entire barrenness; the bottom is a river-like sea, running nearly straight for its whole length of about ninety miles. The northerly winds rush down this gorge with uncommon fury, and render its navigation extremely perilous, causing at the same time strong counter-currents; while most of the few anchorages are open to the southerly gales. It "has the appearance of a narrow deep ravine, — extending nearly a hundred miles in a straight direction, and the circumjacent hills rise in some places two thousand feet perpendicularly from the shore" (Wellsted, 2, 108). The western shore is the peninsula of Sinai. The Arabian chain of mountains, the continuation of the southern spurs of the Lebanon, skirt the eastern coast, and rise to about 3500 feet; while Jebel Teibet-'Ali, near the strait, is 6000 feet. There is no pasturage and little fertility, except near the 'Akabah, where are date-groves and other plantations, etc. In earlier days this last-named place was, it is said, famous for its fertility. The island of Graia, Jeziret Fara'fin, once fortified and held by the Crusaders, is near its northern extremity on the Sinaitic side. The sea, from its dangers and sterile shores, is entirely destitute of boats.

The Arabian coast outside the Gulf of the 'Akabah is skirted by the range of Arabian mountains, which in some few places approach the sea, but generally leave a belt of coast country, called Tihameh, or the Ghor, like the Shephelah of Palestine. This tract is generally a sandy parched plain, thinly inhabited, these characteristics being especially strong in the north (Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 305). The mountains of the Hejtz consist of ridges running parallel towards the interior, and increasing in height as they recede (Wellsted, 2, 242). Burckhardt remarks that the descent on the eastern side of these mountains, like the Lebanon and the whole Syrian

range east of the Dead Sea, is much less than that on the western; and that the peaks seen from the east or land side appear mere hills (*Arabicu*, p. 321 sq.). In clear weather they are visible at a distance of forty to seventy miles (Wellsted, 2, 242). The distant ranges have a rugged pointed outline, and are granitic; at Wejh, with horizontal veins of quartz; nearer the sea many of the hills are fossiliferous limestone. while the beach hills “consist of light-colored sandstone, fronted by and containng large quantities of shells and masses of coral” (p. 243). Coral also “enters largely into the composition of some of the most elevated hills.” The more remarkable mountains are Jebel ‘Ein-Unna (or ‘Eynuwunna, *Mardsid*, s.v. “‘Ein,” *”Ovvn* of Ptol.), 6090 feet high near the strait; a little farther south, and close to Mo’ eileh, are mountains rising from 6330 to 7700 feet, of which Wellsted says: “The coast... is low, gradually ascending with a moderate elevation to the distance of six or seven miles, when it rises abruptly to hills of great height, those near Mowilah terminating in sharp and singularly shaped peaks... Mr. Irwin [1777]... has styled them Bullock’s Horns. To me the whole group seemed to bear a great resemblance to representations which I have seen of enormous icebergs” (2, 176; see also the Admiralty chart, and Muller’s *Geogr. Min.*). A little north of Yembo is a remarkable group, the pyramidal mountains of Agratharchides; and beyond, about twenty-five miles distant, rises Jebel Radwa. Farther south Jebel Subh is remarkable for its magnitude and elevation, which is greater than any other between Yembo’ and Jiddah; and still farther, but about eighty miles distant from the coast, Jebel Ras el-Kura rises behind the holy city Mekkeh (Mecca). It is of this mountain that Burckhardt writes so enthusiastically (how rarely is he enthusiastic!), contrasting its verdure and cool breezes with the sandy waste of Tihameh (*Arabia*, p. 65 sq.). The chain continues the whole length of the sea, terminating in the highlands of the Yemen. ‘The Arabian mountains are generally fertile, agreeably different from the parched plains below and their own bare granite peaks above. The highlands and mountain summits of the Yemen, “Arabia the Happy,” the Jebel as distinguished from the plain, are precipitous, lofty, and fertile (Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 161), with many towns and villages in their valleys and on their sides. The coast-line itself, or Tihameh, “north of Yembo’, is of moderate elevation, varying from fifty to one hundlmred feet. with no beach. To the southward [to Jiddah] it is more sandy and less elevated; the inlets and harbors of the former tract may be styled coves, in the latter they are lagoons” (Wellsted, 2, 244). The coral of the Red Sea is remarkably abundant, and beautifully colored and variegated. It is often red, but the

more common kind is white; and of hewn blocks of this many of the Arabian towns are built.

The earliest navigation of the Red Sea (passing by the prehistorical Phoenicians) is mentioned by Herodotus. "Sesostris (Rameses II) was the first who, passing the Arabian Gulf in a fleet of long vessels, reduced under his authority the inhabitants of the coast bordering the Erythraean Sea. Proceeding still farther, he came to a sea which, from the great number of its shoals, was not navigable;" and after another war against Ethiopia he set up a stela on the promontory of Dira, near the strait of the Arabian Gulf. Three centuries later, Solomon's navy was built "in Eziongeber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom" (~~1028~~ 1 Kings 9:26). In the description of the Gulf of el' Akabah, it will be seen that this narrow sea is almost without any safe anchorage, except at the island of Graia near the 'Akabah, and about fifty miles southward the Harbor of ed-Dhahab. It is supposed by some that the sea has retired here as at Suez, and that Eziongeber is now dry land. *SEE ELATH; SEE EZIONGEBER.* Solomon's navy was evidently constructed by Phoenician workmen of Hiram, for he "sent in the navy his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon." This was the navy that sailed to Ophir. We may conclude that it was necessary to transport wood as well as men to build and man these ships on the shores of the Gulf of the 'Akabah, which from their natural formation cannot be supposed to have much altered, and which were, besides, part of the Wilderness of the Wandering; and the Edomites were pastoral Arabs, unlike the seafaring Himyarites. Jehoshaphat also "made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; but they went not, for the ships were broken at Eziongeber" (~~1228~~ 1 Kings 22:48). The scene of this wreck has been supposed to be ed-Dhahab, where is a reef of rocks like a "giant's backbone" (=Eziongeber) (Wellsted, 2, 153), and this may strengthen an identification with that place. "These ships of Jehoshaphat were manned by "his servants," who, from their ignorance of the sea, may have caused the wreck. Pharaoh-necho constructed a number of ships in the Arabian Gulf, and the remains of his works existed in the time of Herodotus (p. 159), who also tells us that these ships were manned by Phoenician sailors.

The fashion of the ancient ships of the Red Sea, or of the Phoenician ships of Solomon, is unknown. From Pliny we learn that the ships were of papyrus and like the boats of the Nile; and this statement was no doubt in some measure correct. But the coasting craft must have been very different

from those employed in the Indian trade. More precise and curious is El-Maakrizi's description, written in the first half of the 15th century, of the shilps that sailed from Eidhab on the Egyptian coast to Jiddah: "Their 'jelebehs' (P. Lobo, ap. Quatremere, *Memoires*, ii. 164, calls them 'gelves'), which carry the pilgrims on the coast, have not a nail used in them, but their planks are sewed together with fibre which is taken from the cocoanut-tree, and they calk them with the fibres of the wood of the date-palm; then they 'pay' them with butter or the oil of the *Palmra Christi*, or with the fat of the kirsh (*Squalus cas'charias*; Forskal, *Desc?. Animalium*, p. 8:No. 19)... The sails of these jelebehs are of mats made of the dom palm" (the *Khitat*, "Desert of Eidhalb"). The crews of the latter, when not exceptionally Phcenicians, as were Solomon's and Pharaoh-necho's, were without doubt generally Arabians rather than Egyptians — those Himyerite Arabs whose ships carried all the wealth of the East either to the Red Sea or the Persian Gulf. The people of 'Oman, the south-east province of Arabia, were among the foremost of these navigators (El-Mes'uidi's *Golden Meadows, MS.*, and *The Accounts of 'Two Mohammedan Travellers of the 9th Century*). It was customary, probably to avoid the dangers and delays of the narrow seas, for the ships engaged in the Indian trade to trans-ship their cargoes at the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb to Egyptian and other vessels of the Red Sea (Agath. § 103, p. 190; anon. *Peripl.* § 26, p. 277, ed. Muller). The fleets appear to have sailed about the autumnal equinox, and returned in December or the middle of January (Pliny, *H. N.* 6 c. 23 § 26; comp. *Peripl'*. passim). Jerome says that the navigation was extremely tedious. At the present day the voyages are periodical and guided by the seasons; but the old skill of the seamen has nearly departed, and they are extremely timid, rarely venturing far from the coast.

The Red Sea, as it possessed for many centuries the most important sea-trade of the East, contained ports of celebrity. Of these, Elath and Eziongeber alone appear to be mentioned in the Bible. The Heroopolitic Gulf is of the chief interest — it was near to Goshen; it was the scene of the passage of the Red Sea; it was also the seat of the Egyptian trade in this sea and to the Indian Ocean. Heroapolis is doubtless the same as Hero, and its site has been probably identified with the modern Abi-Kesheid, at the head of the old gulf. By the consent of the classics, it stood on or near the head of the gulf, and was sixty-eight miles (according to the *Itinerary of Antoninus*) from Clysmā, by the Arabs called el-Kulzum, near the

modern Suez, which is close to the *present* head. Suez is a poor town, and has only an unsafe anchorage with very shoal water. On the shore of the Heroopolitic Gulf was also Arsinol, founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus; its site has not been settled. Berenice, founded by the same, on the southern frontier of Egypt, rose to importance under the Ptolemies and the Romans; it is now of no note. On the western coast was also the anchorage of Myos Hormos, a little north of the modern town el-Kuseir, which now forms the point of communication with the old route to Coptos. On the Arabian coast the principal ports are Mu'eileh, Yembo' (the port of el-Medineh), Jiddah (the port of Mekkeh), and Mukh, by us commonly written Mocha. The Red Sea in most parts affords anchorage for country vessels well acquainted with its intricacies, and able to creep along the coast among the reefs and islands that girt the shore. Numerous creeks on the Arabian shore (called "shuram," sing. "sharm") indent the land. Of these the anchorage called es-Sharm, at the southern extremity of the peninsula of Sinai, is much frequented.

The commerce of the Red Sea was, in very ancient times, unquestionably great. The earliest records tell of the ships of the Egyptians, the Phoenicians, and the Arabs. Although the ports of the Persian Gulf received a part of the Indian traffic, and the Himveritic maritime cities in the south of Arabia supplied the kingdom of Sheba, the trade with Egypt was, we must believe, the most important of the ancient world. That all this traffic found its way to the head of the Heroopolitic Gulf seems proved by the absence of any important Pharaonic remains farther south on the Egyptian coast. But the shoaling of the head of the gulf rendered the navigation, always dangerous, more difficult: it destroyed the former anchorages, and made it necessary to carry merchandise across the desert to the Nile. This change appears to have been one of the main causes of the decay of the commerce of Egypt. We have seen that the long-voyaging ships shifted their cargoes to Red-Sea craft at the strait; and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after founding Arsinoe and endeavoring to reopen the old canal of the Red Sea, abandoned the upper route and established the southern road from his new city Berenice, on the frontier of Egypt and Nubia, to Coptos, on the Nile. Strabo tells us that this was done to avoid the dangers encountered in navigating the sea (xvii, 1, § 45). Though the stream of commerce was diverted, sufficient seems to have remained to keep in existence the former ports, though they have long since utterly disappeared. Under the Ptolemies and the Romans the commerce of the

Red Sea varied greatly, influenced by the decaying state of Egypt and the route to Palmyra (until the fall of the latter). But even its best state at this time cannot have been such as to make us believe that the 120 ships sailing from Myos Hormos, mentioned by Strabo (ii, v, § 12), were other than an annual convoy. The wars of Heraclius and Chosroes affected the trade of Egypt as they influenced that of the Persian Gulf. Egypt had fallen low at the time of the Arab occupation, and yet it is curious to note that Alexandria even then retained the shadow of its former glory. Since the time of Mohammed the Red Sea trade has been insignificant. But the opening of the Suez Canal has lately rendered it the great thoroughfare to India.

Red Sea, Passage Of.

The departure of the Israelites out of Egypt was their *independence-day* and the date of the nation's birth. As such it is always referred to in Scripture in terms of lofty jubilee and devout acknowledgment of the power of Jehovah, which was so strikingly displayed at almost every step. Two hundred and sixteen years before this event, their patriarch, Jacob, had left the land of his childhood and old age, and emigrated with all his family to Egypt, then the most highly cultivated land on earth. Settled in the most fertile part of the country, they had grown to a population of some two millions of souls. Divine Providence had specially fostered them. But now, for about eighty years, the Egyptian government, under a new and jealous dynasty, had adopted a severe policy towards them, and they were gradually reduced to a condition of servitude. Nevertheless, Jehovah had not forsaken them. Moses had been in process of training all these later years as an instrument for their deliverance, and the time had at length arrived for their emancipation. We need not here review the mighty acts of divine interference by which the Egyptian court were finally compelled to grant the release of the Hebrews. We will come at once to the scenes of their exit from the country. The region where it occurred is not only memorable from the inspired narrative of that event, but is likewise remarkable for its natural features, and interesting on account of the modern associations of the vicinity.

Picture for Red Sea (2)

Goshen, the territory occupied by the Israelites in Egypt, was an extension eastward of the "Delta," or triangular alluvial plain around the mouths of the Nile. It seems to have corresponded substantially to the present valley

of *Tuneilat*, which is a fertile, tongue-shaped tract about eighteen miles long, and averaging about two and a half miles broad, extending along the present railway which branches off to Ismailia from the direct line between Alexandria and Cairo. Westward Goshen probably included, likewise, a considerable tract of the adjoining Delta. The ruins scattered along the continuation of the valley, still farther east, are thought to indicate a populous region there likewise, and hence the name of Goshen is usually extended considerably farther in that direction; but the neglect of irrigation has allowed the sands of the desert on either side to encroach upon this narrow tract, so that it is now almost uninhabitable. The portion named above, however, is still so rich that it was sold in 1863 for two million dollars, and is now worth much more. *SEE GOSHEN.*

The government works upon which the Israelites were compelled to serve were public edifices in the two cities Pithom and Raamses, or Rameses, doubtless situated in or near the land of Goshen. The first of these places is generally identified with the present *Tell elKebit*, a village in the centre of the valley of Tumeilat with remains of antiquity in its vicinity. The other is probably represented by *Tell Ramsis*, a quadrangular mound on an arm of the Nile opposite the modern village of Belbeis, located on the Damietta branch of the railway, about seventeen miles south-west of the former place. The canal which conveys the sweet water of the Nile from Cairo to Suez passes through both these villages, parallel with the railway, by way of Ismailia, pursuing very nearly the same line as the ancient one constructed for the same purpose, but choked up and obliterated for many centuries. By this route small craft, during the Roman period and the Middle Ages, used to furnish a communication with the market at Memphis for the citizens of Clysma, which was situated in the immediate vicinity of Suez, as traces of the name still attest. The Suez Canal, which was opened in 1869 for navigation between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, has made this neighborhood public to thousands of persons travelling across the isthmus to India and China, as large steamers sail directly through it from European ports to these distant lands. Those who wish to see more of Egypt can disembark at Alexandria, take the cars for Cairo, and thence back by way of Ismailia, intercepting their vessel again at Suez. Thus most of the spots rendered memorable by the exodus of the Israelites have been rapidly seen, at least from a distance, by multitudes of passengers on their way to and from the more distant East. The abrupt contact of modern improvements with these ancient scenes is calculated, perhaps, to dissipate

some of the romantic haze which the imagination of Bible-readers usually throws around them, but deepens rather than lessens their interest by the familiarity of approach.

After these preliminaries, we are prepared to follow the Hebrews in their exit from the land of their bondage. On the eve of the Passover, corresponding to our Easter, they had rendezvoused, by divine appointment, at Rameses. Memphis, the capital, was forty miles distant, and hence Moses's final interview with Pharaoh, when the Israelitish leader uttered the ominous words. "Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more," must have taken place at some nearer point. The sacred meal was eaten in haste, the destroying angel at midnight smote all the first-born, and by the morning light the Israelitish host were on their march. As it is expressly stated that "God led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines,... but by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (not the desert between Cairo and Suez, as Palmer thinks [*Sinai from the Monuments*, p. 144], but the great desert of et-Tih itself), we are sure that they took the direct south-easterly route towards the head of the Gulf of Suez, doubtless corresponding substantially with the modern pilgrim road. This way would lead them out of the fertile valley of Goshen across a rolling gravelly plain between low hills of shifting sand the whole distance. There was no obstruction to their journey, and they would make rapid progress. They had but little household stuff, for Orientals, especially those of nomadic habits such as the Israelites inherited from their tent-dwelling forefathers, are not apt to encumber themselves much with furniture. Rain-water would be abundant in the pits and rocks along their path at that time of the year, and they carried with them provisions enough to last several days. Their first day was a long one, and they, no doubt, were anxious to fall as soon as possible into the main Haj road. Their first camp is called Succoth, or "booths" (^{<01237>}Exodus 12:37; 13:20; ^{<01336>}Numbers 33:56), probably a rough khan, like those established in all ages along this thoroughfare. The present Derb el-Ban, a northern branch of the great pilgrim route, leads direct from Belbeis. south-west down the valley by way of Rubeihy and Aweibet, and falls into the main Haj road at the castle of Ajrfid, sixty miles from Belbeis. Ajrfid has been thought by many to correspond to the next station of the Israelites, "Etham, in the edge of the wilderness" (^{<01331>}Exodus 13:20; ^{<01336>}Numbers 33:6). It is a long-established Egyptian outpost on the frontier of the desert. The whole air of the sacred narrative gives us the impression that this was a great landmark for

travellers, and that it formed the first or immediate point of destination for the Hebrews on their journey. If this be Etham, it will be necessary to allow thirty miles for each day's journey, which, under the pressing circumstances, is not extravagant, although an ordinary day's march in caravan is only about twenty miles. *SEE ETHAM.*

At Etham the Israelites received this divine command: "Turn and encamp before Pi-haliroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon: before it shall ye encamp by the sea" (^{<241>}Exodus 14:2). This direction must be carefully examined, as it is the only precise description we have of the actual crossing-place of the Red Sea by the Israelites. It is substantially repeated in ver. 9, where the Egyptians are said to have overtaken the Hebrews "encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon." Of the names of these localities no trace at present exists; their identification, therefore, must depend upon a comparison of the circumstances of the narrative, with some slight corroboration from the etymology and historical application of the names. Three or four places have been selected by different writers as rivals for the honor of this remarkable crossing, and their claims have been somewhat hotly contested at times. We propose calmly and carefully to discuss their respective merits, and to be guided by the explicit terms of the Biblical account, irrespective of any theological considerations as to whether the miracle involved may thus be enhanced or lessened. We take them up in their geographical order.

1. On the Meiditerranean Shore. — M. Brugsch has recently discovered a new crossing-place for the Israelites on their passage out of Egypt, which, on account both of the fame of the author and his confident announcement, has attracted no little attention (*L'Exode et les: Monuments Egyptiens: Discours prononce a l'occasion du Congres International d'Orientalistes Londres, par Henri Brugsch-Bey, delegue de son Altesse Ismael Premier, le Khedive d'Egypte; accompagne d'une carte [Leipsic, J. C. Hinrichs, 1872, 8vo], p. 36*). he conceives that they did not cross the Red Sea at all, but a noted morass — the Sirbonian Bog of antiquity, the modern *Sabaket Bardawa* — a shallow lake along the Mediterranean, on the confines of Egypt towards Palestine. He thinks he has found all the names of the Biblical account in the Egyptian papyri, and that he has succeeded in identifying them with modern localities. Thus On he sets down as equivalent to Anu, a city, according to him, in the Heroopolitic nome. Pi-beseth or Bubastis is, of course, Tell-Bast. Goshen he traces, through the

hieroglyphical Phacoussa, to the modern Kils or Facus; and in the Sethroitic nome on the north of this he finds mention of Pithan and Sukkoth, with Pi-rameses, or Rameses, in the same neighborhood. Etham he conjectures to be Khetam, noticed as another of three ancient stations in this latter region of Tanis-Rameses; the remaining one adjoining being Migdsl, which, of course, must be the Magdolum of classical writers, and the present Tell es-Semut. Baal-Zephon becomes Mnount Casius, and Pi-hahiroth is the entrance upon the narrow sand-beach separating the Mediterranean from the Sirbonian Lake just east of Pellisium. Many of these identifications, which M. Brugsch gives with great brevity, and without the detailed authority, the reader might reasonably question, both on the ground of strained etymological resemblance and inadequate historical data for position. But we prefer to call attention to a few palpable discrepancies with the scriptural narrative, which seem to put this locality utterly out of the question, notwithstanding the author's claim of their perfect accord. To be sure, the Hebrews, on this theory, simply threaded their way along a narrow beach till they came to a bar which allowed them an easy crossing-place over the marsh, and M. Brugsch candidly admits (p. 32), "The miracle, it is true, then ceases to be a miracle; but let us acknowledge, with all sincerity, that Divine Providence always maintains its place and authority." What childlike faith!

In the first place, it certainly was the Red Sea that the Israelites crossed on this occasion. True, the history in Exodus does not explicitly name the body of water, but the immediate context and other passages of Scripture do so most definitely and unequivocally (^{<0250>}Exodus 15:4-22; ^{<0510>}Deuteronomy 11:4; ^{<0023>}Joshua 4:23; 24:6; ^{<0A00>}Psalm 106:9; 136:13, 15, etc.). Josephus distinctly understands it so (*Ant.* ii, 15, 1), and the New-Test. writers are equally clear (^{<0123>}Acts 12:36; ^{<0812>}Hebrews 11:29). Even M. Brugsch has felt himself obliged on his map to call the Sirbonian Sea *Yam Suf*; the Hebrew name exclusively applied to the Arabian Gulf, thus committing a twofold blunder.

In the next place, the route which this theory selects for the Israelites on setting out is exactly the one which they avoided. "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go. that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near,... but God led the people about, through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (^{<0237>}Exodus 13:17, 18). Moreover, it makes no proper account of the

abrupt turn, or rather retrogression, on their way in order to reach the sea (⁽¹²⁴⁾Exodus 14:2).

Finally, this view is wholly unsupported by any local tradition, and requires a displacement of the well-settled positions of Marah, Elim, etc. This latter M. Brugsch locates at “the place which the Egyptian monuments designate by the name of Aalim or Tentlim; that is to say, ‘the city of fishes,’ situated near the Gulf of Suez, in a northerly direction.” Moses, however, speaks of no “city” there, much less so large a one as Heroopolis, which M. Brugsch sets down there on his map; but only of some wells and palms.

This view of the Red-Sea crossing M. Brugsch reiterates in his latest work (*Gesch. Aegyptens*, Leips. 1877), but “he has not won a single Egyptologist of note to a theory which demands so many conjectures in geography and such fanciful analogies in philology” (Dr. J. P. Thompson, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1877, p. 544).

2. At the “Bitter Lakes.” — These are a series of shallow ponds of brackish water, some of them of very considerable extent, stretching at intervals from the head of the Gulf of Suez to the Mediterranean. They are supposed to have formerly constituted a continuous water connection between those two great seas, which has since been broken by a change of level, leaving these isolated basins partly salt from the remnant of seawater. A few geological evidences in support of this theory have been adduced, the most palpable of which is the fact that sea-shells, of the same character with those now thrown up by the Red Sea, may be seen along the shore of these lakes (see Dr. Harman, *Egypt and the Holy Land*, p. 106). This would seem to indicate a continuity of these bodies of water in earlier times. (See further in Laborde, *Commentaire Geographique sur l’Exode* [Paris, 1841, fol.], p. 79 a.)

The great bed of the Bitter Lakes extends in a northerly and southerly direction, and is separated from the Red Sea by a sand-bank 4000 to 5000 meters long, which is seldom more than one meter higher than the sea. It is forty to fifty lower than the water-level of the sea basin, and from plain indications was once covered with the sea (Du Bois Aimee, in the *Descr. de l’Egypt. Mod.* i, 188 sq., 1st ed.). Before it had a connection with the Nile by means of the well-known canal, and thus received fresh water, its waters were bitter (Strabo, 17:804). It is a favorite theory that it was originally embraced in the Heroopolitan Gulf (Stickel, in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1850, p. 328 sq.). Yet this is no proof that the ancient Heroopolis

was situated in the inner corner of the Arabian Sea (Strabo, 16:767; 17:836; Pliny, 6:33), and that vessels sailed thence (Strabo, 16:768); but more probably this city was located far north of Clysma, the modern Kolsum, near the present Suez (Ptolemy, 4:5, 14, and 54; *Itinerar Anton.* p. 107, e(l. Wess.), namely, somewhere about the modern Abu-Keished, or Mukfar (Knobel, *Commentar zu Exodus*, p. 140 sq.). Its ruins are still visible there (Champollion, *Egypte*, ii, 88). Its importance gave name to the entire adjacent nome and to the contiguous gulf. Both were likewise more properly designated from Arsinoi, which was situated near the present head of the bay (see Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*, s.v. "Arsinoi"). This latter seems to have been the official designation of the place which was popularly termed Clysma (namely, *the beach*, τὸ κλύσμα [Reland, *Palaestina*, p. 472, 556]).

A rise of the intermediate land has been inferred from the stoppage of the ancient canal along this line; but this can readily be accounted for by the drifting-in of sand and the neglect of the banks. On the other hand, that no material change of level has taken place in this region in modern times seems to be proved by the fact that the fresh-water canal now actually conveys water from the Nile to Suez, just as it formerly did, without any considerable cutting for that purpose. The brackishness of these lakes merely argues a connection at some period with the Mediterranean, and not necessarily with the Red Sea likewise, and the shells and other marine indications are probably traces of this connection only. In fact, the immense lagoon of Lake Menzaleh still reaches almost to Lake Timsah, the principal or deepest of the Bitter Lakes, and there is nothing but flats and marshes in this direction; whereas southerly the Suez Canal required extensive excavations for its continuance to the Gulf of Suez, cutting in some places, not through sand and silted *debris* merely, but through firm strata of clay and crystalline alabaster.

This theory rests upon so problematical a foundation that it has not been much resorted to in this discussion except for the purpose of strengthening the location of the Israelites crossing at Suez, by way of showing that the water at the latter point was deeper anciently than now, and so preserving the greater appearance of a miracle in the case. It is thus incidentally alluded to by Calmet and Robinson, and by several later writers. But for this purpose, if it proves anything, it proves too much; for if at the time of the Exodus the Red Sea extended thus far north, there is no occasion to

seek for any other place of crossing, so far as a sufficiency of water is concerned.

Aside from these geological and theological speculations, there is in favor of this crossing-place only the shorter distance from Belbeis, rendering it an easy three days' journey of only fifteen miles per day to any point that might be selected in the vicinity of Ismailia. The attempt of Furst (*Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 766) to identify Baal-zephon with Hero-Spolis is mere conjecture; and his remark that Migdol is the Magdolum of Herodotus (ii, 159) is founded on a mistake (repeated in Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*, ii, 246), for Hegiddo in Palestine is doubtless there intended. (See Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 207.) The Hagdolum of Egypt was twelve miles west of Pelusium (*Antonine Itinerary*, p. 14), entirely too remote for the precise indication of locality in the Mosaic narrative.

Against the location of the miracle at the Bitter Lakes are the following facts in the Biblical text:

- (1.)** In order to go round the head of the sea (if thus far north) the Israelites would be obliged to start, not by "the way of the wilderness," as the text states, but precisely by that direct "way of the land of the Philistines" which the text expressly says they did not take (^{<Q1317>}Exodus 13:17, 18).
- (2.)** There would be no change of their course requisite or possible in order to reach this point, as the word "turn" (14:2) demands; they were already going on the direct and only route they could well have taken. Indeed, if the region of Lake Timsah were then so low as to be filled from the Red Sea, it is difficult to see how the water from the Mediterranean on the other side could have been kept out, and then there would be a continuous lake from sea to sea, and a miracle would have been necessary, at all hazards, in order to effect the passage anywhere. The Hebrews had no occasion to "turn" at all, for that matter.
- (3.)** In that case Pharaoh's observation (ver. 3, 4), "The children of Israel are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in," would have been very inapt; at least, its force is not at all clear; for, go which way they might, the material obstacle would be the same, viz. the water merely.
- (4.)** There is no local or historical tradition confirmatory of this spot; in short, circumstances on this theory are all so uncertain and ill-defined that we may safely dismiss it as altogether hypothetical. If we are to determine

anything definite concerning the place of the transaction. it must be based upon the known relations of the localities as they now exist.

Kalisch thinks (*Comment. on Exod. ad loc.*) that the Israelites turned *northwards*; but in that case likewise, as Shaw long since observed (*Travels*, p. 311), they could not in any proper sense have become “entangled in the land” nor “shut in by the wilderness,” for all would have been free before them to escape; in fact, they would have been only pursuing a more direct route to Canaan.

Picture for Red Sea (3)

3. *At Suez.* — This location of the event in question has a far greater array of names in its support, among the most notable of whom is Dr. E. Robinson (in the *Biblical Repository*, 1832, p. 753 sq., repeated in his *Bibl. Res.* i, 80), who followed in the wake of Niebuihr (*Travels in Arabia*, translated by Heron [Edinb. 1792], i, 198, 451), and whose views have been substantially reproduced by the latest writers. Other important authorities on the same side are Laborde (*Commentairi Geographique*, p. 77), who cites, as having adopted it with some modification, the earlier writers, Le Clerc, G. Baer, Du Bois Aimde. Salvator, etc., to whom we add the author of a *Murray’s Hand-book on Egypt* (cd. 1873), p. 279; Keil, *Comment. on the Pentateuch* (Clarke’s translation, Edinb. 1866, ‘3 vols. 8vo), ii, 46 sq. The obvious purport of the arguments adduced in favor of this as the place of the Israelites’ passage is, notwithstanding the disclaimer of most of its advocates, to reduce the miracle to its minimum terms, and to find a spot where it is practicable by merely natural forces. This has created a prejudice against it in the minds of most readers, and induced a controversy not always temperate or logical. Let us look at the arguments on both sides from scriptural sources purely.

Picture for Red Sea (4)

In favor of this view we may say that —

- (1.) The distance from Belbeis (assuming that to correspond substantially with the site of Rameses) sufficiently agrees with the requirements of a three days’ march, being about fifty miles in a straight line.
- (2.) The general direction is about the required one for the Israelites at the outset.

(3.) The adjoining localities are thought to correspond with those of the Scripture account; thus it is generally agreed that Higdul (the tower) answers to some fortress on Jebel-Atikah.

(4.) There are shoals reaching nearly or quite across the channel at this point, so that all east wind might readily lay it bare; and it is, moreover, so narrow that the Israelites could easily cross in the few hours presumed to have been occupied in the passage.

Other features of this locality do not well tally with the requirements of the case, and some appear absolutely to contradict the Biblical statements. Even the above coincidences — especially the last — when more closely examined, do not prove satisfactory.

(1.) The direction to “turn” from the regular course hitherto pursued by the fugitives does not admit of an adequate explanation on this view. The word is an emphatic one, not the ordinary $r\aleph s$, or $h\aleph n$; *to turn aside* or *away*, but $b\aleph v$, *to return, turn back*, viz. actually retrograde. (Ewald, who treats the record in his usually arbitrary and irreverent manner, is yet too good a scholar not to feel the force of this expression, which he construes by saying that Moses “led the host half-way back” [*Hist. of Israel* (translated by Martineau, London, 1869, 5 vols. 8vo), ii, 69]). At least a marked digression or detour is required to meet the significance of this term. But Suez is directly on the beaten track of all ages, and precisely in the line which the Israelites had already been pursuing. It is true the immemorial Haj route does not actually come down to the village of Suez itself, as, of course, it does not cross the head of the gulf there; it passes a mile or two above, so as to avoid the water. But this small divergence would be quite inconsiderable in the direction of a whole day’s march; for the order to “turn,” be it observed, was given at Etham before setting out the third day, not near its close, or in the vicinity of the sea, where the difference in direction might have been more perceptible. This last consideration is, therefore, altogether too insignificant to justify the Hebrew term.

(2.) None of the places given in the Biblical account as fixing the spot determine it at Suez. Even Jebel Atakah, if Migdal, is too far away to be naturally selected for such a minute specification of the immediate scene. Any point from Ras Atakah to the south end of the Bitter Lakes would be “east” of (or “before”) that mountain in this general sense. As for Pi-hahiroth (whether Hebrew for *mouth of the ravines*, or, as is more likely,

Coptic for *the sedge-plot*), it finds no special adaptation to any place in that neighborhood. The attempt to identify it with Ajrud fails utterly, for the Hebrew and Arabic names have but one radical letter in common. Equally unsatisfactory is every effort to discover Baal-zephon in any prominent landmark north of Jebel Atakah. (Some writers refer Migdol to *Muktala*, but this seems to be an error for the pass *Mantulah*, and therefore fails of verbal correspondence.) There is in that direction nothing but a flat, monotonous tract of sand, with no striking name or object to fix upon.

(3.) At Suez the Israelites, so far from being hemmed in by barriers on either side and an impassable sea in front, as the Biblical situation evidently was, had nothing to do if they wished to escape but to act just as every caravan at Suez now does, simply keep on across the open plain around the head of the bay — an easy, free, and direct passage of some three or four miles at farthest. At Suez it was impossible for them to be either “entangled in the land” or “shut in by the wilderness.” The way was clear, so far as natural obstacles or intricacy was concerned, and no troop of six hundred cavalry even could effectually cut them off from it; certainly no enemy in the rear could hinder them.

(4.) “A strong east wind blowing all night” across the head of the gulf (^(~~101~~)Exodus 14:21) would leave by morning no “wall of waters” either “on the right hand or on the left” of passengers at Suez. As will be seen by inspecting the soundings on the accompanying sketch from the British sailing-chart, the channel opposite Suez is (except, of course, the artificial bed of the Suez Canal) nowhere over four feet deep at low water, and not more than one twelfth of a mile wide. It could be waded across without any miracle or extra wind at all; in fact, this has actually been done. One traveller hired a man to walk through the water at ebttide at Suez, which he effected, holding his hands over his head (Madden, *Travels*, 2, 143, 150). So all the way down to the bar at the mouth of the creek which puts up into Suez the water is at the most only five or six feet deep (in one or two spots), and generally three or four at ordinary low tide, with a tolerably uniform width of about one tenth of a mile. But a powerful and prolonged east wind, acting upon the mass of water in the outer or broad part of the bay itself, would so greatly lower the tide on the eastern shore, where the channel of Suez lies, as to drain the latter almost, if not absolutely, dry throughout its whole extent. It is true there would *be* water enough left in the bay itself to prevent an enemy from surrounding the passing host on that side, but on the north there would be no such

protection. Thus, even on the supposition that the term “wall” is used in ver. 22 in the sense of *defence*, the explanation clearly fails to meet the language of the text: “The waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left.” We desire to insist on this fact, and to us it appears decisive of the whole issue. But the phraseology seems to us to be stronger even than this interpretation. The term “wall” (**h mj**) is rarely, if ever, used in this metaphorical sense of *protection*, but invariably (^{<02516>}1 Samuel 25:16 is, we believe, the only doubtful instance) signifies some *physical barrier*, whether of stone or other material, placed more or less vertically for the purpose of protection. Its meaning is by no means fulfilled in the supposition of a vague water-line, shelving away at a distance on one side. Surely nothing but a desire to minify the preternatural element in the discussion could lead to the adoption of so inadequate an interpretation; for the language, it must be remembered, occurs not in a poetical or figurative connection, but in a plain, prosaic history. The poetical version of the transaction (^{<0218>}Exodus 15:8) uses much stronger language: “The floods *stood upright as a heap*, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea.” The phraseology here, although figurative, no doubt correctly represents the facts as seen by an eye-witness. ^{<07813>}Psalm 78:13. “He made the waters to *stand as a heap*,” silows the same traditional interpretation, and ^{<6112>}1 Corinthians 10:2 confirms it, “Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea” — that is, wet with the spray.

For these reasons, even if we could find no better crossing-place for the Israelites, we should be disposed to reject the one at Suez as not fairly meeting the scriptural requirements in the case.

Picture for Red Sea (5)

4. At Ras Atakah. — This place has been preferred as that of the crossing by the great majority of writers and travellers, including Pococke, Joly, Monconys, Shaw, Ovington, Sicard, Bruce, Arundale, Raumer, Kitto, Olin, Wilson, Durbin, Bartlett, Porter, Bonar, Murphy, etc. It seems to us to meet the demands of the Biblical account more perfectly than any other. This cape is situated about six miles, in a direct line, south of Suez, opposite the southern end of Jebel Athkah. It is a tongue running out more than a mile into the water beyond the average shore-line, and continued nearly a mile farther by a shoal, over which the water at ordinary low tide is not more than fourteen feet deep. Beyond this again stretches, for nearly a mile and a half in the same direction, a lower shoal, covered nowhere by

more than twenty-nine feet of water at low tide. Opposite this point there reaches out, for about two miles from the eastern shore, a similar shoal, only thirty feet under water at its deepest place. The entire width of the sea at this point is about five miles, while the space where it is not over fifteen feet deep is but three and a half miles, and the channel, itself not over fifty feet deep, is less than three quarters of a mile wide. The sea immediately above and below this spot, in the channel, is about seventy feet deep. Here, then, is a place where a strong and continued east wind, of the preternatural character implied in the sacred narrative, might open a passage suitable for the occasion, and leave a mass of water fitly comparable to a “wall on either hand.” Moreover, the Israelites would, in that case, emerge on the shore near Ayun Musa (Wells of Moses), the very name of which, in addition to other local traditions, represents the scene of the event.

A close examination of the text itself confirms this view of the transaction. It says (^(12:21)Exodus 14:21), “Jehovah caused the sea to go (ÉI wōwī *cmad/e it walk*) by a strong east wind all night,... and the waters were divided (W[qBŸwi, *were split*).” Similar is the language in ver. 16: “Divide it (the sea), and the children of Israel shall go... through the *midst* of the sea.” The statement that the wind blew “all night” gives no just countenance to the inference that the Israelites did not begin the passage till near morning, and therefore could have gone but a very short distance in all, or, at least, when the wind lulled and the miracle ceased. For aught that appears, they may have already walked many miles, or even have continued their march some time the next forenoon if necessary in order to cross. True, the text says (ver. 27), “The sea returned at the turning of the morning (r qBot wop] *æt daybreak*; comp. ^(19:25)Judges 19:25, 26) to its usual bed (wotyab] *to its perennial flow*),” but it does not necessarily follow from this that the Israelitish host had at that time all reached the opposite shore. Indeed, rather the contrary is intimated by the statement, *givenn subsequently* to this, that “the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea” (^(14:29)Exodus 14:29), as if they continued their march some time after the overthrow of the Egyptians in their rear. Nor is it certain from ver. 20 that both camps remained quiet all the night, although such might be the inference at first sight. The true state of the case appears to have been about this: the Egyptians overtook the Israelites about nightfall, just as they were about to encamp (μυνῆσαι in the act of *pitching their tents*, or

preparing to do so) near the shore of the sea (ver. 9), and marched down directly upon them (ver. 10). In their dismay at the prospect of instant destruction, Moses ordered them to press forward immediately (ver. 15, **W[Syw]** *and they shall pull up stakes*, that is, break up their preparations for camp). While they were doing this the wind sprang up, which did not lull till daylight. As they were marching to the beach the guardian pillar took its position in their rear (ver. 19), and so followed them all night as a light to their steps (ver. 20). When they had reached the middle of the sea (ver. 21), and the Egyptians were not far behind them (ver. 22), the morning began to dawn (ver. 24), and to prevent the enemy from overtaking the fugitives the march of the Egyptians was miraculously retarded, so that they, in their panic, were about to retreat (ver. 25). This they would hardly have thought of doing had they been nearly across, or had it been but a little way to the opposite shore: indeed, every reference to their destruction shows that they were yet in the middle of the sea. So, too, was Moses apparently at this juncture, when, at his extended rod, the water behind the host — who had gained somewhat by the delay of the enemy — began to fall, and the Egyptians actually turned to flee, but were overtaken in the heart of the sea (ver. 27), while the Israelites continued their march through the channel, still open in front of them (ver. 29), till they reached the shore, which the following waves soon strewed with the corpses of the foe (ver. 30). From this recital of incidents in the exact order of the text, it appears that the march really lasted some part of the night, and we consequently require a considerable width of water for its occurrence.

Ras Athkah, too, seems to correspond to the geographical features of the case. The point where the Israelites struck the western coast-line of the Red Sea is (as we have seen above) explicitly defined in three passages of the sacred itinerary, which we translate literally: “Speak to the sons of Israel, and they shall return (**WbvYw**) and encamp before (**ynp**) **ⲡ**Pi-ha-Chirothl between Migdol and the sea; before (**ynp**) **ⲡ**Ba’al-Tsephon, opposite it (**wj b**) shall ye encamp upon (**l []**) the sea” (^{<2442>}Exodus 14:2). “And they [the Egyptians] overtook (**WgyCyt**) them [the Israelites] encamping upon the sea; upon (**l []**) Pi-ha-Chirbth, which is before Ba’al-Tsephon” (ver. 9). “And they [the Israelites] removed from Etham, and he [Israel] returned (**bvYw**) upon (**l []**) Pi-ha-Chirsth, which is before B’allsephon; and they encamped before Migdol” (^{<0437>}Numbers 33:7). The meaning of Pi-hahiroth, if it be Hebrew, can only be *mouth of the gorges*

(root **rwj**, *to bore*); or, if Egyptian (as Gesenius and Furst prefer), it is doubtless *sedgy spot* (Coptic, *pi-achi-roth*, “the place of meadows,” according to Jablonski). In either etymology it would most probably designate a grassy shore, as at the opening of a valley with a brook into the sea. Such a spot is found in the reedy plain (sometimes called *Baderh*) at the mouth of a wide valley just south of Jebel Atikah. The writer’s Egyptian dragoman, who was thoroughly familiar with these localities, called it *Wady Ghubbeh* (“cane-valley”); Robinson calls it *Wady Tawazdriik*, others *Wady Mfusa*, and still other names are assigned to it. Baal-zephon is doubtless a Hebrew rendering of the name of a place “sacred to Typhon,” the Greek form of the Egyptian malignant deity, of whose haunt in this vicinity there are traces in ancient writers (see the Hebrew lexicographers). In that case it was probably a mountain, or at least an eminence, in accordance with the heathen preference for hills as sites of shrines. Migdol is the common Hebrew word for a *tower*, and was, therefore, most likely also a commanding position. It occurs, however, as the name of a town in this quarter of Egypt (²⁴⁰¹Jeremiah 44:1; 46:14), and may be nothing more than a Hebraized form of the Coptic *megtol*, “many hills” (see the authorities in Gesenius). In ³²⁹⁰Ezekiel 29:10; 30:6, it recurs in the phrase **hnmw]l Dgnas**, which may most naturally be rendered *from Megdol of Seveneh*; in the English Bible, “from the tower of Syene,” after the Vulg. (*a turre Syene*; but the rendering of the Sept., **ἀπὸ Μαγδῶλον ἕως** [once **καὶ**] **Σύνης**, suggests that the latter name should be pointed **hnmw]l** *to Seven*, thus marking out the natural limits of Egypt, from Migdol on the north to Assuan on the south, precisely as today; and this conclusion is generally adopted by modern scholars. Furst, in his *Hebrewn Lexicon*, gives a curious interpretation of this whole geographical question: “From Aligdol a road led to Baal-zephon, the later Heropolis on the Red Sea, and therefore the Red Sea is mentioned with it, ²⁴⁴²Exodus 14:2; ²⁸³⁷Numbers 33:7.” Most readers, however, will prefer to see in these texts, so carefully worded in almost exact agreement with each other, a precise indication of the very spot where the Israelites crossed; and if the above reasons be correct, we ought to find on each side of the crossing-place a conspicuous landmark, probably a mountain. This we exactly have at the valley in question, with Jebel Atakah — (“hill of liberty”) on the north, and Jebel AbiiDaraj (“hill of the father of steps,” that is, *long march*) on the south, and a fine well-watered plain between suitable for an encampment. In this position the Israelites would be effectually hemmed in by the sea in front,

the mountains on either hand, and the Egyptians in their rear. The enemy, of course, came directly down from Memphis along Wady et-Till (“the valley of wandering”), which terminates in the wady in question, thus intercepting the Israelites, who could not escape along the narrow, rocky margin of the shore around the point called Ras Atakah. The writer tried to travel that rough coast and found it impracticable enough. Small companies, as was the case with Dr. Durbin, may, indeed, pass slowly along it, but not so great and encumbered a multitude as the Israelites. Besides, it is about a day’s march by this route from Ras Atakah to Suez, and the Egyptians might readily have intercepted the fugitives by sending a detachment around the other side of the mountain.

The particular path by which the Israelites reached Ras Atakah from Ajrud has not been agreed upon by the advocates of this point of crossing. Sicard thought they came down Wady et-Tih from Memphis; but this, as we have seen, is not at all likely. Most others suppose that they came first to Suez, and then along the shore. But if they came that way, why might they not escape by the same? As we have just seen, they could do neither. There remains, therefore, the supposition that they passed around partly behind and across Jebel Atakah. This exactly tallies with the command to “turn” back from Etham. From Ajrud the route would thus be not merely a deflection, but in part an actual retrogression, as the accompanying map shows. A path is laid down on several of the maps of this region between the highest and westernmost summits of Jebel Atakah, which the fugitives would most naturally take. By this route the distance for the third day’s march from Ajrud to the spring on the shore at the mouth of Wady Tawirik would be a little less than thirty miles, the average allowed above for each of the previous days’ travel. Thence to the extremity of Ras Atakah is not quite ten miles, and thence to Ayfin Musa is scarcely seven miles more. The journey does not seem to us to be an impracticable one under the urgency of the circumstances. It might be materially shortened for each of the succeeding days, especially the last, by locating Etham on the Haj route, somewhat to the west of Ajrud — a supposition not at all forbidden by any known fact.

Kurtz (*History of the Old Covenant* [Clarke’s transl. Edinb. 1859, 4 vols. 8vo], i, 357 sq.) has an extended observation on the time that elapsed upon the route from Rameses to the Red Sea, which he argues must have been more than the three days that appear in the narrative (by *implication* only,

however, for there is no express statement to that effect). We condense his statements into the following points:

- (1.) Jewish tradition assigns seven days, and this seems to have been the origin of the Passover week.
- (2.) The term [*Sini* “journey,” denotes only an *encampment*, while the successive days of travel are expressed by *יומם* or “day’s journey.”
- (3.) In ^{<04163>}Numbers 10:33, we find stations three days apart, with no locality named between (the same, we may add, is the case in 33:8, 16).
- (4.) It would have been impossible for the Israelites all to rendezvous at one place and start together, especially as they all kept the Passover in their own homes the preceding night, and were not allowed to leave till morning (^{<0122>}Exodus 12:22).
- (5.) The distance, under any calculation, was too great for a three days’ continuous march.
- (6.) The message to Pharaoh of their movements at Etham (^{<0245>}Exodus 14:5) requires at least four days from that point to the Red Sea—two for him to get the information, and two more for his army to be got ready and overtake the Israelites. To these arguments we may add the fact that a whole month was consumed (^{<0213>}Numbers 23:3; ^{<0260>}Exodus 16:1) in making the first eight stations (^{<0235>}Numbers 33:5-11), containing—so far as the narrative directly states—but ten days of marching. As the remainder of the time could hardly have been all spent in camp—of which, moreover, there is no mention in the account — there arises a suspicion that the most prominent stations only are named, or those where more than one night’s halt was made, or some noteworthy incident occurred. Of course the fugitives would travel faster, longer, and more continuously, till they were escaped from Egypt, and more leisurely after the event at the Red Sea had relieved them from danger. Be all this as it may, it is in any case clear that they could as easily journey from Ajrud to the mouth of Wady Tawarik in one day as they could from Tell Ramsis to Ajrud in two.

5. Capt. Moresby (in Aiton’s *Land of the Messiah*, p. 118 sq.) is of the opinion that the Israelites crossed at Ras Tarafineh, south of Mount Abu-Deraj, some sixty miles below Suez, where the sea is twenty miles wide and two hundred and fifty feet deep. This accords with certain traditions of the Arabs of the Desert, who name the warm springs in the rocks opposite

after Pharaoh. The inducement, however, to this view seems chiefly to be a desire to exaggerate the miracle.

6. The last and most preposterous theory broached is that of Dr. Beke (*Sinai in Arabia* [Lond. 1878]), who contends that the eastern arm of the Red Sea, i.e. the Gulf of 'Akabah, and not the Gulf of Suez, is that which the Israelites crossed. He is driven to this conclusion by his chimerical idea that Mount Sinai is not the traditional mountain in the peninsula, but Jebel Baghir, east of 'Akabah. *SEE SINAI*.

Among the localities named, the choice really lies between Suez and Ras Athkah, and of these we decidedly prefer the latter.

Besides the works cited above, and the commentaries on Exodus, the question has been discussed by the following among the more modern writers: Kitto, *Pictorial History of the Jews* (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. small 4to), i, 187 sq.; Latrobe, *Scripture Illustrations* (ibid. 1838, 8vo), p. 29 sq.; Raumer, *Beitrag zur biblischen Geographie* (Leips. 1843, 8vo), p. 1 sq.; Sharpe, in Bartlett's *Forty Days in the Desert* (Lond. 2d ed. large 8vo), p. 23 sq.; Wilson, *The Lands of the Bible* (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 149 sq.; Olin, *Travels in Egypt*, etc. (N.Y. 1843, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 342 sq.; Durbin, *Observations in the East* (ibid. 1845, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 120 sq.; Porter, in Murray's *Hand-book of Syria* (Lond. ed. 1868, 12mo), i, 9 sq.; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* (N.Y. reprint, 1872, 8vo), p. 42 sq.; Bonar, *The Desert of Sinai* (ibid. reprint, 1857, 12mo), p. 82 sq.; Morris, *Tour through Turkey*, etc. (Phila. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 219 sq.; Strauss, *Sinai und Golgotha* (Berl. 1850, 12mo), p. 147 sq. One of the most recent monographs on the subject — that of Unruh, *Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypte nach Canaan* — (Langensalza, 1860, 8vo) after extending the Gulf of Suez so far north as nearly to join a deep bay of the Mediterranean, locates Succoth at the narrow isthmus, Pi-hahiroth at Suez, and the other scriptural localities (Etham, Migdol. and Baal-zephon) east of the gulf, which on this view was not actually crossed at all. This is the rationalistic theory fully carried out. The lively writer (Kinglake) of *Eothen* (Lond. 1844; N. Y. 1845, 12mo), p. 188, thus briefly puts the main points of the controversy: "There are two opinions as to the point at which the Israelites passed the Red Sea. One is that they traversed only the very small creek at the northern extremity of the inlet, and that they entered the bed of the water at the spot on which Suez now stands; the other that they crossed the sea from a point many miles down the coast. The Oxford theologians,

who, with Milman, their professor, believe that Jehovah conducted his chosen people without disturbing the order of nature, adopt the first view, and suppose that the Israelites passed during the ebb-tide, aided by a violent wind. One among many objections to this supposition is that the time of a single ebb would not have been sufficient for the passage of that vast multitude of men and beasts, or even for a small fraction of it. Moreover, the creek to the north of this point can be compassed in an hour, and in two hours you can make the circuit of the salt marsh over which the sea may have extended in former times. If, therefore, the Israelites crossed so high up as Suez, the Egyptians, unless infatuated by divine interference, might easily have recovered their stolen goods from the encumbered fugitives by making a slight detour.” *SEE EXODE.*

Redditio Symboli

(*rehearsal of the creed*). In early times the candidates for baptism were accustomed, on Maundy-Thursdlay, to recite publicly the creed in the presence of the bishop or presbyters, and this act was designated *redditio symboli*.

Redeemer

a frequent rendering of the Heb. *l aeo*, *goel*, which strictly means the *nearest kinsman*. It is thus applied to Christ, as he is the avenger of man upon his spiritual enemy, and delivers man from death and the power of the grave, which the human avenger could not do. The right of the institution of *goel* was only in a relative — one of the same blood — and hence our Saviour’s assumption of our nature is alluded to and implied under this term. There was also the right of buying back the family inheritance when alienated; and this also applies to Christ, our *goel*, who has purchased back the heavenly inheritance into the human family. Under these views Job joyfully exclaims, “I know that my Redeemer (my *goel*) liveth,” etc. *SEE GOEL; SEE JESUS CHRIST; SEE MEDIATOR.*

Redemption,

in theology, denotes our recovery from sin and death by the obedience and sacrifice of Christ, who on this account is called the “Redeemer” (^{<2831>}Isaiah 59:20; ^{<18925>}Job 19:25). “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (^{<4124>}Romans 3:24). ““ Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us”

(^{<KJB>}Galatians 3:13). “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (^{<KJB>}Ephesians 1:7). “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (^{<KJB>}1 Peter 1:18, 19). “And ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price” (^{<KJB>}1 Corinthians 6:19, 20).

By redemption those who deny the atonement made by Christ wish to understand *deliverance* merely, regarding only the effect, and studiously putting out of sight the cause from which it flows. But the very terms used in the above-cited passages, “to redeem” and “to be bought with a price,” will each be found to refute this notion of a gratuitous deliverance, whether from sin or punishment, or both. “Our English word *redemption*,” says Dr. Gill, “is from the Latin, and signifies *buying again*; and several words in the Greek language of the New Test. are used in the affair of our redemption which signify the obtaining of something by paying a proper price for it; sometimes the simple verb ἀγοράζω, *to buy*, is used; so the redeemed are said to be bought unto God by the blood of Christ, and to be bought from the earth, and to be bought from among men, and to be bought with a price — that is, with the price of Christ’s blood (^{<KJB>}1 Corinthians 6:20); hence the Church of God is said to be purchased with it (^{<KJB>}Acts 20:28). Sometimes the compound word ἐξαγοράζω is used, which signifies *to buy again*, or out of the hands of another, as the redeemed are bought out of the hands of justice, as in ^{<KJB>}Galatians 3:13; 4:5. *To redeem* literally means ‘to buy back;’ and λυτρόω, *to redeem*, and ἀπολύτρωσις, *redemption*, are, both in Greek writers and in the New Test., used for the act of setting free a captive by paying λύτρον, *a ransom*) or *redemption price*.” Yet, as Grotius has fully shown by reference to the use of the words both in sacred and profane writers, redemption signifies not merely “the liberation of captives,” but deliverance from exile, death, and every other evil from which we may be freed; and λύτρον signifies everything which satisfies another so as to effect this deliverance. The nature of this redemption or purchased deliverance (for it is not gratuitous liberation, as will presently appear) is therefore to be ascertained by the circumstances of those who are the subjects of it. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men; they are under guilt, under “the curse of the law,” the servants of sin, under the power and dominion of the devil, and “taken captive by him at his will,” liable to the death of the body and to

eternal punishment. To the whole of this case the redemption—the purchased deliverance of man as proclaimed in the Gospel — applies itself. Hence in the above-cited and other passages it is said, “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” in opposition to guilt; redemption from “the curse of the law;” deliverance from sin, that “we should be set free from sin;” deliverance from the power of Satan; from death, by a resurrection; and from future “wrath” by the gift of eternal life. Throughout the whole of this glorious doctrine of our redemption from these tremendous evils there is, however, in the New Test., a constant reference to the *λύτρον*, *the redemption price*, which *λύτρον* is as constantly declared to be the death of Christ, which he endured in our stead. “The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many” (⁴¹¹⁸Matthew 20:28). “Who gave himself a ransom for all” (⁵¹¹⁶1 Timothy 2:6). “In whom we have redemption through his blood” (⁴¹¹⁷Ephesians 1:7). “Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ” (⁴¹¹⁸1 Peter 1:18, 19). That deliverance of man from sin, misery, and all other penal evils of his transgression, which constitutes our redemption by Christ, is not, therefore, a gratuitous deliverance, granted without a consideration, as an act of mere prerogative; the ransom — the redemption price — was exacted and paid; one thing was given for another — the precious blood of Christ for captive and condemned men. Of the same import are those passages which represent us as having been “bought” or “purchased” by Christ. Peter speaks of those “who denied the Lord *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτούς*, that bought them;” and Paul, in the passage above cited, says, “Ye are bought with a price” (*ἠγοράσθητε*), which price is expressly said by John to be the blood of Christ: “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (*ἠγόρασας*, hast purchased us) by thy blood” (⁴¹¹⁸Revelation 5:9). The ends of redemption are, that the justice of God might be satisfied; his people reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and brought to glory. The properties of it are these:

- (1) it is agreeable to all the perfections of God;
- (2) what a creature never could merit, and therefore entirely of free grace;
- (3) it is special and particular;
- (4) full and complete;
- (5) it is eternal as to its blessings.

See Edwards, *Hist. of Redemption*; Cole, *On the Sovereignty of God*; *Lime-street Lect.* lect. 5; Watts, *Ruin and Recovery*; Owen, *On the Death and Satisfaction of Christ*; Gill, *Body of Divinity*; Pressensd, *Religion*; Goodwin, *Works*; Knapp, *Theology*, p. 331; *Bullet. Theol.* Avril, 1868; Calvin, *Institutes*; *Evangel. Quar. Rev.* April, 1870, p. 290; *Presbyt. Confess.*; Werner, *Gesch. der deutschen Theol.*; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1868; July, 1874, p. 500; Jan. 1876, art. ii; *Presbyt. Quar. Rev.* July, 1875, art. ii; Fletcher, *Works*; *New-Englander*, July, 1870, p. 531; Barnes [Albert], *The Atonement in its Relations to Law and Moral Government* (Phila. 1858, 12mo); *Princeton Rev.* July, 1859; Oct. 1859; *Bibl. Sacra*, Jan. 1858; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 482; Muller, *On Sin*; Pearson, *On the Creed*; Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*; Pin, *Jesus-Christ dans le Plan Divin Ide la Redemptio* (1873). **SEE PROPITIATION**; **SEE RECONCILIATION**; **SEE SATISFACTION**.

Redemptorists Order Of,

Picture for Redemptorists

or “*the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer*,” was established by Alfonso Maria di Liguori (q.v.) in the city of Scala in 1732, and spread first in the kingdom of Naples and in the Papal States. The end of this institute was the association of missionary priests who should minister by special services to the spiritual wants of the abandoned in towns and villages, without undertaking regular ordinary parochial duties. After St. Alfonso had founded several houses of his community. pope Benedict XIV solemnly approved of his rule and institute, under the above title, Feb. 25, 1749. The order rapidly found favor, and was introduced into other countries, chiefly through the instrumentality of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. This man, the first German Redemptorist, was born in Moravia Dec. 26, 1751. He became a baker, and exercised his profession for some years in the Premonstrant convent of Bruck. Here he obtained the favor of the abbot, who made him commence his studies. After studying four years very actively, he left the convent in 1776 with a view to turn hermit. and spent two years at the renowned shrine of Miuhlfrauen. When the hermitages were abolished, he went to Vienna, where he supported himself by working at his former trade. In company with his friend Peter Emanuel Kunzman, who eventually joined the Liguorians as a lay-brother, he made several pilgrimages to Rome, and subsequently completed his studies at Vienna. Here he became acquainted with John Thaddetus Hibel, who was

afterwards his most zealous follower and firm friend. The two friends visited Rome, and together entered the convent of the Priests of the Most Holy Redeemer. The rector of the convent designated them some time after to go to Germany to establish the order there, and thus to supply the place of the Jesuits, who had been expelled. After they had finished the necessary studies, they were ordained. They went in 1785 to Vienna; but as there was no prospect of Joseph II allowing their order to be established in Austria, they turned their attention to Poland. Through the mediation of the papal nuncio Saluzzo, they obtained the church of St. Benno at Warsaw and a dwelling-house, and from this their followers subsequently received in Warsaw the name of *Bennonites*. The priests of the new order, during the first years of their establishment, were in the habit of preaching every Sunday and feast-day in the open air; but as this was subsequently forbidden by the civil authorities, they commenced preaching every Sunday in their church of St. Benno two sermons in Polish, two in German, and one in French. Their activity was rewarded by great success, for in 1796, shortly after they had commenced, the number of their communicants had reached, it is said, 19,000. Natives of Poland, in large numbers, entered the order; and Hoffbauer, during his sojourn in Poland, even opened a seminary for the clergy. In 1794, the order was invited to Mitau, in Courland. and Hoffbauer sent three priests to establish it there. In Warsaw they obtained a second church—that of the Holy Cross. In 1799 the order numbered twenty-five members in that city. As they were at a great distance from Rome, Francis de Paulo had, in 1785, given Hoffbauer full power to establish colleges, receive members, etc.; and in 1792 he appointed him his vicar-general. In 1801 or 1802 they were invited to Switzerland, and in 1803 some of them were sent there. They settled at first on the estate of the duke of Schwarzenberg at the frontier of Switzerland, and afterwards in the village of Jestetten, on Mount Tabor. In August, 1803, Hoffbauer went to Rome, afterwards to Poland, and thence to Mount Tabor. While at the latter place he received a request to send a member of his order to the church at Tryberg, in the Black Forest, a place of pilgrimage. Still the two establishments at Mount Tabor and at Tryberg proved unsuccessful, and were subsequently abandoned. In 1806 Hoffbauer returned to Warsaw; but the very next year proceedings were instituted against the society, their papers searched, and finally the community was suppressed by the military authorities. The fathers were imprisoned in the fort of Kustrin, where they were retained one month, and then sent back two by two to their native country. Hoffbauer retired to

Vienna, where he sought to reunite his order. In 1813 he was appointed confessor and ecclesiastical director of the Ursuline convent of that city, an office which he retained until his death. The church of the convent was soon transformed into a mission church, Hoffbauer's reputation as a confessor became considerable, and he preached, besides, every Sunday in the church of St. Ursula. As he died March 15, 1820, he did not witness the establishing of his order in Austria; although, one month after his death, the Redemptorists were permitted to establish a college, and before the close of the year the emperor granted them a church at Vienna. In the fall of 1826 they formed a branch establishment at Frohnleiten. The Liguorians now continued in Vienna until driven out of it in March, 1848. In Bavaria the king authorized, March 11, 1841, fifteen to twenty members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer to establish themselves at Alt-Oetting. On the other hand, the government became satisfied in 1848 that the Redemptorists and their doctrines would prove dangerous to Bavaria. They were therefore replaced by the Benedictines. The authorities gave as their reasons for this change that the fathers were instilling fanatical views among the people by means of the confessional, and that their preaching excited the lower classes to disorder. A part of the members of the society removed to America after its dissolution, others went to Austria, and some became secular priests. In France the Redemptorists established themselves first at Vischenberg, in the diocese of Strasburg: they were suppressed by the revolution of July, 1830, but succeeded in obtaining their re-establishment, and have at present several establishments in France. The Redemptorists still adhere to the rule of their original constitution. We find in the *Catholic Directory* for England for this year, after mention of their church at Bishop Eton, Liverpool, a memorandum to the effect that "this is not a parochial church — hence the fathers do not baptize children, or assist at marriages and funerals, except in cases of necessity; but they are always ready to hear confessions, visit the sick, administer the sacraments, preach, and instruct." The Redemptorists have also a house at Clapham, Surrey. Of late years they have been busily pursuing their mission in various parts of Ireland. In America they have founded establishments at New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Albany, Buffalo, and Mouzon. According to the *Catholic Directory*, they number over 100 members in this country, about 90 of them priests, who have charge of 20 or more churches, mostly at important centres, viz. New York (2), Rochester, Buffalo, and Elmira, N. Y.; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; Baltimore (4), Annapolis, Ilchester, etc., Md.; New Orleans (3), La.;

Chatawa, Pike County, Miss.; Detroit, Mich.; Chioncgo, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo. They are building a church in Boston; and the large cathedral on Fifth Avenue, New York, which has cost over \$1,000,000, is under their supervision. They have 5 convents in Maryland, with a novitiate and a house of studies, 27 or 28 clerical members (including the provincial, the "Very Rev. Joseph Helmprecht, C.S.S.R."), 5 novices, 36 lay brothers, and 50 students connected with them; 2 houses in New York city, with 14 priests and 2 lay brothers; and houses in other cities, etc., usually with from 4 to 8 priests, besides lay brothers, connected with each. The headquarters is at present at Nocera dei Pagani, in the kingdom of Naples. Their present number, according to the *Statistical Year-book of the Roman Catholic Church*, is about 2000.

There is also a congregation of female Redemptorists, which Liguori instituted in 1732. They had two establishments in Austria — at Vienna and Stein — but these were also abolished in 1848. They have still a house at Bruges, in Belgium. Posl stated in 1844 their possessions as consisting of their colleges in the kingdom of Naples, Sicily, and the Papal States; in Austria, the colleges of Vienna, Eggenberg, Mautern, Frohnleiten, Marburg, Innsbruck, and the hospitals of Leoben and Donaueggen; in Bavaria, the college of Alt-Oetting; in Belgium, that of Liege, St. Trond, Tournay, and the hospital of Brussels; in Holland, the college of Wittem; in America, the colleges of Baltimore and Pittsburgh, and the missionary stations of Albany, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Detroit, Rochester, and New York; in Switzerland, the college of Freiburg; in France, the establishments of Vischenberg, Landser, and one near Nancy; in England, a station at Falmouth. See Posl, *Clemens Maria Hofbauer* (Regensb. 1844); Henrion, *Gesch. d. Monchsorden*; Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* 8:440; Barnum, *Romanism as it Is*, ip. 318, 319.

Redenbacher, Wilhelm

an evangelical German minister and senior of the chapter of Gunzenhausen, was born in 1800, and died July 14, 1876, at Dornhausen. He was a popular Christian writer, and published, *Christliches Allerlei* (Nuremb. 1855, 3 vols.): — *Einfache Betrachtungen, das Ganze der Heilslehre unfassend* (2(1 ed. ibid. 1851): — *Geschichtliche Zeugnisse für den Glauben* (Dresden, 1850, 1858, 2 vols.): — *Kurze Reformations Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1856). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1039; Schneider, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1877, p. 227. (B. P.)

Redford, George, D.D.

an English Congregational minister, was born in London Sept. 27, 1785, and was educated at Hoxton College and the University of Glasgow. His first settlement as a minister was at Uxbridge, where he remained fourteen years. In 1825 he became pastor of the Congregational church at Worcester. In 1855 he was thrown from his carriage, and suffered a nervous shock from which he never recovered. He retired to Edgebaston, near Birmingham, and his congregation at Worcester allowed him £100 per annum. He died May 20, 1860. He was a man of great industry and talent. Faithful in his pastoral work to a remarkable degree, he gave himself largely to literature. He was for some years editor of the *Congregational Magazine*, and was a frequent contributor to the *Eclectic* and to the *British Quarterly Review*. He published, besides a number of minor writings, the *Pastor's Sketch-book* (12mo): — *Holy Scripture Verified*, the Congregational lecture for 1837 (8vo): — *Faith Triumphant* (1841, 12mo): — *The Great Change*, a treatise on conversion (1843, 18mo): — *Body and Soul Considered* (1847, 8vo): — *Life of the Rev. W. Jay*: — *Life of the Rev. J. A. James* (1860, 12mo). He was made D.D. by Amherst College, and LL.D. by the University of Glasgow in 1834. — *English Congregational Year book*, 1861.

Redman (Redmayne), John, D.D.

an English divine, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was a native of Yorkshire, and was born probably in 1499. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and at Paris. He became public orator of the university, master of King's Hall, first master of Trinity College, archdeacon of Taunton, prebend of Wells and of Westminster, and died in 1551. He was one of the most learned men of his age, according to bishop Burnet. Dodd says that "he divided himself between both religions;" but on his death-bed he certainly professed to embrace the cardinal doctrines of the Reformers. He published nothing; but after his death appeared, *Opus de Justificatione* (Antw. 1555, 4to): — *Hymns in quo Peccator Justificationem querens Rudi Imagine describitur*: — *The Complaint of Grace* (1556, 8vo): — *Resolutions concerning the Sacrament*, etc.

Reece, Richard,

a preacher of Methodism in England, who travelled without interruption for a longer period than any other Methodist preacher — no less than fifty-

nine years — and thus figured at one time as the oldest effective Methodist preacher in the world, was born about the year 1765. In 1823 he visited this country with John Hannah as a delegate of the Wesleyans to the Methodist Episcopal Church; and he spent some time here visiting the societies, from Lynn, Mass., to Winchester, Va., and by his and Hannah's profound interest attested the general unity of all Methodists. In 1846 he was obliged to take a supernumerary relation, and he died in 1850. "He was a good, if not a great, preacher," says Stevens, "and a most amiable man. He is still generally remembered, by both English and American Methodists, for his perfect courtesy and his venerable appearance. His person was tall, his complexion ruddy, his head silvered with age, his voice commanding, his language flowing and pertinent, his piety tranquil, and his wisdom in counsel always reliable. He lived to share in the centenary celebration of Methodism, and by proposing that it should be signalized in England by the contribution of a million dollars for its public charities, excited the suspicion that his usual good judgment had suffered from the effect of age; but the people justified his calculation by giving seventy-five thousand dollars more. He was honored with an election to the presidency of the Conference." See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*. ii, 315, 316; 3:236, 308; West, *Sketches of Wesleyan Preachers* (N. Y. 1848); *Wesleyan Magazine*, 1850, p. 652. (J. H. W.)

Reed

Picture for Reed

I. This is the rendering in the A.V. of the following words in the original. In the following account we employ the usual Scriptural and scientific authorities on the subject.

1. Usually *kaneh* (הק; Sept. κάλαμος, καλαμίσκος, καλάμινος, πῆχος, ἀγκών, ζυγός, πυθύνη; Vulg. *culmus*, *calamus*, *arundo*, *fistula*, *statera*), the generic name of a reed of any kind. It occurs in numerous passages of the Old Test., and sometimes denotes the "stalk" of wheat (^{<10405>}Genesis 41:5, 22), or the "branches" of the candlestick (^{<10250>}Exodus 25 and 37); in ^{<183122>}Job 31:22, *kanzeh* denotes the bone of the arm between the elbow and the shoulder (*os humersi*); it was also the name of a measure of length equal to six cubits (^{<36408>}Ezekiel 41:8; 40:5). The word is variously rendered in the A.V. by "stalk," "branch," "bone," "calamus," "reed."

In the New Test. the corresponding Greek word, **κάλαμος**, may signify the “stalk” of plants (^{<4153>}Mark 15:36; ^{<4278>}Matthew 27:48, that of the hyssop, but this is doubtful), or “a reed” (^{<4107>}Matthew 11:7; 12:20; ^{<4374>}Luke 7:24; ^{<4159>}Mark 15:19), or a “measuring-rod” (^{<6105>}Revelation 11:1; 21:15, 16), or a “pen” (^{<6113>}3 John 13).

Strand (*Flor. Palest.* p. 28-30) gives the following names of the reed plants of Palestine: *Saccharum Officiale*, *Cyperus papyrus* (*Papyrus antiquorum*), *C. rotundus*, and *C. esculentus*, and *Arundo scriptoria*; but no doubt the species are numerous. See Bove (*Voyage en Palest., Annal. des Scienc. Nat.* 1834, p. 165): “Dans les deserts qui environnent ces montagnes j’ai trouvé plusieurs *Saccharum*, *Milium arundinaceum* et plusieurs *Cyperaces*.” The *Arundo donax*, the *A. Egyptiaca* (?) of Bove (*ibid.* p. 72), is common on the banks of the Nile, and may perhaps be “the staff of the bruised reed” to which Sennacherib compared the power of Egypt (^{<2182>}2 Kings 18:21; ^{<2316>}Ezekiel 29:6, 7). See also ^{<2418>}Isaiah 42:3. The thick stem of this reed may have been used as walking-staves by the ancient Orientals; perhaps the measuring-reed was this plant. At present the dry culms of this huge grass are in much demand for fishing-rods, etc. **SEE METROLOGY.**

Some kind of fragrant reed is occasionally denoted by the word *kaneh* (^{<2444>}Isaiah 44:24; ^{<2579>}Ezekiel 27:19; ^{<2144>}Song of Solomon 4:14), or more fully by *keneh bosenz* (**μκβθήη**) (see ^{<2123>}Exodus 30:23), or by *kanek hattob* (**בωῤῥי חנך**) (^{<2411>}Jeremiah 6:20), which the A.V. renders “sweet cane,” and “calamus.” Whatever may be the substance denoted, it is certain that it was one of foreign importation, “from a far country” (^{<2411>}Jeremiah 6:20). Some writers (see Sprengel, *Comr. in Dioscor.* 1, 17) have sought to identify the *kaneh bosenz*: with the *Acorns calamus*, the “sweet sedge,” to which they refer the **κάλαμος ἀρωματικός** of Dioscorides (1, 17), the **κάλαμος εὐώδης** of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 4:8, § 4), which, according to this last-named writer and Pliny (*H. N.* 12:22), formerly grew about a lake “between Libanus and another mountain of no note;” Strabo identifies this with the Lake of Gennesaret (*Geog.* 16 p. 755, ed. Kramer). Burckhardt was unable to discover any sweet-scented reed or rush near the lake, though he saw many tall reeds there. “High reeds grow along the shore, but I found none of the aromatic reeds and rushes mentioned by Strabo” (*Syria*, p. 319); but whatever may be the “fragrant reed” intended, it is certain that it did not grow in Syria, otherwise we cannot suppose it

should be spoken of as a valuable product from a far country. Dr. Royle refers the **κάλαμος ἀρωματικός** of Dioscorides to a species of *Andropogon*, which he calls *A. calamus aromaticus*, a plant of remarkable fragrance, and a native of Central India, where it is used to mix with ointments on account of the delicacy of its odor (see Royle, *Illustrations of Himalayan Botany*, p. 425, t. 97). It is possible this may be the “reed of fragrance;” but it is hardly likely that Dioscorides, who, under the term **σχοῖνος**, gives a description of the *Andropogon schoenanthus*, should speak of a closely allied species under a totally different name. **SEE CANE.**

“The beasts of the reeds,” in Psalm 148:30, margin, literally from the Hebrew, but rendered in the text of the A.V. “the company of spearmen,” probably means the crocodiles. Yet for other interpretations see Rosenmuller *ad loc.* Gesenius, *on Isaiah 27, 1*, understands *Babel*. **SEE CROCODILE.**

2. ‘*Aroth* (**תַּרְסָן**; Sept. **τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλόρον πᾶν**) is translated “paper-reed” in ²³⁸⁰Isaiah 19:7, the only passage where the plural noun occurs. There is not the slightest authority for this rendering of the A.V., nor is it at all probable, as Celsius (*Herob.* ii, 230) has remarked, that the prophet, who speaks of the paper-reed under the name *gome* in the preceding chapter (xv3:2), should in this one mention the same plant under a totally different name. “*Aroth*,” says Kimchi, “is the name to designate pot-herbs and green plants.” The Sept. (as above) translates it by “all the green herbage.” The word is derived from ‘*aralh*, “to be bare,” or “destitute of trees;” it probably denotes the open grassy land on the banks of the Nile; and seems to be allied to the Arabic ‘*ara* (*locus apertus, spatiosus*). Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1973), Rosenmuller (*Schol. in Jes.* 19:7), Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v.), Maurer (*Comment.* s.v.), and Simon (*Lex. Heb.* s.v.) are all in favor of this or a similar explanation. Vitringa (*Comment. in Isaiah*) was of opinion that the Hebrew term denoted the papyrus, and he has been followed by J. G. Unger, who has published a dissertation on this subject (*De תַּרְסָן, hoc est de Papyro Frutice* [Lips. 1731, 4to]). **SEE PAPER-REED.**

3. In one passage (Jeremiah li, 32) *agndm* (**מַגְדָּם**; Sept. **σύστημα**, Vulg. *palus*) is rendered “reed” (but elsewhere “pond” or “pool”), and is there thought to designate a *stockade* or fort enclosed by-palisades.

II. Other Hebrew words representing, more or less accurately, various kinds of reedy plants are the following:

1. It has been made a question whether the Hebrew *agmon*', אַגְמוֹן which is mentioned in opposition to the palm-branch (^{231D3}Isaiah 9:13; 19:15), and is translated “rush” in the A.V., does not rather mean *reed*. Both were, and are, used for making ropes (Sonnini, *Trav.* 2, 416; Pliny, 19:9; comp. ^{184D}Job 40:26). See Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, and others; also Celsius, *Hierobot.* 1, 465 sq. **SEE RUSH.**

2. The Hebrew *achu*', אֲחוּ; originally an Egyptian word (see Jerome, *ad* ^{231D7}Isaiah 19:7; comp. Jablonski, *Opusc.* i, 45; ii, 160; Gesen. *Thesaur.* i, 67), occurs in ^{044D}Genesis 41:2; ^{1881B}Job 8:11; in the first place the A.V. has *meadow*, in the second *rush*. It seems to mean, not reed, but “reed-grass,” *Carex* (comp. Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 340 sq.). On the other hand, *suph*, אֵשׁוּפ, ^{101B}Exodus 2:3, 5, growing on the Nile, but distinct from *laneh*, may be the *sari* (Pliny, 13:45). **SEE FLAG.**

3. The word *go'me*, αἰβος Gr. βύβλος, the *papyrus*, *paper-reed* (so rendered, among the old interpreters, by the Sept.; Job *loc. cit.*; ^{231D}Isaiah 18:2; Vulg. ^{231D}Isaiah 18:2; Syr. ^{231B}Isaiah 18:35; Arab. ^{101B}Exodus 2:3. In the Talmud this word means *rush*; comp. Mishna, *Erubin*, 10:14. The leaves were used for binding wounds), does not belong to the genus *Arundo*, and is not a proper reed (called by Pliny, 24:81 *akin to the reed*). It is the *Cyperus papyrus* of Linnaeus, Class. 3 Monogynia. This plant, anciently so important, grew abundantly in the Egyptian swamps (even perhaps in those of the Nile, Pliny, 13:22; comp. v, 8. Hence Ovid, *Miletaph.* 15:753; *Trist.* 3:10:27, calls this river *papyrifer*; comp. *Mart.* 10:1, 3), and is mentioned ^{231D7}Isaiah 35:7; ^{1881B}Job 8:11; ^{101B}Exodus 2:3; ^{231D}Isaiah 18:2. The A.V. has *rush* in the first two places, *bulrush* in the others. It is now rarely met with in Egypt (according to Minutoli, *Abhandl. verm. Inhalts* [Berl. 1831], vol. ii, No. 7, only at Damietta; while Pluver, *Egypt. Naturgesch.* p. 55, says it does not now grow in Egypt), but in Palestine — it is occasionally found at the Jordan (Von Schubert, 3:259). It has a three-edged stalk, which below bears hollow, sword-formed leaves, covering each other; it grows to a height of ten feet or more, and has above a flower cup of reddish leaves, out of which a thick body of hair-like shoots spring up (comp. Theophr. *Plant.* 4:9). The root is as thick as a man's arm, and is used as fuel (Dioscor. i, 115); vessels were framed of the

stalks (^{<0118>}Exodus 2:3; ^{<2382>}Isaiah 18:2; Pliny, 6:24; 7:57, p. 417; Hard. Plutarch, *Isid.* c. 18; Lucan, 4, 136; Rosellini, *Monument. Civ.* II, 3:124; Wilkinson, 3:185 sq.), which sailed very fast (Helidor. *Ethiop.* 10:4). Sails, shoes, ropes, sieves, mattresses, wicks, etc., were made of the green rind (Pliny, 13:22; 18:28; 28:47; Herod. 2, 37; Veget. *Veterin.* 2, 57; Philo, *Op.* 2, 482; comp. Wilkinson, 3:62, 146), but especially paper, on the mode of preparing which comp. Pliny, 13:23 sq. (see Rosellini, *Monument. Civ.* II, 2, 208 sq.; Becker, *Charicles*, 2, 219 sq.). **SEE WRITING.** The plant is now called *berde* or *berdi* by the Arabs (so ^{<3881>}Job 8:11, in the Arabic). **SEE PAPYRUS.**

III. It will thus be seen that the reeds named in the Bible may be popularly distinguished as three.

1. The water-reed in pools, marshes, and on the shores of rivers, as of the Nile (^{<0118>}Exodus 2:3, 5) and of the Jordan (^{<1145>}1 Kings 14:15; ^{<801>}Job 8:11; ^{<3916>}Isaiah 19:6; 35:7). The most common species are *Arundo phragmites* and *Arundo calamagrostis* (comp. Oken, *Botany*, 1. 805). **SEE BULRUSH.**

2. The stronger reed, adapted for staves and canes, and as measuring-rods (^{<3418>}Ezekiel 40:3 sq.; Apoc. 11:1; 21:15 sq.; ^{<1282>}2 Kings 18:21; ^{<3316>}Isaiah 36:6; ^{<3916>}Ezekiel 29:6; ^{<1779>}Matthew 27:29; Mishna, *Shab.* 17:3; Diog. Laert. *Protem.* 6), the *Arundo denax*, whose hard, woody stem reaches a height of eight feet, and is thicker than a man's thumb. This, too, is very frequent on the banks of the Nile (Forskal, *Flora*, p. 24; comp. *Descript. de l'Egypte*, 19:74).

3. The writing-reed (*Arundo scriptoria*) (3 John 13; see Mishna, *Shab.* 8:5). It grows in the marshes between the Euphrates and Tigris; at Hellah, in the Persian Gulf, etc. The stalks are first soaked, then dried, and when properly cut and split make tolerable pens. Formerly the writing-reed grew in Egypt, in Asia Minor, and even in Italy (Pliny, 16:64; Martial, 14:36; comp. Beckmann, *Gesch. der Erfindungen*, 3:48 sq.; see on the Hebrew name, Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2, 312 sq.). — **SEE PEN.**

See, in general, Prosp. Alpin (*Plant. Egypt.* c. 36, p. 53) and Vesling (p. 197) upon it; Rottboll, *Descr. Novar. Plant.* (Hafil. 1773) i, 32 sq.; Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 137 sq.; Bodaei a Stapel, *Comm.* 428 sq.; Bruce, *Travels*, v, 13 sq., 279, with plate i; Montfaucon, in the *Memoires de 'Acad. des Inscript.* 6:592 sq.; Oken, *Botany*, i, 819 sq.

Reed, Alanson

a Baptist missionary, was born in Chesterfield, Mass., in 1807. He pursued his studies at the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution (now Madison University), N. Y.; and was appointed Aug. 3, 1835, as a missionary by the American Baptist Missionary Union to labor among the Chinese living in Bangkok, Siam. Having acquired a knowledge of the language, he took a floating-house on the Meinam, two miles above Bangkok, and began his evangelical labors among the Chinese. While thus occupied, he was stricken down by disease, and died Aug. 29, 1837. (J. C. S.)

Reed, Alexander

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Washington, Pa., Sept. 28, 1832. He was the son of the Hon. Robert R. Reed, a child of the covenant dedicated to God in baptism, and early instructed both by precept and example in the ways of religion. His preparatory education was received in the English department of Washington College, and he graduated at that institute in 1851. After his graduation he went to Georgia and engaged in teaching, and while there joined the Church on a profession of religion under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baker, an eminent evangelist. In 1853 he entered the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh, Pa., and was graduated in 1856. The following year he was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Octorara, Pa. Here his labors were greatly blessed, and the bonds of affection between him and his people greatly strengthened, until the year 1864, when they were dissolved to enable him to accept the pastorate of the Central Church, Philadelphia. This call removed him to a wider sphere, and brought him to a more responsible position in a great city at one of the most critical periods of our national history. His sympathetic nature, ready and effective oratory, very soon attracted attention, and other duties than those merely of the pastorate were soon laid upon him. He was active and influential in the organization of the "Christian Commission," the spirit and object of which appealed to his sympathies and patriotic impulses, and some of his most stirring and powerful addresses were made in behalf of this great interest. He was not only alive to all the duties connected with his pastorate, but to all the general social and moral interests of the community. He gave to all the boards of the Church his zealous and faithful support, and at one time his personal attention as president of the Board of Ministerial Relief and also

the Board of Publication. In the year 1873 Dr. Reed was called to the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., and in accepting this call he threw himself with all his accustomed ardor into the labors of his new field. At the end of two years he was obliged, from declining health, to resign his charge. With the hope of regaining his health, he spent a year and a half in Europe, but he returned without any perceptible change for the better. Thinking that the dry and bracing air of Colorado might prove beneficial, he accepted the pastorate of the church in Denver City. Though in feeble health, he labored among that people, and greatly endeared himself to them by his affectionate nature and eminent pulpit ability. But his work was evidently done, and he was obliged to relinquish the active duties of the pastoral office. He was one of the most genial and companionable of men; a smile of heavenly sunshine played around his features and kindled in his eye, and no amount of sickness could cloud the sunshine or stop the exuberant flow of his feelings. He seemed to have caught the light and lived in the glory of the better world. Dr. Reed was a godly man, a man of faith and prayer. He devoted himself wholly to the work of the ministry because he loved it. All his faculties were alive and active in the great cause in which he was engaged. By his strong power of will he seemed to hold the forces which were moving upon life's citadel in check until his brother, Dr. T. B. Reed, who was on his way to visit him in his distant home, might reach him. When he arrived, and he had committed to him the charge of his beloved wife and children, in perfect peace he laid himself down to die. He died at Denver, Col., Nov. 18, 1878. (W.P.S.)

Reed, Andrew

D.D., an English Independent divine, noted as one of the greatest philanthropists of our age, was born in 1788 at London, where his father, a pious man, was a watchmaker in Butcher Row, St. Clement's Danes. Many a time, it is said, Andrew's mother would keep the shop while his father was off on a preaching tour; for he was much given to itinerating in the suburban towns, proclaiming among the benighted "the truth as it is in Jesus," and so interested became he in this glorious work that Mrs. Reed found it needful to provide for the family herself by opening a china-shop, which she kept for twenty years in Chiswell Street. Young Andrew was brought up in the trade of his father, and no one supposed that he would ever leave watch-making to go on the same errand as his father. Sent to a school in Islington to get such an education as was needful for an ordinary artisan, Andrew evinced a predilection not only for all study, but especially

for the dead languages. He begged to be allowed to study Greek and Hebrew. The careful mother, anxious to prevent her son's defection-for she hoped from him support in the business his father had so much neglected -took him finally from school and apprenticed him to a master. But the temptation of books was a very harmless one compared with the temptations of another kind that awaited Andrew in his new situation. His master's son was a wild youth, and the young apprentice entered on his diary the following: "By the wicked behavior of my master's son I was made still worse. I went twice or thrice to the accursed play-houses." On this account he got his indentures cancelled and returned to the parental roof. Working the usual hours at watchmaking, in his leisure he kept his mother's books, instructed his sister, and taught a little orphan girl, their servant, to read and write — thus early beginning his orphan work. Books, books, evermore books, were the choice friends of his leisure hours; and though he worked well at his trade, his good mother in her diary might well write down, "These are things which, if the lad be for business. show too much taste for study." She was so far right that God was leading him through secular to sacred pursuits. Andrew Reed's Hebrew and Greek studies led him to theology, and his joy knew no bounds when it was decided in the family counsels that he might go to college. He dismantled his little workshop, sold his tools, and laid out the money in books. He entered Hackney Seminary, a collegiate and theological school of the Independents. It is needless to say that when he was ready to graduate his record was already begun as a preacher. He had many invitations to settle. Among other calls was that of colleague to the celebrated preacher Matthew Wilks (q.v.) at the Tabernacle. But Reed gave the preference to the church in the New Road, East London, where he remained the pastor for half a century. He resigned the place on Nov. 27, 1861, the anniversary of his birth and of his ordination. He died Feb. 25, 1862, happy to the last and conscious of his Master's love. Rarely, if ever, was such a record closed as this event ended. More than most men — even Christian ministers — Dr. Reed seems to have lived in the presence of some great public purpose, and to have consecrated, or rather sacrificed, all things to its accomplishment. Thus we read in the *Memoir*' published by his sons (Lond. 1863) that at times he was so engrossed that he would not dine with his family for a week. "In the last four years," he writes in his diary, "I have been four hundred times to Earlswood [asylum for idiots]; each time has consumed the best part of a day, so that I may fairly say that it has cost me a whole year." Indeed, nothing less than a consecration like this could

have accomplished Dr. Reed's work. He must, moreover, have combined the physical strength of a giant with the powerful will of the Christian philanthropist. He was one of the most successful and popular preachers of his day — the laborious pastor of one of the largest churches in the metropolis; and yet he found time to originate not only the Hackney Grammar-school, but five great national benevolent institutions — viz. the London Orphan Asylum, the Infant Orphan Asylum at Wanstead, the Asylum for Fatherless Children at Reedham, the Idiot Asylum at Earlswood, with its branch establishment at Colchester, and the Hospital for Incurables. The aggregate cost of their erection was £129,320; they accommodate 2110 objects of charity; and their total receipts under his administration amounted to the respectable sum of £1,043,566 13s. *ld.* Emphatically was his "a life, with deeds to crown it." Andrew Reed began his work among the seafaring population of London. He befriended the parents, established schools for the children, and founded the first penny bank for savings. Besides these stupendous works of faith and labors of love, he founded a Home for Incurables; and, not forgetting the interests of education while employed in helping the helpless, he was the friend of the Hackney Grammar-school, and always the active promoter of Sabbath and day schools for the children of the industrial classes. He not only refused all remuneration for his great services, but contributed, besides, a large part of his yearly income in charity. The five asylums that he founded alone received from his hand £4540. When he opened a chapel he was ever ready with his £10, £20, and even £50, to encourage its friends to discharge a debt incurred in its erection. He lived in the most simple way, that he might have the more to give to him that needed. His remarkable success in his vast and varied enterprises he owed to his extraordinary business powers, his great sagacity, and his determined will. Few men saw more clearly what was to be done, or knew better how to do it. One record strikingly exhibits the stern kind of discipline that he was wont to exercise upon himself, and the resolute determination with which he concentrated his energies upon his object:

"The measure of mercy is the measure of obligation. Of the course I should take at present I see nothing. All is dark. very dark. Work which I had thought to do is now abandoned. This one thing is left me, and I will do it. For discipline I will do it. I have naturally a love for the beautiful, and a shrinking, almost a loathing, of infirmity and deformity. The thing I would not do is the very thing I

am now resolved to do. Alas! poor idiot! while he is the greater sufferer, I am the greater sinner.”

His benevolence was both a natural enthusiasm and a sacred religious duty, and whatever his warm heart prompted, his clear head conceived and his strong hand executed. A keen discriminator of character, he knew how to bend the wills of others to his purpose. As a speaker, he was endowed with very great power of eloquence. After the fashion of his generation, he was somewhat rhetorical and magniloquent, but there was a mighty power of passion in him. His *Sermons and Charges*, recently published, contain specimens of a very high order of pulpit eloquence; and few sermons of modern times have produced a greater effect than his missionary sermon at Surrey Chapel. His power in the pulpit was attested by his own crowded chapel, and by the large numbers whom he admitted to his Church fellowship. He was a polemic of no mean power — “a sharp threshing-instrument having teeth;” and perhaps Earl Russell never listened to a more powerful or skilful storm of rhetoric than at the British and Foreign School meeting in Exeter Hall, when Dr. Reed claimed him as a leader in opposition to Sir J. Graham’s Factories Bill. Dr. Reed’s power of work was immense; his recreation was change of benevolent employment, either the energetic prosecution of some philanthropic scheme or a campaign of provincial preaching. Amid all his literary and other labors, he did not think of writing his life. One of his sons, perceiving that his venerable father was fast failing, asked him if he had ever arranged any memoir. Dr. Reed replied by writing the following note:

“To my saucy boy who said he would write my life, and asked for materials:

A.R.

I WAS BORN YESTERDAY;
I SHALL DIE TO-MORROW:
AND I MUST NOT SPEND TO DAY
IN TELLING WHAT I HAVE DONE,
BUT IN DOING WHAT I MAY FOR
HIM
WHO HAS DONE ALL FOR ME.

I SPRANG FROM THE PEOPLE; I HAVE LIVED FOR THE
PEOPLE —

THE MOST FOR THE MOST UNHAPPY;
AND THE PEOPLE, WHEN THEY KNOW IT,
WILL NOT ALLOW ME TO DIE OUT OF LOVING REMEMBRANCE.”

What can be added to such a summary? “It is not surprising that the sons of Dr. Andrew Reed should wish to publish the history of his life of goodness and active benevolence — though, in fact, the permanent records of his character and works exist in the many institutions which owe their existence to his activity and devotion.” These are the words of the queen of England in reference to a man who was the honored instrument of doing such a vast amount of good that his name undoubtedly ranks among the first philanthropists of the age. Dr. Reed wrote many works in *practical* theology, principally on practical religion — all of which have had a most extensive circulation, and of which a list is given in Allibone. Dr. Reed is the author of many hymns, among which is the one beginning “There is an hour when I must part.” In 1835 he visited this country as a representative of the Congregational Union of Britain, and made many friends here. On his return home, he wrote on his *Visit to the American Churches*, and the work was republished here (N.Y. 1835, and often). See, besides, the *Memoir* (Lond. 1863, small 8vo; 3d ed. 1867); *London Reader*, 1863, ii, 724; *London Patriot*. Dec. 17, 1863; *Eclectic and Congregational Rev.* Jan. 1864; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Grant, *Metropolitan Pulpit*, 1839, ii, 265-278; *Men of the Times* (1862), p. 648.

Reed, Caleb

an American divine, who belonged to the New Jerusalem Church, was born in 1797. He entered the ministry, but was finally made editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, and continued its management for twenty years. He died in 1854. His publications were of a secular character.

Reed, Fitch

D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose memory is precious in all the communities where he has resided, was born March 28, 1795. His early Christian training was under Calvinistic influences, but, in his nineteenth year, while studying medicine, he was converted under the labors of the Rev. Marvin Richardson, and accepted Arminian doctrines as preferable. In 1815 he was licensed to preach, and was employed upon a circuit by Dr. Nathan Bangs, then presiding elder. In 1817 he was admitted into the New York Conference, and was sent to the extreme eastern point

of Long Island. His second appointment was Dunham Circuit, in Canada East, which offered him all the hardships which the severity of a northern winter, a new country, unimproved and sometimes almost impassable roads, a poor people, and ill-constructed loghuts could afford. Of this he himself told, as follows, in a semi-centennial sermon: "I did at first wonder that my lot had fallen just here, and thought that possibly, after all, the bishop had made a mistake; yet the harsh climate, the hard work, and plenty of it, and harder fare were just what Infinite Wisdom saw I needed. I praise the Lord to this day for Dunham Circuit; it saved me from an early grave." His next field of labor was in the wilderness lying north of Lake Ontario. To this region he was sent as the first minister of the Gospel, within about twelve months after the first settlement had been made. He established his appointments, organized his circuit, which he travelled on foot, making his way through the trackless forest by the aid of a compass, and carrying with him" an Indian hatchet, as a defence against wild beasts and as a means of constructing bridges over streams of water too deep to ford." From 1820 to 1828 Mr. Reed was a member of Genesee Conference. He filled some of its most important stations, and, when twenty-eight years of age, was appointed presiding elder of Susquehanna District. After eight years he was again transferred to New York Conference and stationed at Rhinebeck, and subsequently in New York city, Brooklyn, Poughkeepsie, and other important fields of labor, including New Haven District. In 1848 he was transferred to Oneida Conference, to which he gave fourteen years of effective service, including seven years in the office of presiding elder. In the year 1862 he was compelled by increasing bodily infirmities to retire to the superannuated relation, and thereafter, though his love for the work never abated, he preached only as health and opportunity would permit. He died Oct. 10, 1871, leaving behind the record of a life well spent in the service of his heavenly Master. See *Christian Advocate*, Dec. 9, 1871.

Reed, John

(1), D.D., an American Unitarian divine, was born in Framingham, Mass., Nov. 11, 1751, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1772. He studied for the ministry, and became pastor at Bridgewater, Mass., in 1780. He finally took interest in political affairs, and was a member of Congress from 1794 to 1800. He died Feb. 17, 1831. He published various sermons and theological treatises of passing value. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:143.

Reed, John

(2), D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Wickford, R. I., about 1777. He had his thoughts early turned towards the ministry, and went to Union College with a view to greater efficiency in the sacred work. On May 27, 1806, he was made a deacon, and on June 17, 1808, priest. His first pastorate was at St. Luke's Church, Catskill, N. Y. In 1810 he became rector at Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, and there preached for thirty-five years, in his latter years having the aid of an assistant. He died July 6, 1845. A tablet, erected in the church by the vestry, records the high respect and veneration in which he was held by his parish. He was a careful observer, a diligent student, a man of God, and an acceptable preacher. "His whole demeanor," said the Rev. Dr. John Brown, of Newburgh, N. Y., at the funeral service, "showed that his [Reed's] best treasure was in heaven." He published a small work in defence of episcopacy, and two or three separate *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 506-509; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Reed, Joseph

a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Waterbury, Conn., about 1845. In 1869 he was ordained at Troy, N.Y., and, after supplying a mission at Birmingham, Conn., and serving as a curate at the cathedral in Providence, R. I., was appointed secretary and chancellor of the diocese of Hartford, Conn. He died in 1877.

Reed, Nelson

a pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ann Arundel County, Md., Nov. 27, 1751. Nothing positive is known of his early history. In 1779 his name appears on the minutes as a travelling preacher, and he is believed to have thus preached for four years. His appointments were, in 1779 to Fluvanna; in 1780, Amelia; in 1781, Calvert; in 1782, Little York; in 1783, Caroline; in 1784, Dover. From 1785 to 1795 he had the charge of districts in Maryland and Virginia. In 1796 he was stationed at Fell's Point; in 1797, at Baltimore city; in 1798, at Fell's Point again; in 1799, on Baltimore Circuit. In 1800 his name is found among those "who are under a location through illness of body or family concerns," and it disappears now from the minutes until 1805, when we find him again on the Baltimore Circuit. The next year he was placed in

charge of the Federal and Annapolis Circuit. In 1807, 1808, 1809, and 1810 he presided over the Baltimore District, on which were stationed at that time some of the strong men of the itinerancy. In 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1814 he presided over the Georgetown District. In 1815 we find him on the Baltimore District again, where he presided four years. In 1819 he stands connected with the Baltimore Circuit as a supernumerary. In 1820 his name appears on the super-annuated list; in this relation he continued till the close of his life. At the time of his death, which occurred Oct. 20, 1840, he was the oldest Methodist preacher in Europe or America. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1840; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:68-70.

Reed, Sampson

a Swedenborgian of note as a writer especially, was born at West Bridgewater, Mass., in 1800, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1818. He became editor of the *New Church Magazine* and co-editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, and died in 1875. He published *Observations*.

Reed, Samuel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union County, O., Nov. 18, 1816. He entered the ministry in 1838, and was sent to the Peru Circuit as a supply. He was admitted into the Conference, and travelled Auburn Mission in 1839-40, Frankfort in 1841-42, Vincennes in 1843. Evansville in 1844, Bedford in 1845, North Indiana Conference, Covington, in 1846-47. This fall he went to St. Louis and remained one year, returned with impaired health, and was superannuated for five years following. He was again made effective and appointed to New Harmony in 1853, to Petersburg in 1854, to New Albany in 1855, and to Bedford in 1856, where he remained to the close of that conference year, when he superannuated a second time. He declined in health, but lingered on until Feb. 6, 1869. — *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869, p. 187, 188.

Reelai'ah

(Heb. *Reelayah'*, **hyl** [**ε**] *fearer of Jehovah*; Sept. **Ῥεελίας**), one of "the children of the province" who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel ([Ⓢ]Ezra 2:2); called in the parallel passage ([Ⓢ]Nehemiah 7:7) by the synonym RAAMIAH *SEE RAAMIAH* (q.v.).

Reel'ius

(Ῥεελίας v. r. Βορολίαις), one of the Israelites who returned with Zerubbabel, from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:8); inserted in place of the BIGVAI of the Hebrew lists (~~ESRA~~ Ezra 2:2; ~~NEHEMIAH~~ Nehemiah 7:7) by confusion for the *Reelaiah* of Ezra's list.

Rees, Abraham, D.D.,

a dissenting minister who held a distinguished rank in the literary and scientific world, was the son of a Welsh Nonconformist minister, and was born at Montgomery in 1743. Intended for the ministry, he was first placed under Dr. Jenkins, of Carmarthen, whence he was removed to the Hoxton Academy, founded by Mr. Coward, where his progress in his studies was so rapid that in his nineteenth year he was appointed mathematical tutor to the institution, and soon after resident tutor, in which capacity he continued upwards of twenty-two years. In 1768 he succeeded Mr. Read as pastor to the Presbyterian congregation of St. Thomas's, Southwark. On the death of Mr. White, in 1783. Rees accepted an invitation to become minister of a congregation in Jewin Street, Cripplegate, where he continued to officiate till the time of his death, June 9, 1825. On the establishment of the dissenting seminary at Hackney in 1786, Dr. Rees, who had, in conjunction with Dr. Y. Savage and Kippis, seceded from that at Hoxton two years before, was elected to the situation of resident tutor in the natural sciences. This position he held till the dissolution of the academy, which took place on the death of Dr. Kippis (q.v.). It is, however, in a literary capacity that Dr. Rees is principally and most advantageously known. In 1776 he was applied to by the proprietors of *Chambers's Encyclopedia* to superintend a new and enlarged edition of that valuable compilation, which, after nine years' incessant labor, he brought to a conclusion in four folio volumes. The success of this work stimulated the proprietors to still further exertions. A new undertaking, similar in its nature, but much more comprehensive in its plan, and printed in quarto size, was projected and carried on by him; and he had at length the satisfaction to see the new *Cyclopedia*, now generally known by his name, advance from the publication of the first volume in 1802 to its completion in forty-five volumes with undiminished reputation. His other works, besides those of a secular character, are, *Practical Sermons* (1809-12, 2 vols.): — *The Principles of the Protestant Dissenters Stated and Vindicated*: — besides a variety of occasional discourses. See Jones,

Christian Biography, p. 357; *Annual Biography*, 1825; *London Gentleman's Magazine*, 1825.

Reesai'as

(**Ρησαΐας**), given (1 Esdras 5:8) in place of the above REELIAH (~~ⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓⲁ~~ Ezra 2:2) or RAAMIAH (~~ⲕⲁⲙⲓⲁ~~ Nehemiah 7:7).

Reese, E. Yates

D.D., a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, but especially noted as a writer, was born about the year 1820. He early entered the ministry, and, after filling many positions of prominence in the pastorate, became editor of the Methodist Protestant newspaper at Baltimore, and was in this position until, in 1860, in a fit of mental derangement, he committed suicide. *The Lutheran* of Philadelphia thus commented at the time: "Dr. Reese was one of the noblest and most genial of men. His paper was among the very best of the denominational organs in our country; but it was much more than a denominational organ, immeasurably more than a sectarian one. He drew around him many admirable writers, not only of his own Church, but of other churches, but no pen among them all was so versatile, so happy, as his own. He was a poet and an orator, who consecrated every gift to the service of the Saviour of men. His consecration had a wonderful charm. His delicacy of feeling, his fine tact, his generosity and large catholicity of feeling, made him very dear to all that knew him." Such testimony from another denomination is surely rare; but it was reprinted also by the *Reformed Messenger* of the German Reformed Church, and thus given still further approval than the bounds of one outside denomination.

Reese, Levi R.

a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Harford County, Md.. Feb. 8, 1806, enjoyed a good preparatory training, and taught school for a while after he was seventeen. When about twenty years of age he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, but shortly after the agitation opened which resulted in the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church, he was, it is said, the first preacher appointed by the new body. The first three years of his ministerial life were spent at Philadelphia and New York. In 1833 he was appointed by the Maryland Annual Conference to labor in Alexandria, Va., and there succeeded so

well that he was successively given “every important position and every official position within the gift of the body with which he was connected.” He was for two years president of the Church, and repeatedly a representative in their General Conference. In 1837 and 1838 he was chaplain to the United States Congress. He died in Philadelphia Sept. 21, 1851. He was highly esteemed as a preacher, and the seals of his ministry are all through Maryland. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:751-754.

Reese, Thomas

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1742, was educated at the College of New Jersey, class of 1768, and became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Salem, S. C., and subsequently of two churches in Pendleton District, S. C. He died in 1796. He published, *Essay on the Influence of Religion on Civil Society* (1788): — *Farewell Sermon: Two Sermons* (in the *American Preacher*, vol. i and ii). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3:331.

Reeve, Thomas, D.D.,

an Anglican divine of the 17th century, flourished as preacher of Waltham Abbey, Essex. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 1632, 4to): — *Sermons* (1647, 4to): — *Public Devotions* (1651, 12mo): — *God's Plea for Nineveh, or London's Precedent for Mercy*, delivered in certain sermons, etc. (1657, fol.); “An extraordinary work, very severe in lashing and exposing the vices of the age; the sermons are a very lively picture of London manners now unknown;... this is one of the scarcest books in English theology” (Beloe, *Anec.* iii. 80-84): — an abridgment, entitled *London's Remembrancer*, was published soon afterwards: — *Sermons* (1660, 4to): — *England's Backwardness*, etc., a sermon (1661, 8vo): *Discourses* (1661, 4to): *Sermon* (1661, 4to): — *England's Restitution, etc.*: — *Sermons* (1661, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* sv.

Reeves, William

an Anglican divine, was born in 1668, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, of which he was made a fellow. He took holy orders, and in 1694 became rector of Cranford, Middlesex, and in 1711 vicar of St. Mary, Reading. He died in 1726. He published, *Sermons* (1704, 4to): — *Sermon*

(1706, 4to): — *The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix in Defence of the Christian Religion, with the Commonitory of Vincentius Lirinensis concerning the Primitive Rule of Faith* (transl., with notes and a preliminary discourse upon each author, Lond. 1709-16, 2 vols. 8vo). “The translation is generally perspicuous and faithful. The notes contain a good deal of learning, and frequently illustrate the meaning where it is obscure. The preliminary dissertation may be considered an answer to the valuable work of Daille on the same subject” (Orme). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Refectory

the dining-hall of a monastery, college, etc. The internal arrangements and fittings were very similar to those of the ordinary domestic halls, except that it was usually provided with a raised desk or pulpit, from which on some occasions one of the inmates of the establishment read to the others during meal-time. There are remains of old English refectories at Chester and Worcester now used as a schoolhouse, at Carlisle and Durham as a library, and at Beaulieu as a church. Portions of the beautiful arcaded walls of one remain at Peterborough. It was usually as at Lanercost and Rievale, raised upon cellarage, which at Cluigny contained the bath-rooms; and in Benedictine friars’ and regular canons’ houses it lay parallel to the minster, in order that the noise and fumes of dinner might not reach the sanctuary; but in most Cistercian houses, as Beaulieu, Byland, Ford, Netley, Tintern, Rievale, Furness, and Kirkham, Maulbronn, Clairvaux, Braisne, Savigny, and Bonport, it stood at right angles to the cloister, as it did in the Dominican convents of Toulouse and Paris. A few foreign monastic refectories were of two alleys, as Tours, Alcobaga, the Benedictines’, and St. Martin des Champs at Paris. At St. Alban’s an abbot, on his resignation, went to reside in a chamber which he had fitted up under the refectory. The usual dinner-hour was three P. M. The small bell rang and the monks came out from the parlor and washed at the lavatory, and then entered the hall, two and two, taking their appointed places at the side-tables. At the high-table on the dais the superior sat, in the centre of the east wall, under a cross, a picture of the *Doom*, or the *Last Supper*, having the squilla-bell on his right hand, which he rang at the beginning and end of dinner. Usually the number of each mess varied between three and ten persons. Each monk drew down his cowl and ate in silence. While the hebdomadaries or servers of the week laid the dishes, the reader of the week began the lection from Holy Writ or the lives of saints in the wall pulpit. During dinner all the

gates were closed, and no visitors were admitted. After dinner the broken fragments were sent down to the almonry for the poor and sick, and the brethren either took the meridian sleep, talked in the calefactory, read, or walked, but in some houses went in procession to the cemetery and prayed a while bareheaded among the graves of the brotherhood. At Durham the frater-house was used only on great occasions. It was fitted with benches and mats. The ordinary fare was pulse, fruit, vegetables, bread, fish, eggs, cheese, wine, or ale; and the evening meal, the *biberes*, collation, *mistum*, or *caritas*, consisted of bread and wine, and was followed by prayer in church before bedtime. The dinner-hour at length became put back to noon, and the supper was continued at the old time, about five P. M. At the entrance of the hall there was a large ambry for the mazers, cups, and plate. The Clugniacs distributed the unconsecrated hosts in hall. The *Last Supper* of Leonardo da Vinci, painted for the Dominicans of Milan, represents the high-table of a refectory of the order. French or Latin only was allowed to be spoken in hall or cloister, and in 1337 meat was not eaten on Wednesdays and Saturdays during Advent, or from Septuagesima to Easter-day. The hall of a guest-house was lined with beds at Clugny and Farfa, for men on one side and for women on the other, while movable tables down the centre were laid out at mealtime.

Refine

The art of refining, as referred to in Scripture, was of two different kinds, according as it was applied to liquids or to metals; and the processes, in themselves quite diverse. are expressed by different words. — In respect to liquids the primary idea was that of *straining* or filtering — the word for which was **q̄q̄z**; *za* (*akdk* (^{<22816>}Isaiah 25:6); but in respect to metals it was that of *netting*, and thereby separating the ore from the dross and for this the word was **ārk**; *tsaraph*. But the first word also in the course of time came to be used of gold or other metals, to denote their refined or pure state (^{<1338>}1 Chronicles 28:18; 29:4; ^{<1830>}Job 28:1; ^{<19116>}Psalms 12:6; ^{<3083>}Malachi 3:3). In figurative allusions, however, to the idea of refining, while both words might have been employed, we find almost exclusive use made of that which points to the more searching process of purification by fire (^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25; 40:19; 48:10; Zechariah 13:9; ^{<3083>}Malachi 3:2, 3). Hence the term “refiner” or *smelter* (**ārk̄***tsoreph*; **ārk̄m***]**metsareph*, ^{<3083>}Malachi 3:2, 3) denotes a worker in metals, specially of gold and silver (^{<1254>}Proverbs 25:4). a founder (^{<0774>}Judges 17:4), a goldsmith (^{<2347>}Isaiah

41:7). That the ancients acquired, in comparatively remote times, some knowledge and skill in this art, as in the working of metals generally, admits of no doubt. *SEE METAL*. The Egyptians carried the working of metals to an extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewelry preserved in museums evince; and there is no doubt that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source — though there is evidence that the art of working in copper and iron was known before the flood (^{<0042>}Genesis 4:22). The Egyptian monuments also give various representations on the subject, and in particular exhibit persons blowing at the fire, with a pot of metal on it, in order to raise it to a melting heat. *SEE BELLOWS*. The creation of a heat sufficiently intense for the purpose was the chief element in the process of refining, although, probably, borax and other substances were applied to expedite and perfect the result. The refiner's art was especially essential to the working of the precious metals. It consisted in the separation of the dross from the pure ore, which was effected by reducing the metal to a fluid state by the application of heat, and by the aid of solvents, such as alkali (רבא.V. “purely,” ^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25) or lead (^{<2469>}Jeremiah 6:29), which, amalgamating with the dross, permitted the extraction of the unadulterated metal. The Hebrews evidently understood the process of melting the metals, not only to make them fluid for the purpose of casting, but also for separating from the precious metals the mixed common minerals, such as silver from the lead ore with which it was combined (^{<3028>}Ezekiel 22:18-22; 24:11). The instruments required by the refiner were a crucible or furnace (רװק) and a bellows or blowpipe (j Pmi). The workman sat at his work (^{<3038>}Malachi 3:3, “He shall sit as a refiner”); he was thus better enabled to watch the process, and let the metal run off at the proper moment. *SEE MINE*. The notices of refining are chiefly of a figurative character, and describe moral purification as the result of chastisement (^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25; ^{<3030>}Zechariah 13:9; ^{<3030>}Malachi 3:2, 3). The failure of the means to effect the result is graphically depicted in ^{<2469>}Jeremiah 6:29: “The bellows glow with the fire (become quite hot from exposure to the heat); the lead (used as a solvent) is expended (vaṁquTi [keri]); the refiner melts in vain, for the refuse will not be separated.” The refiner appears, from the passage whence this is quoted, to have combined with his proper business that of assaying metals: “I have set thee for an assayer” (װׁב;A.V. “a tower,” ver. 27). *SEE FINING-POT*.

Reformatio, Legum Ecclesiasticarum

a code of *Church law*, first projected by Cranmer at the commencement of his primacy, and accomplished, after various impediments (1551), by a sub-committee of bishops, divines, canonists, and secular doctors of the law. It was ready to be submitted to king Edward, but his sudden decease prevented the royal confirmation, and so the project came to an end. The work, consequently, is not, and never was, of any authority; but it is a valuable record, as throwing a clear light on the views of the Reformers. It not only reveals their plans with respect to canonical jurisprudence, but their opinions on Christian doctrine.

Reformation

THE, is the name commonly given to the religious and ecclesiastical movement of the 16th century which resulted in the overthrow of the then allpowerful authority of the Roman popes in a large portion of the Christian world, and in the construction of a number of new religious organizations. The name itself is highly significant, and points to the importance of the new departure in the history of Christianity which then began. It has come into quite general use even among Roman Catholic writers, although the theologians of that Church have attempted to substitute for it other terms, like the “so-called Reformation,” and the “separation of the Church.” We have already had occasion in numerous articles of this *Cyclopedia* to refer to detached portions of the Reformation. The Church history of no important country of Europe could be complete without a mention of its reformatory movements, wdnhether they were successful or unsuccessful, and the biographies of the great fathers of the Reformation consist chiefly of an account of their labors in behalf of the reconstruction of the Church upon a new basis. The present article treats of the great turning-point in the history of Christianity as a whole.

I. Forerunners of the Reformation. — Like most of the great events in the history of mankind, the Reformation has had its preparatory history, in which attempts of a similar nature were made for the same purpose, meeting with no or but partial success, but yet smoothing the way for the marvellous changes which were achieved by the victorious reformation of the 16th century.

1. All the Reformed churches which have sprung from the movements of the 16th century are agreed in regarding the undue power which the bishops of Rome at an early time began to arrogate to themselves, and the centralized constitution which consequently was forced upon the Christian Church, as one of the most fatal deviations from the doctrines of the Bible and the practice and the life of the apostolic age. In a wider sense of the word, all the efforts, therefore, which have been made to repress and abolish the arrogant and encroaching power of the Roman popes, and to bring back the Church to its purity in the time of her founder and his first disciples, might be called preparatory and forerunning movements of the great Reformation. These movements have been manifold and widely different in their origin, progress, and ramifications, and each of them has to be individually judged by its own character and history. Indeed, throughout the Middle Ages, even when the power of the papacy was most despotic and absolute, a reformatory tendency was pervading the Church, often confining itself to secrecy and occult labors, but frequently bursting the bonds of the Church, proclaiming its reformatory principles in public, and defying the ire of an enraged hierarchy. Some of these outbursts ran smoothly on in the channels of a purely evangelical belief; others became impregnated with fanatical, sometimes even anti-Christian, elements, and threatened with a common overthrow both the State and the Church of the times. Among the more prominent reformatory movements in the earlier part of the Middle Ages were those of the Albigenses, the Cathari, and the Waldenses, to all of which (and many others) this *Cyclopaedia* devotes special articles.

In the latter part of the Middle Ages, the deviation of the ruling Church from Scripture and primitive Christianity became more and more glaring, and the corruption among all classes of the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, more and more general. The call for a “reformation in the head and members” spread rapidly, and even great nations began to look upon the reformation of the Church as a national cause. It has been justly remarked that the meaning given to the term “reformation in the head and members” was by no means uniform, and that “every one understood it to mean primarily that which he most desired — the removal of what seemed to him most oppressive and unchristian.” All malcontents, however, appeared to agree in regarding the administration of the Christian Church by the papal court as utterly depraved, and as subversive of true Christianity.

The efforts made for putting an end to papal misrule and achieving a reformation of the Church were chiefly of two kinds. The one class found the seat of the degeneration not so much in a departure from the doctrine of the Bible as in the usurpation by the popes of greater power than belonged to them by divine and Church right. These men stroligly believed in the continuity of the visible Church; they rejected the right of separation and secession, and looked upon the oecumenical councils of the Church as the only medium through which the needed reformation of the Church should be effected. This school had for a long time a centre in the most famous literary institution of the Church — the University of Paris. Its chief representatives were Peter d’Ailly, the chancellor, his pupil Gerson, and Nicolas de Climanges, rector of that university. The hearty support of many of the foremst princes of the age, including several emperors, was secured, and at the three great councils of Pisa, Constance. and Basle the majority of the assembled bishops and theologians expressed their concurrence in these views, and earnestly endeavored to effect a radical reformation on this basis. Thejoyous hopes which had been raised in the Church by these reformatory efforts were, however, sorely disappointed when the pope succeeded in dissolving the Council of Basle.

Much more thorough than this class of reformers were a second, who not only turned against papal usurpations in the government of the Church, but also by a study of the Scriptures were led to look upon the entire doctrinal system of the Church, as it had gradually developed under the misguidance of the popes, as an apostasy from the Christianity of the Bible, and who therefore believed that, more than a reformation in its head and members, the Church needed a reformation in its spirit and doctrines. The foremost representatives of this: school were Wycliffe in England, and Huss in Bohemia. To Wycliffe the papacy appeared as anti-Christianity, and the papal power, in his opinion, was not derived from God, but from the emperor. He rejected altogether the existing hierarchical constitution of the Church, and advocated the substitution for it of the presbyterial constitution as he believed it to have existed in the apostolical age. To the traditions of the Church he absolutely denied an authoritative character, and declared the whole Scripture to be the only source and rule of religious knowledge. Huss derived his views of Church reform largely from Wycliffe, and in 1410 was excommunicated from the Church as a Wycliffite. One of the central doctrines of the reformation of’ the 16th century rose, however, in his system to greater prominence, and he also

resembled his great followers more than Wycliffe by arousing the masses of the people in behalf of reform. Neither Wycliffe nor Huss succeeded in carrying through a reformation. When the English government, which had protected Wycliffe during his lifetime from personal injury, began a bloody persecution against his followers, most of whom were found in the higher classes and among the men of learning, the reformatory movement in England came to a sudden standstill. The reformatory ideas of Huss appeared for a time to gain complete control of an entire country, and thus to establish a stronghold of evangelical Christianity: in the centre of Europe. But internal dissensions and the superior power of the German emperor annihilated in 1434 the prospects of the Hussite movement, which dwindled down into a small sect called the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. Numerically too weak to exercise a missionary influence upon the remainder of Christian Europe, this religious denomination will yet always be counted among the ripest and most delicious fruits of the reformatory tendencies of the Middle Ages.

Nothing shows better the vast difference between the two classes of reformers who have been characterized in the above lines than the fact that Gerson, the most gifted representative of the first named, was the leading spirit at the Council of Constance which sentenced Huss to be burned at the stake. Besides these two broad currents of reformatory movements which are visible in the Church history of the latter part of the Middle Ages, there were a large number of theological writers who bravely contended for bringing the corrupt Church of their times back to the purity of Bible Christianity, and who more or less discussed all the great reformatory questions which agitated the world in the 16th century. Among the most celebrated of these reformers were John (Pupper) of Goch, rector of a convent of nuns at Mechlin, John Wessel (Gansfort), called by his friends *Lux Imundi*, and John (Ruenrath) of Wesel. Though many of these writers made undisguised assaults upon the received doctrines of the Church, their views, if not directly addressed to the people, were frequently tolerated as learned opinions of the school.

One of the most gifted reformatory preachers of the Middle Ages appeared towards the close of the 15th century in Italy. With a rare eloquence and boldness he attacked the immoral life prevailing in both Church and State, and demanded a radical reform of both. Though few reformatory preachers have ever succeeded better than Savonarola in swaying the emotions of large masses of the people, he did not lay the foundation of any

reformatory organization; and when he was burned at the gibbet, there was no one to continue the work of his life.

2. At the close of the 15th century, the Church had succeeded in repressing all the reformatory movements of the Middle Ages, at least so far as to prevent, mostly by the sword of the secular arm, the consolidation of any of these movements into a powerful ecclesiastical organization, like that of the Eastern Church. But her triumph, after all, was more apparent than real. Her authority had been thoroughly undermined, and remained shaken in every country of Europe. The threats of the Church might extort reluctant recantations from a number of intimidated reformers; but her very successes of this kind had the effect of spreading the latent discontent with a religious organization which so palpably cared more for power than for the purity of Christian doctrine and Christian life. Other powerful agencies aided in shaking the belief of the educated classes in the Church. The most influential among them was the school of the Humanists, who used the revival of classical studies for promoting a general literary culture, which not only fully emancipated itself from the gildarianship of the Church, but frequently assumed an indifferent and antagonistic position even with regard to Christianity. Especially in Italy, humanism became an enthusiastic worshipper of pagan antiquity, and it became quite common that high dignitaries of the Church were in the circles of their friends and acquaintances known as avowed atheists. Even pope Leo X was credited with the remark — and, whether true or not true, it was regarded as credible by his contemporaries — “It is generally known how much we and ours have profited by the fable of Christ.” While in Italy many of the leading humanists became opponents of Christian belief, though they had no objection to retaining their positions, which often were of the highest rank, in the Church, the chief patrons of the classical studies in the Teutonic countries were mostly men of earnest Christian convictions, who cultivated them with a view to strengthening the cause of Christianity, and of reforming the Church. It was especially the community of the Brothers of the Common Life who founded a number of excellent schools, in which the highest attainments in the revived classical studies, and an education in the principles of earnest, purified Christianity, were aimed at. Though the community as a whole never entered into an oppositional attitude with regard to the Church, but rather, like its greatest member, Thomas a Kempis, limited itself to teaching, preaching, and practicing that which in the system of the ruling Church appeared to be unobjectionable to earnest

and pious Christians, its teachers and pupils generally favored the idea of a Church reformation, and in the 16th century many of them became enthusiastical co-workers in the reformatory labors of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

The labors of such men could not fail to kindle in Germany still more the desire for a reformation, and to strengthen the expectation that in resuming the work of reformation on a grand scale the German nation would take the lead. As early as 1457, chancellor Mayer of Mentz wrote to Aeneas Sylvius, subsequently pope Pius II: "The German nation, once the queen of the world, but now a tributary handmaid of the Roman Church, begins to arouse herself as out of a dream, and is resolved to throw off the yoke." This spirit of preparing for the overthrow of the papal yoke and the purification of Christianity at the proper time was fondly nurtured by hundreds of learned and pious men in the latter part of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century; and when at length the right leader appeared at the fulness of time, he found hundreds of thousands ready to fall at once into line as combatants in the grand army of reform.

II. Luther's Reformation in Germany. — While the forerunners of the Reformation diffused in the Church the yearning for a radical purification of Christianity, and while the humanists were educating a race much better fitted for being the standard-bearers of a thorough reform than were the reformers of preceding centuries, a number of other great events co-operated for bringing the mediaeval history of mankind to a close, and for ushering in a new sera. Maritime discoveries of unparalleled magnitude widened the horizon of the European nations and led to a rapid growth of commerce, to an increase of manufactures, and a greater and more general diffusion of wealth. The invention of the art of printing diffused knowledge among the masses of the people to an extent which former generations would have regarded as impossible. Feudalism and medieval chivalry collapsed before the rise of the wealthier and more intelligent burgherdom of the cities and towns, on the one hand, and the consolidation of powerful states under centralized governments, on the other. The new forces which obtained a controlling influence upon modern society were not always, and not by necessity, hostile to the ruling Church; but it is at once apparent that when in alliance with reformatory Church movements they were a considerable aid in raising up more formidable oppositions to the popes and their Church than those which had been put down in the Middle Ages. Soon after the beginning of the 16th century, Germany, then the soil most

favorable to religious reform, produced the man who succeeded in carrying through the reforms which the preceding centuries had so often in vain attempted, who dealt to the papacy a heavier blow than it had received since the separation of the Eastern Church, and whose name, forever associated with "The Reformation," stands at the portal of modern history as one of its greatest pillars. No one disputes the eminent position which Martin Luther occupies in history, nor the extraordinary qualities which elevated him to it. The *Manual of Church History*, by Dr. Alzog, which has been translated into nearly all the languages of Europe, and is very extensively used in the theological schools of the Roman Catholic Church, says of Luther: "If we look upon his agitated, eventful life, we must count him among the most remarkable men of all centuries, although he has not grasped his mission as a reformer of the Church. We must also recognise his courage, though it frequently degenerated into defiance — his untiring activity, his popular, irresistible eloquence, sparkling wit, and disinterestedness. He did not lack a profound religious sentiment, which yearned for satisfaction, and which constitutes the fundamental character and the most brilliant feature of his system." A Protestant Church historian (Kurtz) justly calls Luther a religious genius, who was called to his great work by the rarest union of the necessary qualifications and gifts of the intellect, sentiment, character, and will; who was trained and educated by a providential guidance of his life; who, in his own life, had passed through the entire essential course of reformation, had tested in himself its divine power, and then could not but make the holiest and dearest experience of his life serviceable to all the world.

1. The origin of the German Reformation was quite humble and indefinite. Pope Leo X, of whom even Roman Catholic writers must say that "he does not appear to have experienced the blessing and power of the Christian faith," and that "religion was not to him the highest affair of life," had arranged for a very extensive sale of indulgences. It was not deemed worth while to assign for such an outrage upon the religious sentiment of pious Christians a more specious pretext than that the proceeds of the sale were intended for a war against the Turks and the erection of St. Peter's church. The real destination of the money, it was quite commonly believed, was to defray the exorbitant expenditures of the pope's court and to serve as a marriage dowry of his sister. Archbishop Albert of Mentz, of whose Christian belief as little was known as of that of the pope, authorized the sale in Germany on condition that fifty per cent. of the gross income should

flow into his own pocket. A Dominican friar (Tetzel) carried on the trade with an effrontery which outraged the sentiments of thousands of earnest Christians. Among those who were urged by their conscience to rise against this profanation of Christianity was Luther, then a young monk in an Augustinian convent. When a young student, he had been driven by his anxiety for the salvation of his soul into the retirement of a convent. After long doubts and mental troubles, he had derived from a profound study of the Scriptures, and of the writings of Augustine and Tauler, the consolatory belief that man is to be saved, not by his own works, but by faith in the mercy of God in Christ. When he became a doctor of the Sacred Scriptures, he was deeply impressed with the duty imposed upon him by the oath he had to take on the occasion of teaching and making known to the world the truths of Christianity. Both as an earnest Christian, who sincerely believed in the Christianity of the Scriptures, and as a conscientious teacher of theology, Luther felt himself impelled to enter an energetic protest against the doings of Tetzel. In accordance with the principles of the Church of Rome, he wrote to several neighboring bishops to stop the sale of indulgences, and only when this appeal remained unheeded he determined to act himself. On the eve of All-Saints' Day, Oct. 31, 1517, he affixed to the castle church of Wittenberg the celebrated ninety-five propositions, which are generally looked upon as the beginning of Luther's reformation. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers are agreed that these theses involved by no means on Luther's part a conscious renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith. Luther himself showed this clearly by his subsequent appeal to the pope; but Dr. Hase justly remarks that Luther certainly must have been aware that he had thrown out a challenge to the most powerful prelates and monks. On the other hand, the opposition to Rome was so widespread that Luther's words worked upon public opinion as the kindling spark in a powdermagazine. Even the pope, who had at first looked upon the matter as another monkish quarrel, became startled at the electric shock which it produced throughout the Christian world. Serious measures for arresting the progress of the movement were resolved upon. At first the pope cited Luther to Rome, but at the request of the University of Wittenberg and the elector of Saxony the concession was made that the papal legate, Thomas de Vio, of Gaeta (better known in history under the name Cajetan), should examine Luther in a paternal manner. The characteristic feature in Luther's line of defence was the rejection of the arguments taken from the fathers and the scholastics, and the demand to be refuted by arguments taken from the

Bible. It was also remarkable that soon after appealing from the cardinal's treatment to the pope when better informed, he was urged on, by a fresh papal bull in behalf of indulgences, to change his appeal and to direct it to an oecumenical council. Soon after, the Roman court found it expedient to change its policy with Luther, and to endeavor to bring him back by means of compromise and kindness. The papal chamberlain, Karl von Miltiz, a native of Saxony, was so far successful that Luther promised to write letters in which he would admonish all persons to be obedient and respectful to the Roman Church, and to write to the pope to assure him that he had never thought of infringing upon the privileges of the Roman Church. The promised letter was actually indited; its language is full of expressions of humility, and exalts the Roman Church above everything but Christ himself. He also promised to discontinue the controversy if his opponents would do the same. But soon he was drawn into the Disputation of Leipsic (June 27 to July 15, 1519), which the vain-glorious Dr. Eck (even Roman Catholic writers thus characterize him) had originally arranged with Carlstadt. History awards to Dr. Eck the glory of having been the more clever disputant, but Luther's cause was nevertheless greatly benefited by it. The arguments of his opponents drove Luther onward to a more explicit rejection of Romish innovations. He was led to assert that the pope was not by divine right the universal bishop of the Church, to admit a doubt of the infallibility of councils, and to be convinced that not all Hussite doctrines were heretical. At the same time the reformatory movement was greatly strengthened by the universal sympathy that began to be expressed with Luther, by the alliance with the liberal humanists and knights of Germany, and especially by the open accession to his cause of one of the greatest scholars of the age, Dr. Melancthon. The conflict between Rome and Luther now became one for life and death. Dr. Eck returned from a journey to Rome with a bull which declared Luther a heretic and ordered the burning of his writings. Luther, on the other hand, systematized his views in three works, all of which appeared in 1520: *To his Imperial Majesty and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*; *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*; and *Sermon on the Freedom of a Christian Man*. Finally he broke away the last bridge of retreat by publicly burning (Dec. 10, 1520) the papal bull with the papal canon law. The pope succeeded in prevailing upon the German emperor and the German Diet of Worms (1521) to proceed against Luther; and when the latter firmly refused to recant, and avowed that he could yield nothing but to the Holy Scriptures and reasonable argument, he was placed under the ban of the

empire; but so great was the discontent in Germany with Rome that the same assembly that condemned Luther for opposing the faith of their ancestors presented 101 articles of complaint against the Roman see. The ban of the empire involved serious dangers for Luther, for it gave permission to any one to assault his person and seize upon his property; but he was saved from these dangers by his secluded life at the Castle of Wartburg, to which disguised horsemen, according to a previous understanding with the elector, but against his own desire, had conducted him. Far from the turmoil of political agitation, he found time not only to issue several powerful polemical essays (against auricular confession, against monastic vows, against masses for the dead, and against the new idol of the archbishop of Mentz), which refuted the rumor that he was dead, but to conceive and partially execute the plan of translating the Bible into the native tongue. During the absence of Luther from Wittenberg, the Reformation under the leadership of men who were more impetuous and practical, but less circumspect and thepological, assumed a more aggressive turn against Rome. Several priests renounced celibacy and were married; Carlstadt administered the Lord's supper in both kinds, and in the German language. To these changes Luther made no objection; but when Carlstadt began to commit open acts of violence in disturbing the public worship of the Roman Church — when enthusiastic prophets appeared from Zwickau, who boasted of immediate divine revelations, rejected infant baptism, and denounced Church, State, and science — he emerged once more from his seclusion, silenced by powerful sermons his adversaries at Wittenberg, and once more placed himself at the helm of the movement. In intimate union with Melancthon, he now labored for completing the theological system of the Church which began to rear itself on the basis of his reformatory movement. Luther himself gave his chief attention to continuing the translation of the Bible in German, which was completed in 1534, and constitutes in every respect one of the master-productions of the reformatory age; while Melancthon, in his celebrated work on theological science (*Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum*), gave to the theological leaders of the new Church a hand-book of doctrine which, as a literary production, ranked with the best works that the Church of Rome had produced up to that time.

In Rome, Leo X had meanwhile (1521) been succeeded by Adrian VI, the son of a mechanic of Utrecht, who, while strongly attached to the continuity of the external Church and opposed to the separation already

produced by Luther, was at the same time sincerely and honestly devoted to the cause of a religious reform. The energy displayed by him and the success obtained were, however, by no means commensurate with the honesty of his convictions. During his short administration (1521-23) he was neither able to arrest the anti-Church reformation of Luther nor to smooth the way for the introduction of any reforms within the Church. The latter were hated in Rome no less than the former, and when Adrian died he was succeeded by a humanist, Clement VII, who, like Leo X, was anxious to preserve the splendor and the power of the papal court, and showed not the least interest in the purity of religion.

In Germany, during this interval, the protracted absence of the emperor had prevented the adoption of any stringent measures for the suppression of the Reformation, and allowed the latter to strike deeper roots in the nation. The majority of the princes, it is true, were not yet willing to part with the religion of their fathers, and to identify themselves with the movement which they thought represented their beloved ancestors as heretics. They mistrusted Rome, however; persisted in demanding reforms; contented themselves with resolving at several successive diets that the Edict of Worms should be carried out as much as possible, and thus enabled the princes and free cities which were friendly to the Reformation to consolidate it within the boundaries of their states. When the papal legate Campeggio succeeded at the Diet of Ratisbon, in 1524, in bringing about an alliance between Ferdinand of Austria, the dukes of Bavaria, and most of the bishops of Southern Germany for the preservation of the old faith and for carrying out the Edict of Worms, landgrave Philip of Hesse and elector John of Saxony, at a meeting held at Gotha, took the initiatory step for a counter-alliance of the friends of the Reformation. Luther and Melancthon were at first opposed to the conclusion of any offensive and defensive alliance, on the ground that God's cause should not be defended by carnal weapons. When, however, the danger appeared to increase, a defensive alliance between the landgrave and the elector was concluded in 1526 at Torgau, and was soon joined by a number of other princes. As the emperor became involved in a new foreign war in which the pope was on the side of his enemies, the Diet of Spire unanimously agreed upon the decree that until the meeting of a free general council every state should act with regard to the Edict of Worms as it might venture to answer to God and his imperial majesty. This decree gave to the states which were friendly to the Reformation time to reorganize the churches of their

territories on the basis of the Reformation. The lead was taken by the elector John the Constant of Saxony. Melancthon drew up the articles of visitation, in accordance with which, in 1529, a general Church visitation of ecclesiastical and lay cotmcillors took place. Among the results of this visitation were the compilation of two catechisms by Luther for more efficient instruction of the children in the elements of religion, the appointment of superintendents to exercise spiritual supervision, and the introduction of an ecclesiastical constitution, which became the common model for the churches in the other German states. Luther, in the meantime (1525), had followed the example of many of his clerical friends and married. As the continuing centre of the entire movement, Luther exerted a powerful influence in many directions as professor and author by an extensive correspondence far beyond the borders of Germany, and by supplying the churches with a great number of excellent Church hymns in the native tongue. By these Church hymns, as well as by his translation of the Bible, Luther at the same time occupied so prominent a position in the history of German literature that Germany as a nation appeared to be under the greatest indebtedness to him, and its further progress to be closely linked to the success of the Reformation. A number of theological controversies into which Luther was drawn, and of which those with king Henry VIII of England, with Erasmus, with Carlstadt, and Zwingli were the most important, belong more to the personal history of Luther than to that of the Reformation.

2. A new crisis for the German Reformation began in 1529 with the Diet of Spire. The emperor having victoriously finished his wars, was now free from foreign entanglements, and showed himself determined to maintain the religious unity of the empire. A very numerous attendance of bishops and prelates secured a Catholic majority, which, in accordance with the imperial demand, decreed that the Edict of Worms should be carried through in the states which had hitherto acknowledged its authority, but that no innovations should be required in the remaining provinces; that none should be obstructed in celebrating the mass; and that the privileges of every spiritual estate should be respected. Against this recess, which if carried out would have made a further progress of the Reformation impossible, Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Luneburg, Anhalt, the margrave of Brandenburg, and fourteen imperial cities entered a protestation, from which they were henceforth called Protestants. They appealed from it to the emperor-to a free council and a German national assembly. Philip of

Hesse urged the evangelical princes to assume a defiant attitude for the defence of the Reformation, and, in order to strengthen their alliance, advised a union with the imperial cities that favored the Reformation of Zwingli. In accordance with his wishes, a theological colloquy was arranged at Marburg (Oct. 1 to 3, 1529), in which Zwingli, Luther, OEcolumpadius, and Melancthon took part. They failed to effect an agreement in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, but parted with the mutual promise to end the public controversy. Soon after the evangelical princes assembled at the Convention of Schwabach, Luther had drawn up, on the basis of the articles of Marburg, the so-called seventeen Schwabach articles, which the Zwinglian cities were requested to sign as conditional of their admission to the alliance. The request was, however, declined, and the convention remained without result. At the next Diet of Augsburg (1530) the emperor intended to put an end to the religious strife. The elector of Saxony therefore requested his theologians to draw up a brief summary of the evangelical faith, and they accordingly presented to him a revision of the Schwabach articles at Torgau (the Torgau articles). The elector was accompanied to Augsburg by Spalatin, Melancthon, and Jonas. Luther, who was still under the ban of the empire, remained behind at Coburg. The emperor's arrival was delayed, and Melancthon used the time up to the opening of the diet (June 20) for composing, on the basis of the Torgan articles, the famous Confession of Augsburg (q.v.), the first of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, which, after being approved by Luther, was signed by the states. It had been drawn up both in Latin and in German; and although the emperor desired the Latin text to be read, it was at the request of the elector publicly read to the diet in German (June 25). Some of the princes admitted that they had derived from this document a clearer conception of the Reformation than they had possessed heretofore of its character and design; but the emperor commissioned the Catholic theologians Faber, Eck, Cochlaeus, and Wimpina to prepare a "confutation" of the Confession, which was read on Aug. 3. The emperor declared that he was determined to stand by the doctrines laid down in the confutation; that he expected the same from the princes; that he was the patron of the Church, and not willing to tolerate a schism in Germany. He refused to receive the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," which had been composed by Melancthon in reply to the "confutation." The recess of the empire of Sept. 22 announced that the confession of the Protestants had been refuted, but that time for consideration would be given to them until April 15 of the next year; until then all should refrain from diffusing

their heresy by writing or preaching; and within six months a general council would be called for the ultimate settlement of the matter. The Edict of Worms was to be carried out, and the imperial court was to proceed against the disobedient. As, soon after the close of the diet, a legal process was actually begun against the Protestant states for having confiscated the property of the Church, the Protestant powers met at Smalkald, and concluded (1531) a defensive alliance for six years, at the head of which the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were placed. Fortunately for the new alliance, the emperor was soon again involved in a war with the Turks, who threatened an invasion of Austria and Germany, and his desire to obtain the aid of the Protestant churches once more disposed him favorably towards toleration. New negotiations resulted in the conclusion of the religious peace of Nuremberg (July 23, 1532), which enjoined upon both parties mutual friendship and Christian love until the approaching council. Pope Clement VII so far yielded to the demands of the emperor that he promised in 1533 to convoke a council within the space of a year at Mantua, Bologna, or Piacenza; but he demanded, at the same time, from the Protestants a previous unconditional submission to the decrees of the council. This promise the Protestants naturally refused to give, though they were ready to attend the council and plead their cause. The power of the Protestants in the meanwhile was greatly strengthened by the accession of the dukes of Pomerania and Wurtemberg, and by a union with the cities which favored the Zwinglian Reformation; and which, after a religious colloquy, held at Cassel in 1535, between Melancthon and Bucer, agreed in May, 1536, upon the Wittenberg Concord, by which the cities unequivocally accepted the Augsburg Confession. When in July, 1536, the pope actually convoked the council at Mantua, the Protestant states met again for consultation at Smalkald. They accepted and signed the "Articles of Smalkald" which had been composed by Luther, and which presented the doctrines of the Reformation in much stronger terms than the Confession of Augsburg, and they remained unanimous in the resolve not to attend an Italian council, at which the pope would appear both as a party and as a judge. The council did not meet, but in 1538 a "holy league" for the suppression of Protestantism was formed at Nuremberg by the archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg, the dukes of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. But the next year George died, and was succeeded by his Protestant brother Henry, who found it easy to carry through the Reformation; and a few years later (1542), Henry of Brunswick was driven from his dominions, into which his conquerors

likewise introduced the Reformation. The elector of Brandenburg, Joachim I, a decided enemy of Luther, was likewise (1535) succeeded by a Protestant son. Thus gradually the Reformation gained over to its side nearly all the secular princes of Germany, with the exception of the dukes of Bavaria and the house of Hapsburg, which found it necessary to adhere to the old faith on account of its connection with Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Several new attempts were made to effect a reconciliation of the contending parties. The Colloquy of Worms (1540) remained without any result. At the Diet of Ratisbon (1541), where Rome was represented by the pious legate Contarini, who himself favored the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism as they were then maintained, an agreement was effected between the theologians concerning the doctrine of justification and other points, but it was found impossible to harmonize views on transubstantiation. The Protestants, but not the Catholics, had to pledge themselves to abide by the agreed articles (the Ratisbon Interim) until the meeting of the council. The pope was finally prevailed upon by the emperor to open (Dec. 13, 1545) the long-promised council at Trent, a city of the German empire. The emperor still adhered to the plan to force the pope into a Catholic reformation of the Church, and the Protestants into submission to the Church. Another colloquy at Ratisbon was arranged in 1546 to draw up a basis of union to be submitted to the council, but it remained without result. At the same time, the emperor was determined to break the political power of Protestantism by annihilating the Smalkald alliance, and in this he was quite successful. The elector and the landgrave were declared guilty of high-treason, and in the ensuing Smalkaldic war, in which duke Maurice, though himself a Protestant, fought from political motives on the side of the emperor, both princes were defeated and made prisoners. The other members of the league, with the exception of a few cities, submitted. The emperor was anxious not to give to his expedition the name of a religious war. but the pope accorded a plenary indulgence to all who would aid in the extermination of the heretics. Shortly before the beginning of the war (Feb. 18, 1546), Luther had died at Eisleben, where he had been invited to act as umpire between the counts of Mansfeld. In order to prevent the participation of the Protestants in the council, the pope caused the immediate condemnation of some important Protestant doctrines in the first session of that body; and to escape the reformatory pressure of the emperor, he transferred the council (March, 1547), on the pretext that in Trent it was threatened by the pestilence, to Bologna, where it soon dissolved. The emperor was greatly dissatisfied, and determined to

go on with his own reformatory policy for preserving the religious unity of Christendom. At his request, the conciliatory and noble-minded bishop of Naumburg, Julius von Pflugk, and the court preacher of the elector of Brandenburg, John Agricola, drew up the Augsburg Interim (1548), which was adopted by the diet, and was to serve as the standard according to which all matters relating to religion should be arranged until the decision of the council. At first the Interim was intended to be valid for both Protestants and Catholics, but it really remained in force only among the former, to whom it conceded the marriage of the clergy, the use of the cup in the sacrament, and some indefinite constructions of particular doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Protestants submitted to the Interim with great reluctance; and even the emperor's ally, Maurice of Saxony, did not risk its unconditional introduction, and at his advice the Leipsic Interim (1548) was drawn up by Melancthon, in which the greater part of the Catholic ritual was declared to be indifferent (*adiaphoron*), and therefore fit to be retained. It also declared that the power of the pope and of the bishops might be acknowledged so long as they used it for the edification, and not for the destruction, of the Church. But even this more Protestant Interim gave no satisfaction, and the fermentation continued until the new pope, Julius III, reconvoked the Council of Trent for May 1, 1551. The emperor demanded that Protestants should attend the council, but Maurice made the attendance dependent upon the condition that Protestants should receive the right of voting, that the former resolutions against the Protestants should be annulled, and that the pope himself should be subject to a general council. Melancthon elaborated as the basis of the doctrinal negotiations the *Confessio Saxonica*, or *Repetitio Confessionis Augustance*. Protestant deputies from Wuirtemberg, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Strasburg appeared at Trent, and Melancthon, accompanied by several theologians of Wittenberg, set out to join them. The situation of the Reformation was radically changed when Maurice concluded a secret alliance against the emperor with a number of Protestant princes and the Catholic king of France, to whom, for his assistance, the three German bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun were treacherously surrendered by the allies. Maurice, in a short and decisive war (1552), completely defeated the emperor, who was sick at Innsbruck, and compelled him to agree to the Treaty of Passau (July 30, 1552), which set the landgrave of Hesse at liberty (the elector of Saxony had been liberated previously), opened the imperial council to the adherents of the Reformation, promised a diet for the settlement of the religious differences, and provided a permanent peace for at least all those

who sympathized with the Augsburg Confession. The continuance of the war between Germany and France delayed the convocation of the Diet of Augsburg until Feb., 1555. Both parties in Germany had arrived at the conviction that the hope of terminating the religious controversy by means of religious colloquies or by a general council must be abandoned for the present, and that peace and order in the empire could only be maintained by mutual forbearance. After long negotiations, the "Religious Peace of Augsburg" was concluded. — It guaranteed the free exercise of religion to the Catholics and the adherents of the Confession of Augsburg. According to the "territorial system," which now came into use, the prince of every German state had a right to reform the Church within his dominion. The subjects of both Protestant and Catholic governments who were unwilling to conform to the ruling religion retained only the right to leave their country without obstruction. The Protestants remained in possession of the ecclesiastical benefices which they held in 1555. But with regard to the future, it was provided that all spiritual states of the empire which should subsequently go over to the Augsburg Confession should by that act forfeit their offices and possessions. The Catholics remembered with fear the losses which they had sustained by the secession of the grand master of the German order, Albert of Brandenburg, and with which they were threatened by the sympathy with the Reformation of the archbishop Hermann of Cologne; and they therefore believed that on the adoption of the articles securing to them the possession of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical states, even if their actual incumbents should become Protestants, the very existence of their Church would depend. The article called "Ecclesiastical Reservation" (*Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*) was proclaimed by the Roman king Ferdinand as an actual ordinance of the diet, though the Protestants loudly protested against it, and their protest had to be recorded in the peace.

III. *Zwingli's and Calvin's Reformation in Switzerland.* — Next to Germany, Switzerland became the principal source of the Reformation. But it sent forth two currents which have never fully united, though many connecting canals have been built between them, and both are now usually acknowledged as belonging to one comprehensive system; which is commonly designated as the Reformed Church. One of the movements originated in German, the other in French, Switzerland. At the head of the one was Ulric Zwingli, at the head of the other John Calvin. The thirteen cantons which constituted Switzerland at the beginning of the 16th century

were still in nominal connection with the German empire; and the same causes, therefore, which have been referred to in our account of Germany favored the growth of the Reformation in Switzerland. Dissatisfaction with and contempt of Rome were, moreover, promoted in Switzerland by the large number of mercenaries who were employed in the military service of the popes, and who, after returning home, not only diffused a knowledge of the utter corruption prevailing in Rome, but by their own unworthy lives helped to bring Rome into disrepute.

1. Ulric Zwingli, who gave the first impulse to the Reformation in German Switzerland, *SEE ZWINGLI*, had received his education at the universities of Vienna and Basle, and in the latter place had joined himself to a circle of enthusiastic admirers of ancient learning and of enlightelned religious views who gathered around Erasmus. It was more classical education and scientific study of the Holy Scriptures than, as in the case of Luther, religious experience which made Zwingli an earnest advocate of religious reform, although, like his teacher Erasmus, he continued to hope for a reformation within the Church by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves. Such views were entertained quite generally in Switzerland; and thus, though Zwingli in 1518 raised his voice against the effrontery of a trader in indulgences, the Franciscan monk Bernardin Samson, he was appointed papal chaplain by the papal legate. His preaching against the corruptions prevailing in the Church became more earnest after he had been appointed, in 1519, "Lent priest" in Zurich. The influences proceeding from Luther did not remain without effect upon him, and he began to be looked upon in Zurich as a Lutheran at heart. When he designated the rule of fasting as an ordinance of man, the Council of Zurich, in 1522, took his part against the bishop of Constance. Zwingli's first reforming work, *Von Erkiesen und Freyheit der Spysen*, which was published at this time, gave a new imptuse to the movement. In the same year Zwingli, in the name of the reformatory party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lutcerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich arranged on Jan. 29, 1523, a religious conference, at which Zwingli presented the reformatory doctrines he had preached in sixty-seven articles, and defended them so successfilly that the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the same manner. Soon after, Zwingli received an efficient co-laborer in his reformatory efforts by the appointment of Leo Judae as Lent priest at

Zurich. Several events signalized at this time the steady advance of the cause. The council allowed nuns to leave their convents, several of the clergy married without hindrance, a German baptismal service was introduced, and the cathedral chapter, at its own request, received new and suitable ordinances. In other cantons, especially in Lucerne, Fribourg, and Zug, a violent opposition was manifested against the Reformation, but in Zurich its success was fully secured. The council convoked a new conference for October 26, upon images and the mass, to which all Swiss bishops and cantons were invited, but only Schaffhausen and St. Gall sent delegates. No champion for images and mass was found at the conference, and the Council of Zurich concluded to promote the reformation of the canton by diffusing the proper instruction in the country districts, for which purpose Zwingli, the abbot Von Cappel, and Conrad Schmidt, commander of the knights of St. John at Kussnacht, were appointed. With the assent of the council, Zwingli published his *Christian Introduction*, which was to explain to the people more fully the meaning of the religious Reformation. Soon new reformatory measures were adopted by the council. The shrined pictures in the churches were shut up, and every priest was left free to celebrate mass or not as he chose (Dec., 1523). On Whit-Sunday, 1524, the work of removing the images from the churches was begun, and it was completed in thirteen days. The abolition of many other usages followed in rapid succession; and the transformation in religious service was completed by the celebration on April 13, 14, and 16, 1525, of the Lord's supper again in its original simplicity in the great minster. The publication of Zwingli's *De Vera et Falsa Religione* and the first part of the Zurich translation of the Bible likewise gave a favorable impulse. Beyond Zurich, the Reformation was carried through in nearly the whole canton of Appenzell, and in the town of Muhlhausen; a broad foundation was laid in Berne by the preaching of the prudent Berchtold Haller; in Basle, Wolfgang Fabricius Capito and Caspar Hedio were the first preachers, and in 1524 the authorities conceded to John Ecolampadius those conditions in regard to reform under which he accepted an appointment as minister. The Reformation also gained a firm ground in Schaffhausen and St. Gall. The majority of the cantons were, however, still opposed to the Reformation, and the Diet of Lucerne (Jan., 1525) endeavored to satisfy the longing for a reformation without rending the Church. Its decrees, however, did not go into effect; and the Catholic cantons, in accordance with the advice of Dr. Eck, arranged a new religious disputation at Baden (May 19, 1526), where (Ecolampadius acted

as the spokesman of the Reformed theologians. Though both parties claimed the victory, the Reformation continued to make progress. In the summer of 1526, the Grisons granted religious freedom; in April, 1527, the Reformed party obtained a majority in the Council of Berne. which, after a new disputation at Berne (Jan. 6, 1528), officially introduced the Reformation. Decisive measures for securing the preponderance of the Reformation were taken in 1528 by St. Gall, and in 1529 by Basle and Glarus. As the most zealous of the Catholic cantons, especially Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Valais, and Fribourg, resorted to forcible measures for the suppression of the Reformation, Zurich and Constance, on Dec. 25, 1527, formed a defensive alliance under the name of Burgher Rights. It was joined in 1528 by Berne and St. Gall; in 1529 by Biel, Mtuhlhausen, Basle, and Schaffhausen; in 1530 by Strasburg, which had been repelled by the German Protestants. The landgrave of Hesse also was received into it in 1530, at least by Zurich and Basle. In the meanwhile five Catholic cantons — Lucerne, Zug, Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden — had concluded (April, 1529) a league with king Ferdinand for the maintenance of the old faith. A war declared by Zurich in 1529 against the five cantons was of short duration, and the peace was favorable to the former. In 1531 the war was renewed, and the forces of Zurich were totally defeated at Cappel, Zwingli himself finding his death. The peace which Zurich and Berne were forced to conclude was, on the whole, humiliating; it recognised, however, and secured both confessions of faith. Soon after the battle of Cappel, O'Ecolampadius died (Nov. 23, 1531) of grief for the losses of the Reformed Church. Henry Bullinger in Zurich, and Oswald Myconius in Basle, now became the leading spirits among the Reformed, whose strength was greatly impaired by internal dissensions and by the progress of the Anabaptists. The Catholic cantons succeeded in arresting the further spread of the Reformation in German Switzerland, and in repressing it by force in some free districts and in parts of the cantons Soleure and Glarus; but in the remainder of the Reformed cantons, especially in Zurich and Berne, the population steadfastly continued to adhere to the cause of religious reform.

2. In French Switzerland, the reformatory movement began in 1526 in the French parts of the cantons Berne and Biel, where the Gospel was preached by William Farel, a native of France. In 1530 he established the Reformation in Neufchatel. In Geneva a beginning was made as early as 1528; in 1534, after a religious conference held at the suggestion of the

Bernese, in which Farel defended the Reformation, public worship was allowed to the Reformed; rapid progress was then made through the zeal of Farel, Froment, and Viret; and in 1535, after another disputation, the papacy was abolished by the council and the Reformation adopted. In 1536 John Calvin, *SEE CALVIN* arrived in Geneva, and was induced by Farel to remain in the city and to aid him in his struggle against a party of freethinkers who called themselves *Spirituels*. In October of the same year he took part with Farel and Viret in a religious disputation held at Lausanne, which resulted in the adhesion of the Pays-de-Vaud to the cause of the Reformation. In 1538 both Calvin and Farel were banished by the council, which had taken offence at the strict Church discipline introduced by the Reformers. Soon, however, the friends of the Reformation regained the ascendancy, and Calvin was recalled in 1541, while Farel remained in Neufchatel. For several years Calvin had to sustain a desperate struggle against his opponents, but in 1555 they were finally subdued in an insurrection set on foot by Ami Perrin. From that time the reformatory ideas of Calvin were carried through in both Church and State with iron consistenc., and Geneva became a centre whence reformatory influences spread to the remotest parts of Europe. By an extensive correspondence and numerous religious writings, he exerted a strong personal influence far beyond the boundaries of Switzerland. The theological academy of Geneva, founded in 1588, supplied the churches of many foreign countries, especially France, with preachers trained in the spirit of Calvin. When Calvin died, in 1564, the continuation of his work devolved upon the learned Theodore Beza. Calvin disagreed in many points with Zwingli, whose views gradually lost ground as those of Calvin advanced. The Second Helvetic Confession, the most important among the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, which was compiled by Bullinger in Zurich, published in 1566, and recognised in all Reformed countries, completed the superiority of Calvin's principles over those of Zwingli.

3. Although the majority of the German Protestant churches remained in connection with the Lutheran Reformation, a German Reformed Church which wore a moderately Calvinistic aspect sprang up in several parts of Germany. In 1560 the elector Frederick III of the Palatinate embraced the Reformed creed, and organized the Church of his dominions according to Reformed principles. By his authority, Ursinus and Olevianus composed the Heidelberg Catechism, which soon came to be regarded not only as the standard symbolical book of the German Reformed Church, but was highly

esteemed throughout the Reformed world. Maurice, the learned landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, after several fruitless attempts to reconcile the Lutheran and Reformed churches, joined the latter in 1564, and compelled the Lutheran Church of his dominion to enter into communion with Calvinism. In Anhalt, Calvinism was introduced chiefly from attachment to Melancthon, and Nassau introduced the Heidelberg Catechism in consequence of its relation to the house of Orange. The most important accession to the Reformed Church of Germany was that of John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who on Christmas day, 1613, received the Lord's supper in the court church of Berlin according to the Calvinistic ritual. Although he tried, as all princes of these times did, to induce the people to follow his example, the overwhelming majority of the country continued to remain Lutheran. Among the free imperial cities, it was especially Bremen which adopted the Reformed creed.

IV. *The English Reformation.* — In England the writings of Luther were warmly welcomed by many, especially by those who secretly adhered to the doctrines of Wycliffe. King Henry VIII, who was a great admirer of St. Thomas a Becket, wrote against Luther (1521) the work *Adversus VII Sacramentorum*, for which he received from the pope the title *Defensor Fidei*. He also wrote the emperor of Germany a letter in which he called for the extirpation of the heretics. But Lutheranism found zealous adherents even at the English universities, and an English translation of the Bible (1526) by Frith and Tyndale, members of the university of Cambridge, had a decisive effect. Soon the king fell out with the pope, because the latter refused to annul Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon, the niece of the emperor Charles V. The king, who represented that his marriage with Catharine, his brother's widow, was open to objections, laid the matter, by advice of Thomas Cranmer, before the Christian universities; and when replies were received declaring the marriage with a brother's wife as null and void, the king separated from Catharine, married Anne Boleyn, and fell under the papal ban. The English Parliament sundered the connection between England and Rome, and recognised the king as the head of the Church. Henry was desirous of destroying the influence of the pope over the Church of England, to which, in other respects, he wished to preserve the continuity of its Catholic character. The cloisters were subjected to a visitation in 1535, and totally abolished in 1536; and the Bible was diffused in the mother tongue (1538) as the only source of doctrine; but the statute of 1539, imposed distinct

limits upon the Reformation, and, in particular, confirmed transubstantiation, priestly celibacy, masses for the dead, and auricular confession. A considerable number of those who refused to comply with the religious changes introduced into England were executed. A powerful party, headed by Thomas Cranmer, after 1533 archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Cromwell, after 1534 royal vicargeneral for ecclesiastic affairs, exerted a silent influence in behalf of a nearer approach towards the Reformed churches of continental Europe. They met with little success during the reign of Henry, but obtained a majority in the regency which ruled England during the minority of Edward VI. Peter Martyr, Occhino, Bucer, and Fagius were called to England to aid Cranmer in carrying through the Reformation. The basis was laid in the Book of Homilies (1547), the new English liturgy (the Book of Common Prayer, 1548), and the Forty-two Articles (1552); but the labors of Cranmer were interrupted by the death of Edward VI (1553). His successor, queen Mary, the daughter of Henry and Catharine of Aragon, was a devoted partisan of the Church of Rome, during whose reign Cranmer and from three hundred to four hundred other persons were executed on account of their religion. A papal nuncio appeared in England, and an obsequious parliament sanctioned the reunion with Rome; but the affections of the people were not regained, and the early death of Mary (1558) put an end to the official restoration of the Papal Church. Queen Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn, whose birth, in consequence of the papal decision, was regarded by the Roman Catholics as illegitimate, resumed the work of her father, and completed the English Reformation, as distinct both from the Church of Rome and the Reformations of Germany and Switzerland. The Book of Common Prayer which had been adopted under Edward was so changed as to be less offensive to Catholics, and by the Act of Uniformity, June, 1559, it was made binding on all the churches of the kingdom. Most of the Catholics conformed; of 9400 clergy, their benefices were only lost by fourteen bishops, fifteen heads of ecclesiastical corporations, fifty canons, and about eighty priests. Matthew Parker, the former teacher of the queen, was appointed archbishop of Canterbury. The validity of his ordination, which was not sanctioned by the pope, nor made according to the Roman rite, was at once disputed in numerous Catholic writings, but has also found some Catholic defenders, as Le Courayer. The Confession of Faith which had been drawn up under Edward in forty-two articles was reduced to thirty-nine articles, and in this form it was adopted by a convocation of the clergy at London in 1562, and by Parliament made, in

1571, the rule of faith for all the clergy. According to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation; justification is through faith alone, but works acceptable to God are the necessary fruit of this faith; in the Lord's supper there is a communion of the body of Christ, which is spiritually received by faith; and predestination is apprehended only as it is a source of consolation. Supreme power over the Church is vested in the English crown, but it is limited by the statutes. Bishops continued to be the highest ecclesiastical officers and the first barons of the realm. Subscription to the articles was made binding only on the clergy; to the laity freedom of conscience was allowed. The adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles completed, in the main, the constitution of the Episcopal Church of England. Some parts of the Church government and the liturgy, especially the retaining of sacerdotal vestments, gave great offence to a number of zealous friends of a radical religious reformation who had suffered persecution during the reign of Mary, and, while exiles, had become strongly attached to the principles of strict Calvinism. They demanded a greater purity of the Church (hence their name Puritans), a simple, spiritual form of worship, a strict Church discipline, and a Presbyterian form of government. The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Non-conformist clergy formed separate congregations in connection with presbyteries (since 1572), and a considerable portion of the clergy and laity of the Established Church sympathized with them. The rupture between the parties was widened in 1592 by an act of Parliament that all who obstinately refused to attend public worship, or led others to do so, should be imprisoned and submit, or after three months be banished; and again in 1595, when the Presbyterians applied the Mosaic Sabbath laws to the Christian Sunday, and when Calvin's doctrines respecting predestination excited animated disputes.

A much more uncompromising opposition than that by the Puritans was made to the Established Church by Robert Brown, who embraced (from 1580) Calvinism in its strictest form, denounced the English Church as a false Church, and demanded that, in accordance with the apostolic example, every congregation should be an independent Church. His adherents, who were variously designated as Brownists, Independents, and Congregationalists, renounced all fellowship with the Church of England, and met with great success, though Brown himself returned to the Church

of England. In 1593 there were about 20,000 Independents in England: those who fled to Holland founded a number of churches there, and from Holland the Pilgrim fathers brought this branch of the English Reformation over to the New World.

The Stuarts entertained immoderate opinions as to the royal authority in Church and State. James I, the son of Mary Queen of Scots, remained, in spite of the Gunpowder Plot (1605), mild towards the Catholics, but bitterly opposed to Puritanism. The Catholic element in the Established Church was greatly strengthened, and an attempt was even made to restore episcopacy in Scotland. A bond of union was, however, given to all parties by an excellent new translation of the Bible into English, with which king James's name is honorably connected. Charles I followed in the footsteps of his father; and as the bishops sided with him in his conflicts with Parliament and his endeavors to enforce the divine right of kings, the king's overthrow, which ended in his execution (1649), involved the overthrow of the supremacy of the Episcopal Church. The Parliament summoned an assembly of divines at Westminster — the Westminster Assembly (1643-49) — and, in accordance with the proposition of this assembly, introduced a Presbyterian form of government and a Puritanic form of worship. Soon after the death of Cromwell, however, the Stuarts were recalled (1660) and the Episcopal Church re-established. The Test Act (1673) prohibited every one from holding any public office unless he had acknowledged the king's ecclesiastical supremacy and had received the sacrament of the Lord's supper in an Episcopal church. In consequence of the adherence of James II to the Church of Rome, there arose one more conflict between the English king and the Episcopal Established Church; but when William III of Orange became king the constitution of the Church was definitely settled (1689). The Church of England retained the Episcopal form of government, and Ireland was placed under the jurisdiction of the Church of England. This connection between the Established Church of England and the Established Church of Ireland remained until 1870, when the latter was disestablished and its official connection with the Church of England severed. The "Church of Ireland" since then forms an independent, self-governing body; while the Scotch Episcopal Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States agree with the religious creed of the Church of England, but frame their Church laws with entire independence.

V. *The Presbyterians of Scotland.* — The first knowledge of the Reformation begun in continental Europe was brought to Scotland by

several Scotch students of Wittenberg. They tried to circulate Luther's writings, but found the ground not favorable to a reformation, because king James V had intimately allied himself with the clergy for the purpose of curbing the power of the nobility. Stringent measures were adopted against the favorers of the Reformation. The first victim was Patrick Hamilton (March 1, 1528), a youth of royal blood, who, while studying in Germany, had imbibed a love of the Reformation. Two more Reformers were burned in 1534; in 1539, five in Edinburgh and two in Glasgow. Nevertheless, the adherents of the Reformation steadily increased in number, especially among the nobles. When James V died, the leader of the reformatory party, James Hamilton, earl of Arran, succeeded in seizing the regency. When the latter saw his political influence endangered by the Reformed earl of Lennox, he was gained over by the widowed queen and by David Beautoun (Beton), cardinal-archbishop of St. Andrew's, to the Catholic side, and persecution began afresh. The Catholic party derived some advantages from the national war against Henry VIII of England, as the latter was looked upon as a patron of reformatory movements; but the burning of George Wishart, one of the theological leaders of the Reformation, rallied the reformatory party anew. Under the guidance of John Knox they began to advance more firmly, and to develop their ecclesiastical affairs more definitely. As both Knox and Wishart had been educated at Geneva, and were firmly addicted to the Reformed Confession, the reformed type of the Reformation now obtained in Scotland a decided and lasting ascendancy over the Lutheran. The Reformed party allied itself with the English government, the Catholics with that of France. The latter sent the young daughter of James V, Mary Stuart, to France for education, where she was subsequently married to king Francis II of France, and imbibed an enthusiastic attachment to the Church of Rome. In 1554 the fanatical dukes of Guise, the brothers of the widowed queen, became regents of Scotland. The French influence was strongly used for the repression of the reformatory party, which, on the other hand, was benefited by the accession to the English throne of Mary, daughter of Henry VIII. Protection was afforded to the English Protestants who had fled on account of their religion, and freedom of worship was again secured by the native friends of the Reformation. John Knox, who in 1546 had had to flee from Scotland, returned in 1555 to strengthen the Reformed faith and to urge on the nobility and the people to an unceasing contest against the idolatries of Rome. Dissatisfied, however, with the feeble support which he found, Knox returned in 1556 to Geneva, in which

city he received from the Scotch bishops the sentence to the stake which had been passed against him. The stirring letters which Knox wrote to Scotland from Geneva led (1557) to the formation of a defensive league of the Protestant nobility — the “Congregation of Christ.” The accession of Elizabeth to the English throne was followed in Scotland by the adoption of new measures against the Reformation, which French troops were to carry into effect. This led to a furious outbreak of the Reformed party. John Knox once more returned, the Covenant of May 31 was signed, a new alliance with England was concluded, and the widowed queen deposed as regent. The iconoclastic devastation of Catholic churches and cloisters began at Perth and rapidly spread over the kingdom. A civil war which ensued was concluded by the treaty of Edinburgh (1560), which recognised the rights of the Reformed. The Scotch Parliament, which met soon after, immediately abolished the papal jurisdiction over Scotland, forbade the mass, and approved an entirely Calvinistic Confession (*Confessio Scottica*). In the next year (1561) the Presbyterian Church government was set in order in the Book of Discipline. These acts of the Parliament were, however, not sanctioned by the government until 1567, after the overthrow of Mary Stuart, who, notwithstanding her fanatical zeal in behalf of Rome, had been unable since her return from France (1561) to arrest the complete victory of the Reformed party. While the theology of the Scotch Confession was strictly Calvinistic, the episcopal benefices were allowed to continue, as the regents during the minority of James VI, and still more James himself, had a strong personal interest in their preservation. Melville, the successor of Knox, induced the Assembly of 1578 to adopt a strictly Presbyterian Church constitution, which admits no Church office except the four recognised by Calvin — of pastor, doctor, elder, and deacon. The sanction of this Church constitution (the Second Book of Discipline) by Parliament and the youthful king was not obtained until 1592. James was, however, personally averse to Presbyterianism and a strong adherent of an episcopal form of government. He left no means untried, especially after he had united the crown of England with that of Scotland, to force an episcopal form of government upon the Church of Scotland. Charles I went still further than his father, and gave to the Scotch a liturgy which the Presbyterians denounced as a service to Baal. The union of Scotch Presbyterians with the Puritans and Independents of England led to the overthrow of Charles I. In 1643 a new league and covenant was adopted, and in 1645 Scotland received the Westminster standards. After the execution of Charles I, the Scotch, from opposition to

Cromwell, proclaimed Charles II, who had signed the covenant, as king. This led, however, to a serious and lasting division among Scotch Presbyterians. Other divisions, from various causes, followed in the course of time, and even at the present time (1879) Scotch Presbyterianism is split up into a large number of divisions. The Presbyterian character of the people has, however, remained unimpaired. Cromwell, who several times defeated the Scotch, did not allow the assembly to meet, but in no other way interfered with the freedom of the Scotch Church. Charles II relapsed into the Stuart tendency to introduce Episcopalianism; but on the expulsion of the Stuarts in 1689, the Church constitution of 1592, and the Westminster Confession were definitely restored. To the adherents of an Episcopalian Church an act of 1712 granted freedom of worship, and in 1792 they received the full enjoyment of civil rights.

VI. *The Reformed Church of Holland.* — Nowhere did the Reformation find a more favorable soil than in the Netherlands, which were closely united with Germany. being regarded as a fief of the empire. The people were noted for their industry and love of freedom, and were therefore inclined to an earnest opposition to every form of ecclesiastical and civil despotism. Besides, the Brethren of the Common Life, the Beghards, and other religious communities had awakened and fostered an interest in a purer, more scriptural form of Christianity, which, at the beginning of the 16th century, was far from being extinct. Therefore Luther's writings, although they were condemned by the University of Louvain, were enthusiastically received in the flourishing cities of Flanders, Brabant, and Holland. As the Netherlands were the hereditary land of the emperor Charles V, he made the utmost efforts to suppress the reformatory movement: and the penal law which was issued at Worms in 1521 was carried out with greater earnestness in the Netherlands than in Germany. In 1523 two Augustinian monks, Henry Vos and John Esch, were executed at Brussels—the first martyrs of the Reformation. Other edicts against the Protestants followed, and with them new executions. The progress of the Reformation was, however, not checked; but, in consequence of the closer connection of the people with France and Switzerland, it took a Reformed rather than a Lutheran type. The vigor of the persecution during the reign of Charles was somewhat mitigated by the mild disposition of the two stadtholders, Margaret of Savoy, and Mary, widowed queen of Hungary, the latter of whom, a sister of the emperor, was even suspected of a secret sympathy with the Reformation; and in many places the execution of the

obnoxious decrees was even prevented by the out-spoken personal inclinations of municipal and provincial authorities. An effort made by Charles V (1550) to establish a regular inquisition, after the pattern of the Spanish, was not successful. Philip II did not shrink from measures of the utmost cruelty to enforce submission to the laws and to the Council of Trent; but, instead of submitting, the people rallied for the defence of their religious and civil liberty. A Calvinistic confession of faith (*Confessio Belgica*) was in 1562 drawn up by Guido de Bres, and in 1566 it was recognised by a synod of Antwerp as a symbolical book of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. In the latter year a defensive league, the *Connpromiss*, was also concluded by the nobles, which spread with great rapidity. The name of *Gueux* (Beggars), by which the court at first had ridiculed the confederates, was received by the people as a title of honor, and served as a rallying-point for a great national movement towards freedom. When the stadtholder Margaret of Parma felt unable to curb any longer the rising opposition, the duke of Alba undertook to extinguish the Reformation with fire and sword. In the southern provinces he was successful; but seven of the northern provinces formed, in 1579, the Union of Utrecht, and renounced allegiance to the king of Spain. A long and bloody war of independence followed, which terminated in the establishment of the independent Dutch Republic. In the southern provinces, which remained under the crown of Spain, the Reformation was almost wholly extinguished. The Dutch Republic, though only one of the smaller Protestant states of Europe, soon added to the reputation of the Reformation by the conspicuous position it occupied in regard to literature and art, to civilization and to maritime conquest. In the inner history of the Reformed churches, the Arminian controversy, *SEE ARMINIANISM*, and the Synod of Dort (q.v.) — which was attended by delegates of the English Episcopal Church and the churches of Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Wetteran, Geneva, Bremen, and Emden — were of considerable importance. The decision of the Synod of Dort led for a time, both in Holland and in the Reformed churches of several other countries, to a complete victory of strict Calvinism over a party which demanded more Biblical simplicity and less rigid conformity with the system of any theologian, even if it be Calvin; but soon strict Calvinism lost more ground in Holland than in any other Reformed Church, and rationalism obtained an ascendancy so decisive and of so long duration that in the 19th century a numerous party of orthodox members of the National Church separated from the latter and constituted a Free Reformed Church. The Dutch

Reformed Church has planted large and flourishing offshoots in North America and several countries of South Africa, and thus contributed an important share to the ascendancy which Protestantism enjoys in these regions. In Belgium, under the cruel rule of the Spaniards, but very few and small Reformed congregations were able to continue their always endangered existence, until, in the 19th century, the reunion of the country with Holland began an era of greater freedom and of progress, which continued after the erection of Belgium into an independent kingdom. Now Belgium has again a National Reformed Church, which is still one of the smallest Reformed national churches of Europe, but is recognised by the State, enjoys a steady progress, and the outspoken sympathy of many of the foremost statesmen of the country.

VII. *The Lutheran Reformation in the Scandinavian Kingdoms.* — At the time when Luther began his reformation, Christian II ruled over all the Scandinavian countries — Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and Sweden. He was an unprincipled tyrant, who favored the Reformation in Denmark in order to strip the bishops of their political power, while in Sweden he executed the noblest men under the plea that they were under the papal ban. As early as 1519 he called Martin Reinhard from Wittenberg to Copenhagen into the theological faculty, and in 1521 he issued a decree encouraging the marriage of the priests. When, in 1522, a papal delegate appeared in Denmark, Christian took back his decree on the marriage of the priests. He was, nevertheless, deposed in 1523, and among the grounds of the deposition which the estates brought forward was, that he had infected his wife with the Lutheran heresy, and introduced promoters of this same heresy into the Catholic kingdom of Denmark. Christian was succeeded by his uncle Frederick I, duke of Holstein, who strongly inclined towards the Reformation, but who had, nevertheless, to promise to the estates of Denmark to put down, with persecution, the heresy that was pressing in. In the hereditary duchies of Schleswig and Holstein all violent interference with the great religious struggle was in 1524 forbidden, and the king's well-known sympathy with the Reformation greatly promoted the more rapid diffusion of Luther's doctrines and writings. The provincial of the Carmelite order, Paulus Elise, translated part of the Psalms; the New Test., translated by John Michelsen, a companion of the expelled king, Christian II, and printed in Leipsic in 1524, found a large circulation, and in 1525 the reading of the Bible was declared free. The nobility at an assembly at Viborg showed itself favorable; the king declared himself

openly for it in 1526; the Diet of Odense, in 1527, deprived the bishops of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and granted religious liberty to all, and the right of marriage to the clergy until the meeting of a general council. Viborg, in Jutland, Maimij, in Scania, and Copenhagen became important centres of the movement, which now spread with great rapidity over the whole kingdom. At the Diet of Copenhagen in 1530, which was to attempt a reunion of the parties, the Lutheran preachers, with John Jansen (preacher at Copenhagen) at their head, presented a confession of faith in forty-three articles. Though the object for which the diet had been convoked was not attained, the predominance of the Lutherans was now fully decided, and the king openly ranged himself on their side. On the death of Frederick I the bishops used the political power which had been left to them for a last attempt to put down the Reformation, but it was of no avail. The new king, Christian III, by energetic and violent measures, soon destroyed the last remnant of the old Church and completed the victory of the Reformation. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he confirmed the freedom of religion. On Aug. 20, 1536, all the bishops were imprisoned. A diet held at Copenhagen decreed that the bishops should thereafter be deprived of all secular power, and that the Church property should be confiscated, and divided among the king, the nobility, and ecclesiastical and charitable institutions. When the imprisoned bishops declared their willingness to renounce their dignities, they were restored to liberty; only Ronnov, bishop of Roeskilde, refused, and died in prison. At the invitation of the king, John Bugenhagen came to Denmark, crowned (1537) the king and the queen, consecrated two evangelical bishops or superintendents, and took a leading part in the framing of a new Church constitution, which was published on Sept. 2, 1537, and sanctioned by the Diet of Odense in 1539. From that time all Denmark has firmly adhered to the Lutheran Church. For many years no other worship was allowed; and, even after the establishment of complete religious liberty in 1848, more than ninety-nine per cent. of the entire population continue to be classed as Lutherans.

On the progress of the Reformation in Norway we are but imperfectly informed. A monk Anthony is mentioned who preached the Gospel in Bergen. The majority of the bishops and the clergy appear to have been opposed to the Reformation, which was almost unknown until the reign of Christian III; then the Danish government began to introduce the Reformation. Olaf Engelbrechtsen, archbishop of Drontheim, soon

abandoned his opposition to the Danish king and fled (1537) with his treasures to the Netherlands, and resistance to the new Church constitution soon ceased. Many of the bishops and clergy, however, left their positions; there was a scarcity of preachers, and the people for a long time showed a marked preference for Catholicism. But when the people had become settled in their new belief they became strongly attached to the Lutheran Church, with which now fully ninety-nine per cent. of the population are connected.

Iceland had become a part of the Danish kingdom by the Calmar Union of 1397, and the decree of the Danish Diet of 1536, which declared the Evangelical Church as the State religion of Denmark, became also valid for Iceland. For several years the two bishops of the country successfully neutralized the efforts of the Danish government. In 1540 Gifur Einarsson, who had studied in Wittenberg, became bishop of Skalholt, and began the introduction of the Reformation. His successor, Martin Einarsson, worked in the same direction, but was violently opposed by the other bishop, John Aresen, of Holar, who even took him prisoner, and had Gifur's bones dug up and interred in an unconsecrated place. But finally bishop Aresen was overpowered, and in 1550 executed as a rebel. This ended all opposition to the Reformation in Iceland. The entire population, as in Denmark and Norway, has ever since belonged to the Lutheran Church. In Sweden the Reformation was hailed as a useful ally in the struggle for shaking off the yoke of Denmark and re-establishing the national independence. The bishops and higher clergy were the strongest supporters of Danish rule, and when Gustavus Vasa achieved the freedom of Sweden and was elected king (1523) by the Diet of Strelnngnas he was looked upon by the bishops as a dangerous enemy. The king, who needed part of the immense wealth of the clergy to relieve the people of their taxes, at first endeavored to gain pope Adrian VI's co-operation for a reformation of the Church. When this was found to be useless, he commissioned the brothers Olaf and Lawrence Petersen, who had studied at Wittenberg, to introduce the Lutheran Reformation. The two brothers had returned to Sweden in 1519, gained a number of adherents, the most prominent of whom was the archdeacon Lawrence Andersen, and Olaf's sermons had made a great sensation at the Diet of Strengniis. The king appointed Olaf preacher in Stockholm, Lawrence Petersen professor of theology in Upsala, and Lawrence Andersen his chancellor. In 1526 a public discussion took place under the king's protection at Upsala, and a translation of the New Test. into

Swedish was made by chancellor Andersen. The bishops, however, whose prominent champion was bishop Brask, of Linköping, made a successful resistance to the progress of the Reformation; and the people, though irritated against the power and wealth of the clergy, manifested at the same time a superstitious attachment to the old Church. To bring matters to a crisis, the king offered (1527) at the Diet of Westeras to resign; but the Estates, placed before the alternative of either accepting the king's resignation or of surrendering the Church to his discretion, chose the latter. On account of the very outspoken aversion of the lower classes of the people to a change of religion, the king proceeded, however, with great caution. According to the so-called Western Ordinance the bishops were to give efficient preachers to the congregations, otherwise the king was to see to it. The bishops were to hand in to the king a schedule of their revenues, that he might determine how much should remain to the churches and what was to fall to the crown. The priests, in secular matters, were to be under the jurisdiction of the king; the Gospel was to be read in all the schools; excommunication was to be pronounced only after an investigation before a royal court. An assembly of clergy at Örebro in 1529 declared in favor of the Church Reformation, but retained many usages of the old Church, as the Latin language at divine service, the elevation of the host at the eucharist, the prayer for the dead, and the episcopal constitution. In 1531 Lawrence Petersen became archbishop of Upsala, and in 1537 another assembly of the clergy at Örebro provided for a more thorough evangelical purification of divine worship. The continuing aversion of the people to the new order of things was ascribed by the king to a want of energy on the part of the bishops, and he therefore appointed George Normann, a Pomeranian nobleman, superintendent of all the clergy of the kingdom, with a number of custodians and religious councillors as overseers of particular provinces. This arrangement was received with general disfavor, and led to a number of conspiracies. At the death of the king (1560) the ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom was quite undecided. The oldest son and successor of Gustavus, Eric XIV, removed some more Catholic elements from the new constitution of the Swedish Church, and gave a hospitable asylum to persecuted Protestants of every creed; the orthodox Lutherans suspected him of an inclination towards Calvinism, which, however, did not gain any ground in Sweden. Eric's brother and successor, John III, was prevailed upon by his Catholic wife, who was a Polish princess, and by the hope of succeeding to the Polish throne, to attempt the re-establishment of a closer connection with the Church of Rome. The

king was willing to recognise the supremacy of the pope, but demanded a number of concessions for the Swedish Church. The archbishop of Upsala was gained for the plan, a strongly Romanizing liturgy was introduced, but the boldness of the Jesuits incensed clergy and people against the counter-reformation, and the king finally took offence at the refusal of the pope to accept his proposition. The death of the Catholic queen and the king's second marriage with a Lutheran princess put an end to the negotiations with Rome, though the king stubbornly clung to the new liturgy. While John was wavering between Catholicism and Protestantism, his younger brother Charles, who was regent of South Ermeland, was an unflinching protector of the Reformation, and did not hesitate to incur the anger of his royal brother by affording a place of resort to the Lutheran clergy who had been expelled from the royal dominions for their unyielding character. King John was succeeded (1592) by his son Sigismund, who was already king of Poland and had been brought up a Catholic. Popular opinion by this time had undergone a great change, and demanded, prior to the recognition of Sigismund, a guarantee of the Lutheran State Church. An ecclesiastical council at Upsala (1593), which was convened by duke Charles as regent, decreed, even before the arrival of Sigismund, the exclusion of Catholicism from Sweden, and the official authority of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1595 the Diet of Sinderkoping declared the Lutheran Church as the only tolerated State Church. In 1599 duke Charles was appointed administrator, and in 1604 he was elected king. The new king was somewhat inclined to Calvinism, but he confirmed the resolutions of the diets in favor of the exclusive rights of the Lutheran State Church, which since then has retained full control of the kingdom.

VIII. *Protestantism in the Austrian States.* — In the various states governed by the house of Hapsburg both the Lutheran and the Reformed Reformation spread with great rapidity. Great enthusiasm was awakened by Luther's Reformation in Bohemia, where deep-rooted opposition to Rome still pervaded the masses of the people. Both the Bohemian Brethren and the Calixtines entered into communication with the German Reformer. Though a full union between Luther and the Brethren, who had never returned to the communion with Rome, was not effected, there was a mutual recognition as evangelical Christians; and the Brethren, whose number now increased again rapidly, and who in 1533 handed in their confession of faith to Ferdinand, helped to strengthen the reformatory host in Europe. Among the Calixtines, so large a number adopted the doctrines

of Luther that an assembly of the Estates in 1524 declared in favor of a continuation of the reformation begun by Huss in the way set forth by Luther. At the time of the Smalkald war, a majority of the Bohemians were attached to the Reformation; the Estates denied to king Ferdinand the aid of their troops, and united with the elector. When they had finally to submit, the king gave orders that in future only Catholics and Utraquists should be tolerated in the royal domains, and a large number of the Brethren deemed it best to emigrate to Poland and Russia. In the last years of his life Ferdinand showed a greater moderation towards Protestants, and his son Maximilian II was even, by Protestants as well as Catholics, regarded as a secret friend of the Reformation; but he was unable to protect the Protestants of his states against the persecutions instigated by the Jesuits. In 1575 the Calixtines and Brethren united and presented a common confession of faith, and received from Maximilian an oral pledge of recognition. In 1609 the king was forced to give to the adherents of the Confession of 1575 equal rights with the Catholics; but practically the persecutions continued. When the Estates of Bohemia refused to recognise Ferdinand as their king, and elected the Protestant elector of the Palatinate, Frederick V the Thirty Years' War broke out, in the course of which appeared the fatal decree of 1627, that left to the people only the alternative of becoming Catholics or leaving the country. Notwithstanding the rigorous persecution, which lasted for more than a hundred years, several thousand Protestants maintained themselves secretly both in Bohemia and Moravia; but to-day ninety-six per cent. of the Bohemians and ninety-five per cent. of the Moravians are connected with the Church of Rome.

In the southern provinces of Austria the Reformation likewise spread at an early period. Luther's writings were eagerly read in Vienna as early as 1520. In 1528 more than one half the nobility of the archduchy of Austria were evangelical. The Estates demanded freedom of religion in 1542 at Innsbruck, in 1548 at Augsburg, and in 1556 at Vienna, and bishop Naunea, of Vienna, intended to resign because the government tolerated the appointment of Lutheran professors at the University of Vienna. Under Maximilian the Estates called the Lutheran theologian David Chytrseus to Vienna to compile a *Book of Religions* and a *Church Agenda*, and their use was sanctioned by Maximilian after long reluctance. Lower Austria was at once almost wholly won over to Protestantism; but the numerous and bitter doctrinal controversies of the Protestants made it easy for the Jesuits to

enforce a counter-reformation. Gradually stringent laws demanded here, as in Bohemia, either a return to the Catholic religion or emigration; but how generally the people continued to be secretly attached to Protestantism became apparent when the victorious Hungarians and Transylvanians compelled the government, in 1606, to promise religious toleration. Whole towns at once returned to Protestantism, and in 1610 the emperor Matthias had to recognise the equal rights of the churches. The reviving hopes of Protestantism were, however, cruelly destroyed by the Thirty Years' War, which led to the utter extirpation of the Protestant congregations. In Austria, as in all other countries, the Reformers paid a special attention to the promotion of education; and for the ignorant South Slavic tribes in particular, where Primus Truber displayed a remarkable literary and reformatory activity, the Reformation promised to be the beginning of a national literature and of an aera of civilization. With the suppression of the Reformation, the Slavs relapsed into the utmost ignorance. from which only now an efficient system of State education is gradually extricating them. How thoroughly Protestantism has been eradicated in these provinces, in most of whicli it constituted at one time a majority of the population, may be seen from the fact that at present there are hardly any Protestants in Carinthia and the Tyrol, and that they are only one per cent. of the population in Stvria, two in Upper and Lower Austria, five in Carinthia, and fifteen in Silesia.

The number of Hungarian students at Wittenberg at the time when Luther began his reformation was so great that his reformatory views became at once widely known in Hungary, and found many friends. As early as 1518 several adherents of the Reformation were burned. The diet of 1523 passed a decree that all Lutherans and their patrons should be seized and burned. But the number of Protestants was already considerable: in Hermannstadt they had in 1523 the upper-hand; a new bloody law passed in 1524 remained ineffective, — and in 1525 the five royal cities declared in favor of the Reformation. The civil war which followed the death of king Louis II, who fell in the battle of Mohacs in 1526, was favorable to the progress of Protestantism. Although both rivals for the throne — archduke Ferdinand of Austria and John of Zapolya, voyvode of Transylvania — issued laws of persecution, they were unable to carry them out. The number of influential preachers rapidly increased. As the first preacher, Thomas Preussner, of Kasmark (about 1520), is mentioned; among the most distinguished were Matthias Devay (called Lutherus Ungaricus),

Leonhard Stockel, who drew up the *Confessio Pentapolitana*, which the free cities of Upper Hungary in 1549 presented to the king, and John Honter, who had studied in Basle and worked in his native city, Kronstadt, as a preacher and at a printing-press. In 1529 Hermannstadt expelled all priests and monks, and Kronstadt soon followed this example. The episcopal sees which became vacant after the battle of Mohacs were partly not filled, and partly came into the hands of friends of the Reformation. Several bishops, as Kechery of Veszprim, Thurczo of Neutra, and Andrew Dudith, who had attended the Council of Trent, openly became Protestants; and even the primate of Gran, Nicholas Olah, approved Stockel's Confession of Faith. The widow of king Louis II, to whom Luther wrote a letter and dedicated his translation of the Psalms, appointed an evangelical court preacher. Neither Ferdinand, who by the peace of 1538 was confirmed in the possession of the throne, nor John of Zapolya, who was to retain during his lifetime the royal title, Transylvania, and a portion of Upper Hungary, regarded it as safe to adopt stringent measures against the Protestants. The widow of John, Isabella, who, after John's death, endeavored to retain her husband's possessions, with the aid of the Turks, for her son John Sigismund, favored the Protestants; and in that part of the country which was subject to the Turks the Reformation advanced without any obstruction. Thus the Reformation obtained a decided ascendancy in all Hungary and Transylvania. At one time only three families of magnates were Catholic; the archiepiscopal see of Gral remained vacant for twenty years; the whole Saxon population of Transylvania, at the Synod of Medves (1544), adopted the Confession of Augsburg, which for a long time remained a bond of union for all the Protestants of Hungary and Transylvania. Among the Magyars, however, Calvinism finally obtained the ascendancy, and in 1566 all the Hungarian Reformed churches signed the Helvetic Confession. In Transylvania; in 1564, a Lutheran superintendent was appointed for the Saxons, and a Reformed for Magyars and Szeklers. In 1571 religious freedom was also extended to the Unitarians; and from this time Transylvania has always had four religions recognised by the State (*religiones receptoe*). In Hungary the Jesuits succeeded in arresting the further progress of Protestantism, and in instigating new and bloody persecutions. Repeatedly the Protestant princes of Transylvania, aided by the Hungarian Protestants, compelled the kings by force of arms to confirm anew the religious freedom of Protestantism; but each time these promises were immediately broken. In 1634 the majority of the Hungarian Diet had again become Catholic, and from that

time persecutions naturally became all the more oppressive. Though, in spite of all these persecutions, the Protestants maintained themselves, they constitute at present only a minority of the population — about twenty-three per cent. in Hungary proper, and twenty-four per cent. in Transylvania.

IX. *Protestantism in Poland, Prussia, and Livonia.* Towards the close of the Middle Ages the kings of Poland showed a firmer attachment to the Papal See than any other government of Europe. As, however, the powerful nobles were almost independent of the king, those of them who favored a religious reformation were able to give an asylum to many persecuted heretics during this period. The Hussite movement met with a great deal of sympathy, and a Polish translation of the Bible came into wide circulation. Luther's doctrines were favorably received by a large portion of the Polish nobility, which at that time was distinguished for its scholarship, and especially by the large German commercial cities of Polish Prussia. In the neighboring grand-mastership of Prussia, the domain of the Teutonic Order, the grand master Albert of Brandenburg called himself in 1523 two Lutheran preachers to Königsberg. The two bishops, and soon the grand master himself, confessed the Reformation, and in 1525 Albert took the duchy of Prussia in fief from Poland. The Reformation was soon generally accepted. The success of the Reformation in Livonia was equally rapid, notwithstanding the determined opposition of the archbishop of Riga. The city of Riga took the lead, and in 1538 joined the League of Smalkald. Nearly all the population soon followed. The grand master Conrad Kettler followed the example of Albert of Brandenburg, and in 1561 assumed the title of duke of Courland and Semigallia. This duchy also was a Polish fief: that part of Livonia which was situated on the other side of the Dwina was united by a special treaty with Poland on condition that it should be permitted to profess the Confession of Augsburg.

The success of the Reformation in these two fiefs encouraged its friends in Poland proper. King Sigismund, who died in 1548, was opposed to Protestantism, but unable to arrest its progress. His son, Sigismund Augustus, favored the Reformation, entered into negotiations with Calvin, and granted religious liberty to the cities of Dantzic, Thorn, and Elbing. Notwithstanding the utmost efforts made by the national Catholic party, with bishop Hosius at its head, the Diet of Petrikow, in 1565, demanded a national council for the express purpose of introducing priestly marriage, the Lord's supper under both kinds, and other reforms. In 1583 an edict of

religious toleration was passed, but in the next year Hosius caused the adoption of the decrees of the Council of Trent by the diet, and in 1565 the Jesuits who were called by him established their first college. The progress of the counter-reformation which now set in was greatly aided by the divisions existing among the Protestants. The Reformed effected a national organization in 1547; the Lutherans in 1565. The Bohemians retained their separate Church constitution, and the Unitarians, who had able leaders in Laelius Socinus, Blandrata, and Occhino, became likewise numerous. In 1570 the Reformed, Lutherans, and Bohemians agreed at the Synod of Sandomir upon a general confession to which all three could subscribe, but which left room for the retention by each Church of its doctrinal peculiarities. This Protestant union proved sufficiently strong to secure in 1573 the adoption of a general religious treaty, which guaranteed equal rights to Catholics and Protestants. A strong reaction against Protestantism began under king Stephen Bathori (1586 to 1587). His successor, Sigismund III, by conferring offices and dignities exclusively upon Catholics, induced many nobles to renounce Protestantism. In 1717 the erection of new Protestant churches was forbidden, and in 1733 the Protestants were excluded from all public offices. The increasing persecution of all non-Catholics led finally to the interference of Prussia and Russia, and to the partition of Poland.

X. *Protestantism in Italy, Spain, and France.* —

1. In Italy the revival of the classical studies and the observation of the corrupt condition of the ruling Church had diffused among the educated and literary classes a widespread contempt not only of the Catholic Church, but of Christianity in general. The friends of a reformation of the Church had, however, organized societies in Rome, Venice, and other cities, and the writings of the German and Swiss Reformers met therefore with a great deal of sympathy in all parts of Italy. One party of Italian reformers, which counted among its members several cardinals, as Contarini and Pole, was averse to a separation from the Church, and hoped for an evangelical regeneration of the old Church. Another party came out in favor of a thorough reformation, first in Ferrara (under the protection of the duchess Renata, a French princess), then in Modena and many other cities. A prominent centre of reformatory movements was subsequently in the city of Naples, where the Spanish nobleman Juan Valdez displayed a remarkable activity, and where two of the greatest preachers of Italy — Bernardino Occhino, the general of the Capuchins, and the learned

Augustinian Peter Martyr Vermigli — were gained for the Reformation. Translations of the principal writings of German and Swiss Reformers, mostly under assumed names, found a wide circulation, and the Italian reformers themselves published a large number of writings, the most celebrated of which is the work entitled *On the Benefit of Christ*. Under Paul III the evangelical Catholics, like Contarini and his friends, had for a time a leading influence upon the government of the Church; but in 1542 a decided reaction began when the pope, by the advice of cardinal Caraffa, who had formerly been a friend of Contarini, appointed an inquisition for the suppression of Protestantism. Many of the leading friends of the Reformation fled to foreign countries; among them Occhino, Vermigli, Vergerio (bishop of Capo d' Istria), and Caraccioli, a nephew of cardinal Caraffa. When Caraffa became pope, under the name of Paul IV, the persecution extended also to the Catholics of evangelical sentiments, including a number of cardinals and bishops. Under Paul V an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* led to the suppression of all literature friendly to Protestantism. Protestantism in Italy, as in other countries, had been divided into Lutheranism and Calvinism, with a prevailing inclination to the latter; and Anti-Trinitarian followers of Servetus had likewise become numerous, although they had to keep their opinions secret. The division of the Protestants weakened their power of resistance, and before the end of the century the Inquisition had destroyed all vestiges of Protestant communities. Among the distinguished martyrs of the Reformation were Carnesecchi and Palearius; two Waldensian congregations in Calabria were rooted out in a terrible massacre.

2. The union of Spain under one ruler with Germany and the Netherlands facilitated the introduction of the writings of the German Reformers. Besides, from Bearn, which was wholly Protestant, the doctrines of the Swiss Reformation spread into Aragon. Seville and Valladolid became the chief seats of the Reformation. Diego de Valera, John Egidius, Ponce de la Fuente (all of Seville), Alfonso and Juan Valdez, and Augustine Castalla were among its prominent friends. Francis Enzonas and Juan Perez translated the Bible. From fear of the Inquisition, the Spanish Protestants never ventured to constitute congregations; the Inquisition, nevertheless, discovered them, and exterminated them with merciless cruelty. In 1570 Protestantism was regarded as fully extinct.

3. France, during the Middle Ages, had often taken a leading part in opposing the claims of the papacy, and in asserting the superiority of

general councils over the pope; but it had shown no sympathy with a thorough reform of doctrine. When Luther's views became known in France, they were condemned (1521) by the Sorbonne. One of the French bishops, Guillaume Brionnet, took, however, an active interest in the reformation of the Church. He called to his aid men like Lefevre, Farel (who was at that time regent of the college of cardinal Le Moine at Paris), Roussel, and others; but when the charge of heresy was raised against him, he cut loose from his Reformed friends, and in 1523 pronounced against Luther. When Parliament was appealed to for the suppression of Protestantism, it lent at once its arm to the clergy for bloody persecution. In 1524 Jean le Clerc, of Meaux, the first martyr of the Reformation, was executed in Metz. In 1529 a great sensation was aroused by the hanging and burning of Louis de Berquin, a royal councillor and zealous adherent of the Reformation, whose writings and translations had previously (1523) been condemned by the Sorbonne. Francis I was an admirer of Erasmus, and by nature averse to any decisive attitude in religious affairs: he was, moreover, quick in detecting the advantages which an alliance between the Protestant princes of Germany and the ruler of France against the Catholic emperor of Germany might have for him and for France. On the other hand, he was afraid of disturbing the religious unity of France, and desirous of securing the pope's aid in his war against the German emperor. Thus his course in the progress of the religious controversies was wavering and undecided. At his court, and even in his family, both parties were represented, the chief patron of the Reformation being his sister Margaret, queen of Navarre. While the persecution of the Lutherans went forward, and, in January, 1535, several of the Reformed were executed in Paris in a barbarous way, Francis assured the Protestant princes of Germany that he was really in favor of a religious reformation, and that only some fanatics were punished in France. Of considerable interest are the negotiations which took place between Francis and Melancthon. The king became acquainted with Melancthon in consequence of a memorial which the latter addressed in 1531 to Guillaume Bellay, and in which he explained the essential points of the Reformation, and how they might be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine. Melancthon's *Loci Communes* pleased the king much. In 1535 John Sturm, then professor in Paris, invited Melancthon to France. Melancthon answered cordially, and was then formally invited by the king himself, by cardinal Bellay, Sturm, and Guillaume Bellay. Luther was in favor of accepting the invitation, but the elector sharply refused to give him permission. Melancthon therefore did not go, but in August of the

same year his *Consilium*, with many alterations, was presented to the Sorbonne for their decision, in the form of a confession of faith, and it was declared by them to be thoroughly objectionable. The king, nevertheless, announced in December to the Protestant princes assembled at Smalkald that he had formed a favorable opinion of the articles of Melancthon. Soon, however, the king, chiefly through the influence of cardinal Tournon, ceased to manifest any sympathy with the cause of the Reformation. With it the connection of Frenchmen with the Lutheran Reformation seems to have come to an end, until, at a later period, the conquest of German territories gave to France a considerable number of Lutheran congregations.

The friends whom bishop Brionnet had called to Meaux to assist him in his reformatory work remained mostly, like himself, within the old Church, contenting themselves with diffusing spiritual and evangelical feelings among Catholics. Lefevre (Faber Stapulensis), after having fled to Strasburg on account of the charges of heresy brought against him, was recalled by Francis I, appointed librarian at Blois, where he translated the Old Testament, and spent the end of his life at the court of Margaret of Navarre. Gerald Roussel, who fled with Lefevre to Strasburg, became subsequently bishop of Oleron, where he introduced important reforms, but never ceased to be suspected of heresy. Even Margaret of Navarre, the zealous patron of all friends of the Reformation, who reformed all the churches of her little state according to evangelical principles, never regarded it necessary to separate externally from the Catholic Church. Her course was disapproved by Calvin, but her work was continued by her daughter Jeanne d'Albret, the wife of Antoine of Bourbon, and in 1569 the Reformation was fully carried through in Bearn.

The main reformatory movement of France, which has played a conspicuous part in its ecclesiastical as well as political history, attaches itself to the name of John Calvin. He was a native of France, and became thoroughly imbued with reformatory ideas while studying 'at Bourges and Paris. He had to flee in 1533, spent a short time at the court of the queen of Navarre, returned to Paris, but had to flee again to Switzerland in 1534, when he wrote his *Institutes*, in the preface of which he exposes the injustice of the king. From Basle he went to Geneva, where, with the exception of a few years which he spent in Strasburg, which was then a German city, he remained until the end of his life, as the author and recognised leader of one of the two great divisions of the Reformation of

the 16th century. Though he was not allowed to return to France, Geneva became the hearth and home from which the Reformation in France itself was constantly receiving new food. In the latter years of the reign of Francis the persecution of the Reformed increased in severity; and especially the Waldenses in Merindol and Cabrieres, in Provence, suffered from a most horrible persecution, which in 1545 ended in a general massacre. Notwithstanding the persecution, the number of the Reformed grew steadily; it was very large even at the death of Francis I, in 1547, and rapidly increased during the reign of Henry II. Regular congregations began to be formed in the large cities in 1555, and in 1559 a general synod held at Paris agreed upon a confession of faith and a Church order. (For the further history of the Reformed Church, *SEE FRANCE*.) The subsequent history of the Reformed, to whom soon the name of Huguenots was generally applied, is closely connected with the political history of France. They were forced in self-defence to act no less as a political than an ecclesiastical party. While the Catholics adhered to the fanatical Guises, the Protestants looked for protection to the Bourbons. In 1570 they received in the Peace of St. Germain equal rights, and several fortresses' as a guarantee of the peace; but two years later (1572), St. Bartholomew's Eve was the beginning of the most terrible ordeal through which they passed in their entire history, more than 30,000 of them being massacred during one month. King Henry III was driven by the arrogance of the Guises into the ranks of the Huguenots, and was soon after assassinated by the Dominican Clement. Then the first Protestant, Henry of Navarre, ascended the French throne. To save the Protestant cause, he submitted externally to the Catholic Church; but to his former coreligionists he preserved his sympathy and secured equal rights in the Edict of Nantes. During the reigns of the following kings the Huguenots again passed through a series of severe persecutions: under Louis XIV the Edict of Nantes was revoked, and a large number of families compelled to emigrate, and to settle in foreign countries. The French Revolution at last began for them the sera of religious freedom.

XI. *Main and Minor Divisions.* — The Reformation swept with irresistible power over all Europe. In some countries it was totally extinguished by fire and blood; in others it maintained itself as the religion of the minority; in others still it became the predominant or the exclusive religion of the people. Fifty years after its beginning it numbered many millions of adherents. All these millions agreed in protesting against the

claim of Rome to be the only true Christian Church, and in the desire to restore a purer form of Christianity. The immense majority rallied around three centres — the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Anglican Reformation. These three main divisions, and even the principal subdivisions, of the 16th century have retained their identity to the present day. To the old subdivisions new ones have been added. Thus, in the 18th century, the Wesleyan Methodists sprang from the Church of England, and, with an unparalleled rapidity of growth, soon took a front rank among the most numerous subdivisions of the Reformed churches. The subdivisions have again been subdivided into a number of minor sects, and in many of them, at times, the old doctrinal platforms of the founders of the Reformers appeared to have been abandoned, leaving nothing but the name of the Church as a bond of connection with the Reformation of the 16th century. The very name, however, and the remaining consciousness of a live connection with the great movement of the 16th century have proved elements of great conservative force, and have been largely instrumental in keeping the territory which the three great branches of the Reformation conquered in the 16th century undiminished up to the present day. While it has been the prevailing tendency in the history of the subdivisions to develop independent life-organisms illustrating the vitality of the principles and theories which led to their separate existence, attempts have never been wanting to strengthen the bonds of union connecting them. Many subdivisions which had been formed in consequence of disagreeing views on particular points of belief or Church government have been reunited on the basis of the points common to all, allowing the right to disagree on points of minor importance. In modern times, attempts have even been made to find a permanent bond of union for all the subdivisions of the large groups of the Protestant churches. Thus, all the bishops of the churches in doctrinal conformity with the Church of England have twice been called to meet in Pan-Anglican councils. All the Reformed and Presbyterian churches met in 1877 for the first time in a Pan-Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took, in 1876, the first step towards the convocation of an OEcumenical Council of Methodism.

While the large majority of the millions which in the 16th century rose up against and separated from the Church of Rome rallied around three large centres, it was but natural that many, in the search of a pure Christianity, arrived at different results. Some of these dissenters never succeeded in

forming sects; others became numerous, and have, in the course of time, assumed large dimensions. To the latter class belong the Baptists, the Anti-Trinitarians, the Friends, and many others. All of these have long had to struggle for toleration, because Protestant governments united with the Catholic in persecuting and suppressing them. More recently, however, the principle of religious liberty has gradually come to be recognised in nearly all Christian countries, and enabled individuals as well as sects to carry out the great principles which lay at the bottom of the Reformation of the 16th century to the best of their understanding, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. About the middle of the present century (1845), an attempt was made to unite in one association, called the Evangelical Alliance, Christians belonging to all denominations collectively called evangelical, and to represent, on a larger scale than had ever been attempted before, the unity of all these churches in the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. A list of nine articles was drawn up, to which, it was thought, all Christians wishing to be regarded as evangelical might be expected to assent. In the list of these articles are included the inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, the utter depravity of human nature, justification by faith alone, the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked, the divine institution of the Christian ministry. According to this programme, it could and did become a rallying-point for Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Moravians, the evangelical or Low-Church party of the Anglican churches, and a number of minor denominations. It was objected to by the so-called high and strict Church parties among Anglicans and Lutherans, by Unitarians and Universalists, by the Friends, by the Annihilationists, and by all Anti-Trinitarians and Rationalists.

XII. *Central and Fundamental Principles of the Reformation.* — The parties which withdrew from the Church of Rome in the 16th century and tried to restore a purer form of Christianity took different roads and arrived at different results; yet there was one principle in which they all agreed, and which may be declared to be preeminently the central principle of the Reformation — this was the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures. Every Reformed Church charged the Church of Rome with holding doctrines and usages which the former deemed anti-scriptural, and which on that ground it rejected. The three large divisions of the Reformation were all more intent upon eliminating from the creed of Christendom what

could be proved to be anti-scriptural than to undertake the revision of every article of the creed by a scriptural test exclusively. Thus they all retained what the early councils had defined on the essence of the Godhead and the person of Christ. Gradually other parties arose which demanded a greater prominence for the necessity of the scriptural affirmative proof, and that not too great a stress should be laid upon the testimony of the early Church. Hence many doctrines which the great Reformed churches of the 16th century agreed in continuing in their creeds were by other Christian inquirers declared to lack the foundation of a clear scriptural proof, and on that ground either rejected or held as indifferent on which Bible Christians had a right to disagree. All these parties, however, held fast to the fundamental principle that the Bible was the supreme authority for the believer in Christ. Other sects and parties have made a distinction between the written Scripture and the Word or Spirit of Christ, and placed the latter above the former; others, again, have found a hidden sense in the Bible besides the literal; yet all these parties concur in recognising the central principle of the Reformation. A total change of the basis of the Reformation was attempted by the Rationalists of the 18th and 19th centuries, who wanted to have the Bible regarded and interpreted as any other book, recognising what appeared to agree with sound reason, and claiming the right to reject all the remainder. The divergence between this view and the central principle of the Reformation is so apparent and so radical that the longcontinued coexistence of both views in many of the European State churches can only be explained from the fact that the churches were enslaved by the State, and treated not as forms of religion, but as a division of the State administration. The introduction of self-government into these churches rapidly develops a tendency towards the complete separation between the Rationalistic and the Biblical conception of Christianity.

Theologians have sometimes called this principle the formal principle of the Reformation, or the *principium cognoscendi*. They have distinguished from it the material principle, or *principium essendi*, which proclaims the justification of the sinner by faith alone. Both are intimately connected. When the Church is no longer viewed as the infallible teacher of the true Christian doctrine, but the inquirer after Christian truth is pointed to the Bible and to Christ himself, the soul's salvation can only be found in a direct relation between Christ and the Christian soul. The doctrine

occupies, however, a somewhat different position in the doctrinal systems of different Protestant churches. *SEE JUSTIFICATION.*

XIII. *The Reformation's Place in the History of the Christian Church and in the History of the World.* — It is agreed on all sides, and not even denied by the Catholics, that the Reformation is one of the great turningpoints in the Christian Church, and that with it begins all entirely new aera. The compulsory uniformity of the Church was forever at an end. Church history, henceforth, has not to deal only with one predominant and all-powerful Church, but with a number of rival churches, the number of which has steadily increased. For a time, the leading reformatory churches in close alliance with the governments of the countries in which they prevailed endeavored likewise to enforce conformity with their doctrines and laws; but this course was gradually recognised to be untenable, and religious toleration, and subsequently the freedom of religious confession, has become one of the characteristic features of the Reformed countries. The Catholic Church continues up to the present day to brand the principle of religious liberty as a heresy of modern times; but it is a notable fact that nearly all the Catholic countries which nominally continue to adhere to the doctrine of the Church entirely disregard what their Church declares to be the Catholic principle, and have introduced the Protestant principles of religious freedom into their legislation.

In universal history, the Reformation is by all historians designated as one of the great movements which mark the transition from the Middle Ages to modern times. A characteristic feature of the countries which adopted the Reformation is the progress towards political freedom, and the separation between Church and State. The Catholic Church in the Middle Ages claimed a far-reaching influence upon civil legislation. It claimed the sole right of legislating on marriage affairs, exempted priests and monks from civil jurisdiction, and accumulated within its hand a very large proportion of the nation's wealth. Though the Reformed State churches pursued different courses in reforming the civil codes, the tendency to make all citizens equal before the law can be directly traced to the Reformation.

Although the Catholic Church still has a larger membership than all the Reformed churches combined, the power and the commanding influence upon the destinies of mankind are more and more passing into the hands of states the governments of which are separated from Rome. In the New World, the ascendancy of the United States and British America, in both of

which Protestantism prevails, over the states of Spanish and Portuguese America is not disputed even by Catholics. In Europe, England has become the greatest world-power, and in its wide dominions new great Protestant countries are springing into existence, especially in Australia and South Africa. In Germany, the supreme power has passed from the declining Catholic house of Hapsburg to the Protestant house of Hohenzollern, and the new Protestant German Empire marks an addition of the greatest importance to the aggregate power of the Protestant world. The combined influence of the three great Teutonic peoples — the United States, Great Britain, and Germany — continues to be cast in a steadily increasing ratio for the defence of that freedom from the dictation of Rome which was first won by the Reformation. That freedom is now not only fully secured against any possible combination of Catholic states, but the parliaments of most of the latter, as France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, are as eager in the defence of this freedom as the Protestant states. Thus it may be said that, after an existence of about 350 years, the Reformation has totally annihilated the influence of Rome upon the laws and the government of the civilized world.

XIV. Literature. — A great many works which are sources for the history of the Reformation have been mentioned in the articles on the Reformers and on particular churches. The following list contains works which more specially treat of the history of the Reformation: Sleidani *De Statu Religionis et Reipublicoe, Carolo V Ceosare, Commentarii* (Strasburg, 1555; Engl. transl. by Bohun, Lond. 1689); Sculteti *Annalium Evangelii passim per Europam Decimo Sexto Salutis Partce Sceculo Renovati Decas let II* [embracing the time from 1516 to 1536] (Heidelb. 1618); Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation* (Lond. 1679 sq.); Gerdes, *Introductio in Hist. Evangelii Sec. XVI passim per Europeanum Renovati* (Groning. 1744-52, tom. iv); Hagelbach, *Vorlesungen uber das Wesen undd Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland und der Schweiz* (Leips. 1834-43, 6 vols.; Engl. transl. by Evelina Moore, Edinb. 1878 sq.); Clausen, *Populare Vortraye uber die Reormation* (Leips. 1837); D'Aubigne, *Histoire de la Reformation au XVIeme Siecle* (Paris, 1835-53, 5 vols.; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1843 sq.); and the supplementary *Histoire de la Reformation au temps de Calvin* (Paris, 1862 sq. 8 vols.; Engl. transl. N.Y. 1862-79); Beansobre, *Hist. de la Reform.* (1785); Neudecker, *Gesch. der Reform.* (Leips. 1843), and *Gesch. des Protest.* (ibid. 1844, 2 vols.); Dillinger, *Die Reform.* (1846-48, 3 vols.); Gaillard, *Hist. of the Reform.* (N.Y. 1847); Guericke, *Gesch.*

der Reform. (Berlin, 1855); Stebbing, *Hist. of the Reform.* (Lond. 1850); Waddington, *Hist. of the Reform.* (ibid. 1841); Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ch. during the Reform.* (Camb. 1856); Soames, *Hist. of the Reform.* (Lond. 1826); Fisher, *Hist. of the Reform.* (N. Y. 1873). On the doctrinal history of the Reformed churches, see Dorner, *Gesch. der Prot. Theologie* (1867, Engl. transl. 1871); and Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (N. Y. 1877, 3 vols.). (A. J. S.)

Reformation, Festival Of The.

This is an annual commemoration in Germany of the great event of the 16th century. It is held on Oct. 31, to remind of the opening of the Reformation by the nailing of the ninety-five theses on the church doors at Wittenberg (Oct. 31, 1517). It is first celebrated as a secular feast, and on the following Sabbath as an ecclesiastical commemoration.

Reformation Rights

(*jus reformandi*) are the privileges granted to the different princes of the Reformation compact at the Augsburg Interim in 1555 to introduce into their states either the Catholic or Protestant faith, and to maintain it as the faith of the people. The peace of Westphalia, in 1648, brought in modifications, but modern events have made so many changes that the rights of the Reformation exist only in name. At present it is religious liberty which each state concedes to its subjects, and the only question remaining is whether Church and State shall have any interdependence. *SEE STATE.*

Reformed Baptists

SEE CAMPBELLITES.

Reformed Churches

the name usually given to all the churches of the Reformation. In a conventional sense, it is used to designate those Protestant churches in which the Calvinistic doctrines, and still more the Calvinistic polity, prevail, in contradistinction to the Lutheran (q.v.). The influence of Calvin proved more powerful than that of Zwingli, which, however, no doubt considerably modified the views prevalent in many of these churches. The Reformed churches are very generally known on the continent of Europe as the *Calvinistic churches*, while the name *Protestant Church* is in some

countries almost equivalent to that of *Lutheran*. One chief distinction of all the Reformed churches is their doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, characterized by the utter rejection not only of transubstantiation, but of consubstantiation; and it was on this point mainly that the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed was long carried on. *SEE LORDS SUPPER*. They are also unanimous in their rejection of the use of images and of many ceremonies which the Lutherans have thought it proper to retain. Among the Reformed churches are those both of England and Scotland (notwithstanding the Episcopalian government of the former and the Presbyterianism of the latter), the Protestant Church of France, that of Holland and the Netherlands, many German churches, the once flourishing Protestant Church of Poland, etc., with those in America and elsewhere which have sprung from them. *SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE REFORMATION*.

Reformed (Dutch) Church

IN AMERICA, one of the oldest and most influential bodies of Christians in this country.

I. Name. — The former title of this denomination indicated its historical relations, “the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America.” It is “Reformed,” as distinct from Lutheranism; “Protestant,” as protesting against Rome; “Dutch,” as expressing its origin in Holland. In 1867, by an almost unanimous vote of its General Synod, with the concurrence of the great majority of the classes, the name of the Church was restored to its simple and original form — *the Reformed Church*. The history and reasons of this change are fully presented in an elaborate report, which is appended to the minutes of the General Synod of 1867. The word “Dutch” was originally introduced to distinguish the Church from the “English” Church, by which the Episcopalian denomination was generally known, in the State of New York, after the Dutch colonial government had surrendered to the British in 1664. The Hollanders who settled New York and Albany, and intermediate places, came over as members of the “Reformed Church of the Netherlands” and representatives of “the Reformed Religion.” It was not until thirty years after the cession of the province to the British that the word “Dutch” was incorporated in the style and title of a single Church when William III of England gave a charter to the Netherland Reformed Congregation in the city of New York as the “Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.” In resuming its original name the Church has lost none of its

historical associations, and has only dropped what had long been regarded by many as a hindrance to her advancement.

II. Reformed Church in Holland. — The Reformed Church of the Netherlands was a legitimate outgrowth from the great Reformation of the 16th century. The conflict for civil and religious liberty in the Low Countries was preceded by the labors of those “Reformers before the Reformation,” Wessel Gansevoort and Rudolph Agricola. Both of these illustrious scholars and teachers were natives of Groningen. They were students of the Bible, who, fifty years before Martin Luther, came to a clear knowledge of the great doctrines of the faith with which he shook the world. But it was not until many years after he had taken his position that he saw the writings of Gansevoort, and then he felt constrained to make the fact public, lest his enemies should use their agreement of views to his own disadvantage. Gansevoort was an eminent teacher at Heidelberg, Louvain, Paris, Rome, and at last, as head of a celebrated school, in his native Groningen, where he died in 1489. Agricola was professor in the University of Heidelberg, and was noted for his classical and scientific attainments, and especially for his skill in the use of the Greek New Test. The labors of these great and good men mightily prepared the Way for the civil and religious conflict which followed under Charles V and his son Philip II of Spain. Evangelical truth struck its roots deep down into the hearts of the people. Confessors and martyrs for Christ were never wanting for the persecutions of the government and the Inquisition. The poor people called their churches “*the Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross.*” They worshipped privately for many years, in scattered little assemblies, until they crystallized into a regular ecclesiastical organization. The ban of the empire and the curse of the Romish Church could not keep down the rising spirit of the heroic believers in Christ alid liberty. Every new act of tyranny fanned the sacred flame. Popular field-preachers, like Herman Strijker and Jan Arentsen, gathered thousands of people beneath the open sky to listen to their powerful eloquence. The whole country was stirred to its depths. The hymns of Beza and Clement Marot, translated from the French, rang out the pious enthusiasm of the multitudes. Babes were brought for baptism, and alms were collected for the poor. At length three pastors were set apart to the ministry of the Church in Amsterdam, deacons and deaconesses were appointed to distribute alms to the needy saints, and churches were organized. In 1563 the Synod of Antwerp was held, which adopted the Belgic Confession, and laid the foundations of that

noble Church to which subsequent synods only gave more permanent shape. Her scholars and theologians, her schools and universities, her pure faith and holy living, her active zeal and martyr spirit, gave the Reformed Church of Holland the leading position among the sister churches of the Continent. Her catholic feeling and religious liberty made her a refuge for the persecuted of other lands. The Waldenses and the Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters and the English Puritans, found a welcome at her altars; and John Robinson and the voyagers of the Mayflower learned in Holland some of the best lessons which they brought with them to Plymouth Rock.

III. *History of the Reformed Church in America.* —

1. — *Origin.* — The Reformed Church in America was founded by emigrants from Holland, who formed the colony of the New Netherlands, under the authority of the States General and under the auspices of the Dutch East India Company. Hendrick Hudson arrived in New York harbor Sept. 11, 1609, in the Half Moon, and proceeded as far as Fort Orange (now Albany). Trading-posts were established there and on Manhattan Island (New York) in 1614. The emigrants came for trade, but they did not neglect religion and the public worship of God. They had no ordained minister and no organized Church for several years; but two “krank-besoeckers,” or “zieken-troosters” — literally “comforters of the sick,” pious persons who were often commissioned as aids to the ministers of the Gospel in the mother-country — came over with governor Minuit in 1626. These were Jansen Krol and Jan Huyck. “They met the people on Sundays in an upper room above a horse-mill, and read the Scriptures and the creeds to them. This was *the beginning of public worship in New Amsterdam.*” There is evidence, however, that “a considerable Church was organized in that city as early as 1619,” and that “a list of members in full communion of the Church of New York is still extant, dated 1622” (*Life of Dr. John II Livingston*, p. 79, note).

The first minister of the Gospel who came to this country from Holland was the Rev. Jonas Michaelius, a graduate of the University of Leyden, and afterwards a missionary in San Salvador and Guinea. He preached in New Amsterdam from 1628 to 1633, and then returned to Holland. **SEE MICHAELIUS.** In the spring of the same year his successor, the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, arrived, bringing with him the first schoolmaster, Adam Roelandsen, who organized the parochial school of the Collegiate

Reformed Dutch Church. This school is still in existence, without a break in its, succession of nearly two hundred and fifty years. It is sustained by the Collegiate Church, and has always been “an instrument of much good to the Church and to the community.” A history of it has been published in a small volume by its present principal, Mr. Dunshee. This intimate connection of the Church and the school was characteristic of the early Reformed churches, and it antedates the claim of priority made for the New England Puritans by several years. The upper room in Francis Molemaker’s horse-mill was relinquished as a place of worship upon the arrival of dominie Bogardus in 1633, and a plain, frail wooden church-building and a parsonage were erected near what is now Old Slip, on the East River. In 1642, at the suggestion of the famous navigator David Petersen de Vries, funds were raised for the erection of a stone edifice within the fort (now the Battery), where the people worshipped until the church was finished in Garden Street in 1693. A church was planted in the colony of Rensselaerswvck (Albany) under the patronage of Kilian van Rensselaer, a pearl-merchant from Amsterdam, who founded a colony upon the large tract of land of which he was the first patron. In 1642 he secured the services of the Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, whose call states that “By the state of navigation in the East and West Indies a door is opened through the special providence of God, also in the New Netherlands, for the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the salvation of men, as good fruits have been already witnessed there through God’s mercy.” He was also the first Protestant missionary to the Indians in this country, preceding the labors of John Eliot near Boston by three or four years. *SEE MEGAPOLENSIS*. His successors Delliuss and Lydius did the same good work.

2. First Period. — “The Dutch rule in Manhattan lasted fifty years from the establishment of the first tradingstation. The Church had been organized about thirty years. The city of New Amsterdam, at the date of the surrender, contained only 1500 inhabitants; and there were but five Reformed churches in the whole province — New York, Albany, Flatbush and Flatlands, Esopus (or Kingston), and Breuckelen (Brooklyn). There were six ministers the two Megapolenses, Drisius, Schaats, Polhemus, and Blom.” They were men of thorough education, and, as far as we can learn, diligent in the ministry. There were also a church at Bergen, which was the first of any denomination in New Jersey organized in 1660, and one at New Amstel, Del., which subsequently dropped out of the connection. The

Hollanders numbered, at the time of the surrender, about 10,000 souls. This first period of the Church was necessarily one of very small beginnings. The churches were planted in the wilderness. They encountered all the difficulties of new colonies — surrounded by savage tribes, separated by long distances from each other, and dependent entirely upon Holland for their clergy and school-teachers. Civil affairs were sometimes unhappily mixed up with religious interests, and the growth was slow indeed.

3. The *second period* covers nearly three quarters of a century (1664 to 1737), during which about fifty churches were added to the denomination. Of these fourteen were in New Jersey, about twenty on the banks of the Hudson River, about half as many in the valleys of Schoharie, Orange, and Ulster, and a half-dozen on Long Island and Staten Island. Forty-two ministers began their labors, some of them only remaining a short time, among these churches; and at the close of the period there were sixty churches, and seventeen ministers of Hollandish extraction in America. When the English rule began in New York, emigration from Holland almost ceased. Frequent collisions occurred with the British governors of the province. Governor Andros sent a minister of the Church of England, *SEE VAN RANSLAER, NICHOLAS* to Albany to take possession of the Dutch church there; and governor Fletcher, failing to impose the use of the English language by law upon the Hollanders, procured the passage of a bill by the Assembly settling a maintenance for ministers, which was so worded that, while it might apply to dissenters, it practically subserved the Church of England, and made it substantially the Established Church in the counties of New York, Kings, Queens, Richmond, and Westchester. Church-rates were exacted by the government for the support of these Episcopalian ministers. The line of separation between the Dutch and English gradually became more distinct. Many of the Hollanders, to escape English oppression, removed to New Jersey, and settled principally in Middlesex, Somerset, Monmouth, and Bergen counties, where they laid the foundations of churches that have long been great and powerful. Some French Huguenots, who fled from religious persecutions in the Old World, also settled in New York, Westchester, and Ulster counties, and on Staten Island. For their benefit, the Collegiate Church of New York called Samuel Drisius, who could preach in French as well as in Dutch and English; and Daille, Bonrepos, and Perret ministered to the pious exiles. They fraternized heartily with the Dutch churches, and ultimately were absorbed

in the one organization. Their descendants in the same localities still form a strong constituent element of the Reformed Church in America.

In 1709 a large body of Germans from the Palatinate, fleeing from religious persecution, settled upon Livingston Manor, in Schoharie County, N. Y., and in the valley of the Mohawk. Among them were many Swiss, who sought the same shelter in the New World. Unable to obtain help from the Church in their fatherland, and living beside their Dutch neighbors, they naturally sought and received assistance from them. The Classis of Amsterdam, at the request of the Church of the Palatinate, agreed to aid the Germans upon condition that they would adhere to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Palatinate Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, and the Rules of Church Government of Dort. Ministers were sent over. A coetus or American Classis was formed by the direction and under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Holland, which charged the Classis of Amsterdam with the supervision of the affairs of the German Church in America, which then extended among the German settlements in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, New Jersey, and New York. This relation subsisted forty-six years, until 1793, when the coetus asserted its independence of the Church in Holland. *SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA*. In Schoharie and Columbia counties, and in the valley of the Mohawk, the German and Hollandish elements have, to a great degree, united in the Reformed churches. 4. The *third period* in this history dates from the first effort of the Dutch churches to secure an independent organization — 1737 to 1792. Their entire dependence upon the Church in Holland for ministers, their growth in numbers and their distance from the mother country, the necessities of a new country, and the lack of facilities for educating their clergy, the delays, expense, and anxieties occasioned by the necessity of sending young men to Holland for training and ordination, and other good reasons growing out of their position and the ecclesiastical restrictions of the Classis of Amsterdam, led to the organization of a coetus, or ecclesiastical association, in New York in 1737. A plan was carefully framed, submitted to the churches, and sent to Holland for approval by the classis. This plan embraced a yearly meeting of clerical and lay delegates for the transaction of ecclesiastical business only, to promote the welfare of the churches, and in entire subordination to the Classis of Amsterdam. But nine years passed away before that body gave its sanction. The first meeting of the coetus

was held in September, 1747, and the first German coetus in the same month.

The powers of this body were too limited to make it really effective. It had no authority to ordain any man to the ministry without special permission, nor to decide finally upon any question. But these restrictions only roused the spirit of independence in the younger ministry, and generated the powerful opposition of the adherents of the policy of the mother Church. In 1753 measures were taken for forming an American Classis, which was organized in 1755. This event caused the withdrawal of the conservatives, who were thereafter known as the "*Conferentie*," the Dutch word for the Latin *coetus*. From this time until 1771 the conflict between these parties rent the Church asunder. Ministers, churches, and people entered into the strife with the most bitter animosities. The coetus were noted for their practical zeal, their pious and progressive earnestness, and their high sense of the rights and duties of the Church in this country. The conferentie possessed more learning, and some of its members occupied the highest places in the Church. In numbers they were nearly equal. In spirit, while both were often extremely culpable, the Conferentie are generally credited with being the most intemperate. Yet they should be regarded as impelled by their zeal for a thoroughly educated ministry, and for the order and worship of the Church. But the quarrel grew apace. Preachers were sometimes disturbed in their pulpits; public worship was often interrupted, or actually stopped, by violence. Church doors were locked against one or the other party by their opponents. Tumults were excited on the Lord's day at the doors of the sanctuaries. Personal, domestic, and public divisions were made between those who had always before been friends. Religion suffered sadly, and the Church seemed almost on the brink of ruin, when at length the hour of deliverance and the deliverer came.

In 1766 John H. Livingston, then a young man, arrived in Holland to study for the ministry at the Unieversity of Utrecht. His heart was filled with anxiety for the churches at home, whose dissensions he had witnessed and deplored. With great wisdom he embraced every opportunity to spread information and take counsel with leading men in Holland respecting the state of things in America. He prepared a plan of union, secured the assent of the ecclesiastical authorities, and returned to New York as pastor of the Church in that city, in 1770, with his olive-branch. In October, 1771, a convention was held in New York, at which there were present twenty-two ministers and twenty-five elders, from thirty-four churches. The plan of

union was presented by Dr. Livingston, discussed in a friendly manner, with a sincere desire for peace, ratified by that body, and transmitted to Holland for final approval by the Classis of Amsterdam. In 1772 their favorable answer was received, dated Jan. 14 in that year. (A translation is printed in full in Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 11, 12.) This practically ended the long strife. A general synod was organized, with five classes. The power of licensing and ordaining ministers was granted to the new and independent body, and the way was thus peacefully prepared for the formal and final organization. The articles of union were only intended as a temporary scaffolding for the erection of a more permanent ecclesiastical structure. In 1788 the doctrinal symbols of the Church, and the articles of Church government used in Holland, were translated by a committee of the synod. In 1792 the whole work was reviewed by the synod, adapted to the wants of the Church in this land, and adopted as the constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church. At this time there were one hundred and thirty churches and fifty ministers. During the whole period of strife ninety new churches were organized, and eighty-eight ministers began their labors among them. Before the first attempts at independent organization, for forty years prior to 1730, the average growth in ministers and churches was only seven of each per decade. During the next sixty years, the average per decade arose to seventeen. These facts tell the story of the differing policies of the coetus and conferentie.

The separate organization which was thus secured has remained to this day, a monument of providential interposition, and of the wisdom and piety of its chief human agent, Dr. Livingston, who is justly revered as the father of the Reformed Church in America. The constitution adopted in 1792 continued in force for the space of forty years. In 1832 it was revised, and again in 1874.

5. Causes of Slow Growth. — It has often been a matter of surprise to persons unacquainted with these and other facts that this oldest Presbyterian Church organization in this country has been of such slow growth. The reasons are self-evident. The Dutch rule in New Amsterdam lasted only about thirty years; and when it ceased, the population of the city was but 1500. The English Episcopal Church rose almost to the power of a state establishment. "The Presbyterians of Ireland and Scotland, for a hundred and twenty-five years, were practically excluded by the continued use of the Dutch language from the Church assemblies of the Reformed, and they established their own churches nearly half a century before an

English word was heard in a Dutch church.” The introduction of English preaching by the Rev. Dr. Laidlie, who was called by the Church of New York for this purpose, was the result of a long strife, and the commencement of a longer struggle against the use of this restrictive tongue. The damage to the Church from this cause alone was almost incalculable, keeping multitudes away from its sanctuaries, and driving many of the younger families into the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. The first English sermon was preached in the church in New York in 1764 by Dr. Laidlie. The dependence of the American churches upon the mother Church in Holland for more than a hundred and fifty years also produced its natural results in dwarfing their growth and diminishing their strength. They were mere attachments to a foreign body, without ecclesiastical organization on the spot, save by a consistory, with no powers of legislation, licensure, or ordination, with no college or theological seminary to supply a new ministry, distracted by internal troubles, and bound hand and foot by Old-World alliances, prejudices, and powers. The only wonder is that the Reformed Church maintained its separate existence, and that it achieved its independence at last. After the articles of union were adopted in 1772, the Revolutionary War added greatly to the embarrassments of the Church. Many ministers were obliged to leave their flocks for years. Church edifices were sometimes used for British cavalry stables and riding-schools, and military prisons; and the fairest portions of the goodly heritage were occupied by the opposing armies. After peace was declared, the Church grew slowly but surely, and laid the foundations of her educational and benevolent institutions upon a broad and enduring basis. The tenacity of the Dutch character is abundantly illustrated in the extreme difficulty with which this Church has been induced to break off its old traditional relationships and attachments to its foreign origin. It never has yielded one of them until it was compelled to do so by long conflicts.

IV. Theological Standards. — The doctrinal symbols of the Reformed Church in America, which are still the same with those of the Reformed Church in Holland, are, (1) the Belgic Confession; (2) the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Compendium of the Christian Religion, which is an abridgment of the Heidelberg Catechism, designed for the young and to prepare for the Lord’s supper; (3) the Canons of the Synod of Dordrecht. The use of the Westminster Shorter Catechism in Sunday-schools has been also sanctioned by the General Synod. The Hellenbroek Catechism was

formerly much employed by pastors and in Sabbath-schools, but it is now out of use.

These standards harmonize with each other, and in all essential points with the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the Westminster Confession of Faith, and with the confessions of the Reformed churches of Germany, France, and Switzerland. The theology of the Reformed Church is “Calvinistic,” in the moderate sense of that historical term, and it is Calvinistic simply because she believes it to be scriptural. The liberality with which she holds her standards is sufficiently attested by the very large number both of ministers and communicant members whom she has received from other evangelical bodies. The Heidelberg Catechism is held in the sense in which it is interpreted by the Synod of Dort.

V. Church Government. — The government of the Church, in common with that of all Reformed churches is strictly Presbyterian. Her constitution recognises “the offices of the Church of Christ to be:

“1. Ministers of the Word.

“2. Teachers of theology.

“3. Elders.

“4. Deacons.”

1. Ministers of the Word. — “No person shall be allowed to exercise the office of a minister without being regularly inducted thereto, according to the Word of God and the order established by the Church” (*Constitution*, art. ii, § 1). Great care is required in the education of students and in the examinations of candidates for the holy office by the classes, which have the power of licensure, ordination, and installation. The candidates for both licensure and ordination are required to sign certain “formulas,” pledging themselves to a hearty belief and persuasion of the theological standards of the Church, and “diligently to teach and faithfully to defend the same without either directly or indirectly contradicting the same by our public preaching or writings.” If difficulties, or doubts, or change of views occur respecting doctrine, they engage that they “will neither publicly nor privately propose, teach, or defend the same, either by preaching or writing, until they have first revealed such sentiments to the consistory, classis, or synod, that the same may be there examined; being always ready cheerfully to submit to the judgment of the consistory, classis, or synod,

under the penalty of being, in case of refusal, *ipso facto* suspended from office.” Other provisions, however, guard the rights of conscience and of individual judgment against any harsh or unjust treatment.

Ministers are regarded as bound to the service of the sanctuary for life, and are not at liberty to secularize themselves “except for great and important reasons, concerning which the classis shall inquire and determine.” Superannuated and disabled ministers may be “declared *emeriti*, and be excused from all further service in the Church during such infirmity.” In the case of pastors thus incapacitated and retired, congregations are required to provide a reasonable support, with the approval of the classis.

The parity of the ministry is effectually secured by the following article of the constitution: “All ministers of the Gospel are equal in rank and authority. All are bishops or overseers in the Church, and all are equal stewards of the mysteries of God. No superiority shall therefore be ever claimed or acknowledged by one minister over another, nor shall there be any lords over God’s heritage in the Reformed churches” (art. ii, § 16).

Licentiates and ministers of churches with which the Reformed Church holds correspondence are received upon the usual certificates of dismissal from those bodies; unless there be grounds of presumption against their doctrines and morals; and then inquiries are to be proposed to satisfy the classis as to the propriety of proceeding freely in each case. Foreign ministers must present their credentials before the classis prior to invitation by any consistory to preach in its church; and no classis can receive any such minister without strict observance of the rules of the Church provided for these cases. Ministers coming from non-corresponding bodies must always be examined respecting their theological views before they can be received.

2. Teachers of theology, or professors in the theological seminary, are to be appointed only by the General Synod—the office is for life, or during good behavior” and to that synod a professor of theology shall always be amenable for his doctrine, mode of teaching, and moral conduct.” He is also required to sign a constitutional formula expressing fidelity to the Church and her theological standards, etc. And, to complete the independence and personal responsibility of the professor to the General Synod, it is provided (art. 3:§ 4), that “no professor, while in office, shall have the pastoral charge of any congregation, or be a member of any ecclesiastical assembly or judicatory; but, as a minister of the Gospel, may

preach and, administer, or assist in administering, the sacraments in any congregation, with the consent of the minister or consistory.” Six months’ notice of intention to resign his office must be sent to the president of the General Synod before it can be accepted by that body. Most of these provisions respecting teachers of theology are peculiar to the Reformed Church. Their practical effect has been excellent.

3, 4. *Elders and deacons.* See “Consistory,” below.

VI. *Judicatories.* — These are:

1. The Consistory.
2. The Classis.
3. The Particular Synod.
4. The General Synod.

1. *The Consistory* is the primary ecclesiastical body, corresponding to the *session* of the Presbyterian Church. It is composed of the *minister, elders, and deacons* of a Church. To the *elders*, with the minister, are committed the chief spiritual functions of the Church, especially in admitting persons to the communion, in maintaining discipline, and in choosing delegates to the classis. To the *deacons* is confided the care of the poor. “When joined together in one board, the elders and deacons have an equal voice in whatever relates to the temporalities of the Church, to the calling of a minister, or the choice of their own successors, in all which they are considered the general and joint representatives of the people” (art. 6:§ 2). In New York and New Jersey the minister, elders, and deacons constituting the consistory are the legal trustees of the corporate rights and property and temporal interests of the churches which they represent. It is believed that this plan possesses superior advantages to that which prevails in the Presbyterian churches, which have a separate board of trustees, chosen from the congregation, and are often composed of men who are not professors of religion.

In another important respect the consistory of the Reformed Church differs from the session of the Presbyterian Church. In the latter the elders are chosen for life, and thus make a permanent body of officers. In the Reformed Church elders and deacons are elected by the male communicants for two years. The term of one half of the consistory expires each year; they are eligible for immediate re-election if it is deemed desirable to retain their services, and this often occurs. This principle of

rotation in office has its obvious and great advantages, harmonizing with our republican system of government in Church and State, bringing gradually into active service all the best available talent of each congregation, and permitting such changes as may be demanded for the welfare of the Church and congregation without giving needless offence to any who may pass out of office.

The *Great Consistory* is an *advisory* body, intermediate between the consistory and the classis, and is composed of all who have previously been elders and deacons in the same Church. This arrangement works admirably in cases upon which the acting consistory may need counsel; as, for instance, in the settlement of a pastor, the erection of Church buildings and parsonages, etc. This is an institution peculiar to the Reformed Church alone in this country, and has stood the test of the whole history of its organization. In this way also the Presbyterian principle of “once an elder always an elder” is practically preserved, the official character of both elders and deacons being recognised in this body, although they may not be in active service in the consistory. Besides this, it often happens that persons who have not been acting as elders in any given Church for many years are appointed and sit as delegates in the Particular and General synods.

2. *The Classis* is the body next above the consistory, and corresponds to the Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in its general organization and functions. It is composed of not less than three ministers, and one elder from each Church represented, within certain limits which are prescribed by the Particular Synod. Stated meetings are held twice a year. To the classis belongs the right to license, ordain, install, dismiss, suspend, and depose ministers, to exercise a general supervision over the spiritual interests and concerns of the several churches, and to try and decide cases of appeal from judicial decisions of consistories, subject also to appeal to the Particular Synod. For promoting the doctrinal purity, the spiritual interests, and the general welfare of the churches each consistory is required annually, at the spring session of classis, to present a full report, in writing, with statistical information respecting its religious condition. At the same meeting the following constitutional questions are asked of every pastor and elder:

1. Are the doctrines of the Gospel preached in your congregation in their purity, agreeably to the Word of God, the Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms of our Church?
2. Is the Heidelberg Catechism regularly explained, agreeably to the Constitution of the Reformed Church?
3. Are the catechising of the children and the instruction of the youth faithfully attended to?
4. Is family visitation faithfully performed?
5. Is the 5th section, 2d article, 2d chapter of the Constitution of our Church (which relates to oversight and discipline of Church members) carefully obeyed?
6. Is the temporal contract between ministers and people fulfilled in your congregation?

The replies are required to be noted in detail in the minutes of the classis, and sent up to the Particular Synod for inspection. It is now also required to report whether the contributions enjoined by the General Synod for specific benevolent objects have been taken in each church.

3. *The Particular Synod* dates back to the year 1794. Previous to that time the only ecclesiastical bodies were the consistory, classis, and synod, or, as they were denominated, the Particular and General bodies. These met annually. The first synodal assembly was only provisional; it possessed and exercised the right to examine students of theology for licensure until the year 1800. This function was afterwards devolved upon the classes alone. The Particular Synod is a court of appeal in judicial cases which are carried up from the classes. It has power to form new classes, to transfer congregations from one classis to another, and has a general supervisory power over its classes. It also confirms the nominations of the classes for delegates to the General Synod. It meets annually, and is composed of four ministers and four elders from each classis. The four Particular synods now existing are those of *New York*, organized in 1800, composed of nine classes; *Albany*, organized in 1800, composed of ten classes; *Chicago*, organized in 1856, composed of five classes; *New Brunswick*, organized in 1869, composed of nine classes. At the session of the General Synod held in 1869 the Particular synods were reorganized upon the basis of a plan which is intended to increase their previously limited powers, and to bring

them into more systematic and direct contact with the spiritual interests and benevolent agencies of the Church. See *Minutes of Gen. Synod*, 1869, p. 626, 633.

4. *The General Synod.* — The long conflict between the coetus and conferentie which ended in 1771 resulted in an assembly of representatives of both parties, who style themselves “A Reverend Meeting of Ministers and Elders.” They organized what were called a “General” and five “Particular” bodies, which were subsequently called by the names familiar in Holland, “synod” and “classis.” The General Body was merely a provincial and provisional assembly — a sort of ecclesiastical bridge over which the Church passed from her dependence upon the mother Church in Holland to her condition of real independence and separate American organization. At first it was a conventional assembly, consisting of all the ministers in the Church, with an elder from each separate Church. It met triennially. In 1800 it was made a delegated body, consisting of eight ministers and eight elders from each of the two Particular synods of New York and Albany, which were constituted in that year, only two ministers and two elders being admitted from each classis. In 1809 the delegation was increased to three ministers and three elders, who are nominated by each classis and confirmed by their respective Particular synods. By the present Constitution, each classis having more than fifteen churches is entitled to one additional delegate for each additional five churches. In 1812 the sessions were made annual. This body meets on the first Wednesday in June, and it continues in session about ten days. It exercises a general supervision over the entire Church. It is the court of last resort in appeals of judicial cases from the lower bodies. It has power to form and change the Particular synods. It elects professors of theology and has supreme control of the theological seminaries. The benevolent boards of the Church are its creations. It maintains friendly correspondence with various ecclesiastical assemblies of other denominations. It has no power to alter or amend the Constitution of the Church, but can only recommend such changes, which must be submitted, through it, to the classes, and can be adopted only by the votes of a majority of these bodies. The General Synod was incorporated in 1818 by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York.

The fiscal concerns of the whole Church are managed under this charter by the *Board of Direction of Corporations*, which is elected annually by the General Synod, and consists of a president, three directors, and a treasurer.

The personal and real estate and all the synods' property are confided to the custody of this board, which is thus made the chief fiscal agent of the Church. Its affairs are reported annually to the synod. For more than sixty years it has managed its large trust with the most exemplary diligence, fidelity, and success, and with scarcely the loss of a dollar from all its investments. The board reported in 1878 that the assets in the hands of the treasurer, June 1, amounted to \$451,411.69; this was in addition to the large real estate owned by the synod at New Brunswick, N. J., in the buildings and grounds of the theological seminary. and in those of Hope College, at Holland, Mich.

VII. *Usages.* —

1. *Mode of Worship.* — All the Reformed churches of the Continent adopted liturgies for the observance of public worship, including the offices for the administration of sacraments, the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and for the infliction of discipline in excommunication, etc. The Scottish Reformer John Knox prepared a liturgy for the Church of Scotland which was used for some time, but which was ultimately swept away by the same anti-ritualistic storm in which Puritans and Presbyterians were driven to the opposite extreme of bold simplicity in public worship. The liturgy of the Reformed Church of Holland — with the omission only of a prayer in the marriage service and an article on the consolation of the sick — is accurately given in the English translation, which is now in use in the Reformed Church of America. It is “precisely what it was in 1619, and substantially as when first adopted in 1568 by the Synod of Wesel.” Like all the Reformed liturgies, it is based on that of John Calvin. But its shape was given chiefly by John Alasco, the popular pastor of the Reformed Church in London, which numbered, under his ministry, over three thousand members, who were refugees from persecution in their native land. This Church still exists. Alasco also prepared a new liturgy, using his old one and that of Strasburg, a translation of which, from the French, was published by Pollanus, Calvin's successor, who founded a Church at Glastonbury, England. It was written in Latin, and then, in 1551. translated into Dutch by John Uytenhove, an elder of the Church in London. The liturgy of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands was prepared by Peter Dathenus, an eminent minister, who, when driven from Holland by persecution, settled with some of his fellow-exiles in the Palatinate at Frankenthal, near Heidelberg. He first translated the Heidelberg Catechism into the Holland language, and also the psalms of Beza and Marot from

their French originals. He dedicated the volume containing these symbols (psalms, catechism, and liturgy) “to all the churches and ministers of Jesus Christ sitting and mourning under the tyranny of antichrist.” Subsequently, the “Form for Adult Baptism,” and the “Consolation of the Sick and Dying,” and the “Compendium of the Christian Religion,” a condensation of the Heidelberg Catechism — which was in place of another brief catechism for persons who intended to unite with the Church, were issued. In 1574 the Synod of Dordrecht directed the liturgy to be used in all the churches. For a full account see *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies*, ch. xi; and Prof. Demarest’s *History and Ecclesiastical Characteristics of the Ref. Ch.* ch. 8.

The liturgy is officially declared to be a part of the Constitution of the Reformed Church (*Minutes of Gen. Synod*, 4:425, 426). The offices for the administration of baptism and the Lord’s supper, for ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and those for excommunication and for readmitting the excommunicated are also declared by the Constitution to be essential, and must be used. The forms of prayer, marriage-service, etc., are not essential, but simply remain as formulas and specimens, — which may or may not be used, at the option of the minister. The prayers were used for a time, but always in connection with extempore prayer. Since the latter part of the 17th century they have been dropped in public worship in Holland. When English preaching had been established in the Church of New York, three years after Dr. Laidlie’s advent, a translation of this liturgy into English — which is more accurate and faithful than elegant in style — was procured and introduced by the collegiate consistory. The same year also (1767) singing in the English language was commenced in that Church. The volume used was an amended edition of Brady and Tate’s version, in which the old music was retained and the rhyme adapted to it. *SEE PSALMONY.*

Several attempts have been made to revise the liturgy, all of which have failed of final adoption by the classes, to whom, under the constitution, they were referred for final decision.

2. Other Customs (essential and non-essential). — In 1814 the General Synod adopted a report of a committee on this subject which is still the law of the Church. The essential customs and usages which are deemed necessary to be continued in the Church are expressed in the explanatory articles of the constitution; such as singing the psalms and hymns approved

of and recommended by the General Synod; preaching from the Heidelberg Catechism; observing the forms in the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, etc., as contained in the liturgy, etc. "Other customs and usages prevail in the Church which are deemed non-essential, and in many instances are either wholly dispensed with or partially retained in our congregations, according to the taste or circumstances of pastors or people; such as the arrangements observed in the performance of public worship—the number of times of singing psalms and hymns; reading sermons and preaching them from memory or extemporaneously; sprinkling in baptism one or three times; sitting or standing in receiving the Lord's supper; preaching on Ascension-day, Good-Friday, and other days which have long been observed both in Holland and America" (*Minutes*, 1814, p. 31,32). In the Constitution adopted in 1832, however, "for the purpose of uniformity in the order of worship," a directory is set forth which "is to be observed in all the churches." In Holland all the clergy wear the official pulpit dress or gown during their performance of public worship. In this country the custom prevails chiefly in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Newark, New Brunswick, etc., and in some of the country and village churches.

VIII. *Institutions.* —

1. *Colleges.* — Zeal for the training and perpetuation of an educated ministry — which produced the unhappy division of the Church in the last century — soon led to various plans for the establishment of proper schools for that purpose in this country. Few ministers came from Holland; and the time, cost, and dangers, the difficulties and disappointments, incurred in sending youth to be educated in the universities of the mother country were too great to furnish a supply from this source. The number of churches rapidly outgrew the pastors. In 1754, in order to defeat the movements of the coetus for independence, a plan was adopted, by a provision which was inserted in the charter of King's (now Columbia) College, in New York, giving the consistory of the Church of New York the right to appoint a professor of theology in that institution. But, fearing that such an arrangement would produce an episcopalian defection, the Rev. Theodore Frelinghuysen, of Albany, projected an academy or seminary, in which the Dutch language only should be used, and which should combine the advantages of both the German gymnasia and the university system. In 1759 he sailed for Europe to urge his project; but he never returned, having been lost at sea upon his homeward voyage. The

conference opposed his plan, in a letter to the Classis of Amsterdam, and it perished with him.

Ten years later — in 1770 — and chiefly by the powerful influence of Rev. Dr. Jacob R. Hardenbergh, its first president — a charter was obtained from governor William Franklin of New Jersey, then a British province, for a college, the object of which is stated to be “the education of the youth in the learned languages, liberal and useful arts and sciences, and especially in divinity, preparing them for the niniistry and other good offices.” It was called — in honor of the queen of George III — “Queen’s College,” and retained this name until, in 1825, it was changed — in memory of one of its principal benefactors, Col. Henry Rutgers — to “Rutgers College.” It is located at New Brunswick, N.J. This institution was suspended during the Revolutionary War, and again in 1795, when it was revived, chiefly by the efforts of the Rev. Dr. Ira Condict, its vice-president. Dr. John H. Livingston was appointed president in 1810. But in 1816 its doors were closed again until, in 1825, it resumed its work, which has continued without interruption since that time. The centennial year was celebrated, with appropriate services, at the commencement held in June, 1870. A large endowment has been secured. The course of instruction has been greatly enlarged and the standard of scholarship eleyated. The faculty is full, and the number of students in 187879 was 173. In 1864 *a scientific school* was organized in connection with the college, and designated by the Legislature of New Jersey “the State College for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts,” as provided for by an act of the Congress of the United States in 1862. It was opened in 1866. The course of study embraces mining, metallurgy, agricultural chemistry, civil engineering, and mathematics, with other branches of scientific education. The college possesses an astronomical observatory, a museum of natural history, an agricultural farm of one hundred acres, and ample facilities for the illustration of scientific studies. The grammar-school, which is as old as the college, occupies a large and appropriate building opposite the college grounds. The college faculty embraces a president, vice-president, eleven professors, and an assistant professor. The buildings include the main college edifice; Van Nest Hall, in which are the rooms of the literary societies and lecture-rooms; Geological Hall, which contains an armory, the museum of geology, mineralogy, and natural history, and the chemical laboratory; the Kirkpatrick Chapel, a large and handsome Gothic building erected in 1873, in which also is the library of the college; the Schenck

Observatory; and the president's house. There are no dormitories belonging to the college. The library is of great value, although not adequate to the wants of the institution. The museum is extensive and contains many rare curiosities and specimens. Valuable prizes are given at each commencement to successful competitors in oratory, composition, classics, mathematics, mineralogy, spelling, English grammar, modern history, mental and moral philosophy, and for the best essay on Christian missions.

The Vedder Lectureship was founded by Mr. Nicholas F. Vedder, of Utica, who gave a fund of \$10,000, in 1873, on this among other conditions, that the General Synod should "every year elect some member of the Reformed Church in America to deliver to the students of the seminary and of Rutgers College at least five lectures on the present aspects of modern infidelity, including its cause and cure." The following courses of lectures have been delivered upon this foundation: 1874, by Isaac S. Hartley, D.D., of Utica, on *Prayer and Modern Criticism*; 1875, by Tayler Lewis, LL.D., of Union College, on — *Nature and the Scriptures*; 1876, by Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., of New York, on *The Psalter, a Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible*; 1877, by William R. Gordon, D.D., of Schraalenberg, N. J., on *The Science of Revealed Truth Impregnable, as shown by the Argumentative Failures of Infidelity and Theoretical Geology*. All of these lectures have been published under the general title of *The Vedder Lectures*. "Hope College," located at the city of Holland, Mich., was chartered in 1866, and grew out of a flourishing academy which was started as a civil and parochial school in the infancy of the colony of Hollanders, founded by the Rev. Dr. Albertus C. Van Raalte, on Black River and lake, in that state, in the year 1846-47. This institution embraces a preparatory school, collegiate, scientific, and theological departments, under the ecclesiastical supervision of the General Synod, and in the immediate charge of its cotuncil and faculty. It possesses ample college grounds, good buildings, an endowment of funds which are augmenting yearly, a tract of land called "the James Suydam farm of Hope College," after a great benefactor, and many appliances for a liberal training. The course of instruction is thorough, and will be expanded with the demands of the times. The faculty consists of a president and five professors, with subordinate teachers. The whole number of pupils in June, 1878, was 98, of whom 65 were in the preparatory department, and 33 in the academic course.

2. *Theological Seminaries.* — A professor of theology, Dr. John H. Livingston, was chosen in 1784, and at the same time Dr. Hermanus Meyer was appointed professor of languages, and two years later, also, as lector in theology. In 1792 Drs. Solomon Froeligh and Dirck Romeyn were appointed additional professors of didactic theology. Other appointments were subsequently made — Rev. Drs. John Bassett, Jeremiah Romeyn, and John M. Van Harlingen. All of these professors and lectors originally taught their students at their own places of residence. The seminary proper, under Dr. Livingston, was located in 1796 at Flatbush. L.I., and in 1804 was transferred to New York, where it remained until its final location, in 1810, at New Brunswick, N.J.

These facts substantiate the claim that the Reformed Dutch Church in America was *the first of all her Protestant sisters to reduce theological education to a system, the first to demand that it be in charge of a professional instructor, and the first to appoint a theological professor.* But for the outbreak of the Revolutionary war, her theological seminary would have been started in the year of American independence, 1776. Dr. Livingston occupied the professorial chair from 1784 to 1825; and previous to the removal to New Brunswick he and his colleagues sent forth 91 students into the ministry. After various ineffectual efforts to secure a proper endowment, the professorship was merged in Queen's College by a covenant between the synod and the trustees of that institution. In the year 1825, the seminary had three resident theological professors, and was fully organized. Additional articles of agreement were now entered into with the trustees, by which a theological college was organized, and the name changed from Queen's to Rutgers. Three years later, a Board of Education was established to care for beneficiaries. In 1865 another theological professorship was added, and the covenant between the synod and the trustees of Rutgers College formally annulled. The following year, Hope College was organized in Holland, Mich., and in a twelvemonth more a theological department in the same place. In the year 1856, Mrs. Anna Hertzog, of Philadelphia, donated \$30,000 for the erection of a suitable edifice for the use of the seminary, upon the condition that it should bear the honored name of her deceased husband, "the Peter Hertzog Theological Hall." The building was speedily erected — three stories in height, 120 feet long — and contains a small chapel, double rooms for sleeping and study purposes, to accommodate about sixty students; lecture-rooms for the professors, rector's residence, and refectory. It

stands in the midst of seven acres of land, which were also donated for the purpose by Messrs. James Neilson, David Bishop, and Charles P. Dayton, and Francis and Wessell Wessells. The site is commanding. Three professors' houses have been built upon it, and another one, directly opposite, has been bought and presented to the General Synod by Messrs. James Suydam and Gardner A. Sage, of New York, at a cost of \$18,000. Mrs. Hertzog also left by will \$10,000 to be invested, the interest of which is to keep the hall in repair. By the munificence of its friends the building has been thoroughly refitted and furnished in the best manner to make it a pleasant Christian home for the students. In 1873 the James Suydam Hall was opened for use. This large, substantial, and costly building, containing a chapel, lecturerooms, museum, and gymnasium, was the gift of the late James Suydam of New York, who laid its cornerstone but did not live to see it completed. Mr. Suydam also endowed the professorship of didactic and polemic theology which bears his name, in the sum of \$60,000; and these, with various gifts and legacies to the theological seminary and other specific Church purposes, amount to more than \$250,000. This was in addition to other bequests to the American Bible and Tract societies; and the seminary and the Bible-Society were also made his equal residuary legatees. A bronze statue of Mr. Suydam, somewhat larger than life size, the gift of friends, was unveiled on the day of dedication of the hall. The Gardner A. Sage library building is the gift of the generous founder whose name it bears, and who superintended its erection and has provided for its maintenance and support. It is perfectly fire-proof, and combines every modern arrangement for heating, ventilation, light, and security from dust and other annoyances. It has room for about 100,000 volumes. The library at present numbers over 30,000 volumes, to which additions have been constantly made by donations, and principally from a fund of \$53,763, of which a balance of about \$15,000 remains unexpended. The selection of books is confided to a competent committee of the General Synod, in co-operation with the theological professors. The library has a very complete Biblical critical apparatus, including facsimiles of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and other MSS.; the *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandist), 60 vols.; Migne's *Patrology*, 320 vols., embracing all the fathers, Greek and Latin; and many of the best and rarest editions of standard works imported from Europe.

The permanent endowment of the seminary, which is still in progress, now amounts to over \$200,000, besides the real property held for its uses. There are four professors, and thirty-two students now in its classes, while

the hall is filled with other young men of the college and preparatory school who are on their way to the ministry. The course of instruction is thorough, and embraces the usual departments of theological study in similar institutions, with the addition of those subjects which are specially related to the Reformed Church, such as the Confession of Faith, Canons of Dort, Heidelberg Catechism, the ecclesiastical polity, and the constitutional law of the denomination. The whole number of graduates from its establishment in 1810 to 1879 is 609. The government of the seminary is vested in the faculty and in a Board of Superintendents, which is chosen by the General Synod and meets annually. A standing committee of the synod has the charge of its temporal affairs.

The "Theological Seminary in Hope College" had for its first professor Rev. Cornelius E. Crispell, D.D., who was elected by the General Synod in 1867 to the chair of didactic and polemic theology, and the other professors in Hope College were invited to act as lecturers. In 1869 two additional professors were elected. There is a Board of Superintendents, which consists of the Council of Hope College, with duties and prerogatives like those of the seminary at New Brunswick. The endowment of this institution has been begun. In 1878, on account of financial embarrassments, the theological department was suspended and the students went to other institutions. A few young men have gone out from its walls to preach the Gospel, two of them as foreign missionaries.

3. Parochial Schools. — A few of these are aided by the Board of Education. They are almost exclusively confined to the German and Holland Churches.

4. Foreign Missions. — From her earliest days, her ministers gave special care to the evangelization of the heathen Indians. During the existence of the United Foreign Missionary Society, she stately contributed to its funds; and when that organization was dissolved, and its stations transferred to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, she continued her efforts in connection with it. In 1832 the General Synod appointed its own Board of Foreign Missions, proposing to organize missions of their own Church to be conducted through the medium of its prudential committee. In 1836 the first band of missionaries went out to seek a settlement in Northern India, but subsequently located in the island of Borneo. After working a long while harmoniously in this relation, prompted by a desire to accomplish the utmost that might be gained by an

independent denominational effort, it was thought most desirable to sever the connection existing between their society and that of the American Board. This was accordingly done in 1858. The number of members is twenty-four — one half being laymen, and one third elected annually by the General Synod. A number of missionaries at several times, under the auspices of the board, have been sent out to China, India, and Japan. Chief among the servants of the Church in the foreign field were the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of the Madras Mission; the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., the first American missionary to China; and the Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, the translator of the Arabic Bible, who, although in the employ of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, yet retains his relation to the Reformed Church, from which he went out as a missionary physician. The Mission to the Dyaks in Borneo was given up in 1849, some of the missionaries having been transferred to Amoy in China, and the others returned to America.

The China Mission was organized at Amoy in 1844, at the original suggestion of the Rev. David Abeel D.D., who visited that city in 1842, just after it had been declared one of the five open ports. The first missionaries were Rev. Messrs. William J. Pohlman and Elihu Doty. Its prosperity has been wonderful. The Mission now (1879) consists of seven churches and seventeen stations, comprising, according to the last report, a membership of 598 communicants. Over these in Amoy and adjacent cities there are now four missionaries and four assistants, with three native pastors settled over and sustained by two churches in the city of Amoy and the Church of Kang-than and Opi. The Mission employs twelve native catechists or preachers and has eight students under theological instruction. A building for the theological students has been erected at Kolongsu, called “the Thomas De Witt Theological Hall.” Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes from the native Christians in 1889 were \$2866.70 in gold.

The Arcot Mission in India was organized in 1854, being composed of the sons of the celebrated missionary the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of Madras, with their families. The Classis of Arcot was formed in 1854, with the clerical missionaries and three native elders. According to the report of 1877, the classis is composed of twenty churches, with a membership of 1755 communicants. With them are connected 86 stations and out-stations, the whole number of regular attendants upon the means of grace being 4398. Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes in 1889

amounted to \$756 in gold. There are 8 missionaries and 6 assistants in this important field of labor, with 2 native pastors and 21 catechists, 26 Bible-readers, 28 teachers, and 19 colpor teurs. There are 4 seminaries for males and females, a preparandi school for training native catechists and pastors, and 97 day-schools with 2503 scholars. The missionaries and native helpers make frequent tours into the surrounding country. The statistics of this work for 1889 were, 18,006 sermons preached to 395,979 hearers, and 14,000 books and tracts distributed. The press is used freely to print the Scriptures, catechisms, and practical, religious, and educational works. The hospital and medical dispensary at Arcot has received the highest official praise from lord Napier, the governor-general, and an increased allowance from the government. The number of patients treated in 1889 was 6358, an average of 17 per day. A medical class of young natives is connected with it. The Gospel is daily preached to all comers, and portions of the Scriptures, tracts, and good books are offered to all who can read. A simple and brief story of Christ's love to fallen man is carried away by every patient on the printed ticket given: to him on his first application, and which he must show at each subsequent visit.

The Japan Mission originated at a monthly concert for prayer for missions held in Feb., 1859, in the South Reformed Church, New York, when one elder offered to give \$800 per year to support a missionary in Japan, another made a similar promise, and the Church pledged itself for a third like sum. On May 7, 1859, the Board of Foreign Missions sent out three missionaries — Rev. Samuel R. Brown, M.D. (who had been a missionary in China for several years), Rev. Guido F. Verbeck, and D. Simmons, M.D., with their wives, and Miss Caroline E. Adriance — who reached Kanagawa Nov. 1 of that year. Rev. James H. Ballagh was sent out in 1862, and Rev. Henry Stout in 1868. Dr. Simmons and wife resigned in 1860, and Miss Adriance went to Amoy, where she became an assistant missionary, and died in 1863. She always bore her own expenses as a volunteer missionary. The missionaries engaged chiefly at Yokohama, Nagasaki, and Tokio in teaching the government schools, translating the Word of God, circulating the Scriptures, tracts, and books in Chinese, and instructing inquirers in the way of salvation. Mr. Ballagh began a Japanese religious service in 1866, the average attendance being about twenty persons. The first two native converts, Wakasa, a nobleman, and Ayabe, his younger brother, were baptized by the Rev. G. F. Verbeck, May 20, 1866, the day of Pentecost, at his residence in Yokohama. Wakasa's

attention was first drawn to Christianity by a copy of the New Test. in English, which some Japanese picked up out of the water in the bay of Nagasaki, and which was probably lost overboard from an American or English ship. He did not rest until, five or six years after, he procured a Chinese translation of it, which he eagerly read. Thus this "bread cast upon the waters" was found "after many days" in the soul of the first Japanese convert to Christianity. In March, 1872, the first native Christian Church was organized by the Rev. James H. Ballagh at Yokohama with eleven members. In 1877 it had 145 communicants. The edifice in which it worships cost about \$6000, of which the first thousand was given by the native Christians of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. It seats about 450 persons. In 1889 there were 2 stations and 19 out-stations, and preaching-places with communicants enrolled to the number of 1969 belonging to this mission. The entire native contributions amounted to \$8324.70. The mission has been very successful in the last three years.

The present missionary force of this Church in Japan consists of 9 missionaries and 11 assistant missionaries, with 18 native ordained ministers and 2 catechists or preachers. There is one academy at Yokohama, the Isaac Ferris Seminary, for, girls, of whom there were 135 at latest date. A theological class or school of 32 young men is also established, under the instructions of the Rev. James L. Amerman. Another school for girls is at Nagasaki. The Rev. Dr. G. F. Verbeck has been for many years connected with the Imperial University at Yeddo, under the auspices of the government, and he has also been engaged with Drs. Brown, Hepburn, and others. in the work of translation of English works into Japanese and of Japanese works into English. Of the large number of Japanese youth who came to this country for education, a score or more were students in Rutgers College and its grammar-school. Several of them have united with Christian churches in the United States, and some have gone back to Japan to preach the Gospel and to serve Christ in other stations. The outlook of this mission work in Japan is full of promise. Dr. Brown has long been engaged with Dr. Hepburn and others in translating the Bible into Japanese.

In addition to these Oriental Missions, the board has also co-operated with other missionary boards in the plan of Indian agencies under the government of the United States. The tribes assigned to it are the Pimas, Maricopas, and Papagoes; the Mohaves on the Colorado River Reserve;

and the Apaches on the White Mountain Reserve, numbering in all about 9000 souls.

The Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, an efficient auxiliary to the Synod's Board, was organized in February, 1875. It has between fifty and sixty auxiliaries; is devoted to the increase and maintenance of woman's work for women in heathen lands; and contributes liberally to the general work. Its principal field is Nagasaki, Japan, where it has undertaken to establish a female seminary; and it has also begun to labor for China. It has published in an elegant volume, with maps and many illustrations on wood, a very complete *Manual of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Dutch Church in America* (8vo, 326 pp.).

The ordinary appropriations of the Board of Foreign Missions for the year ending June 1, 1879, were \$55,600.

5. Home Missions. — The Board of Domestic Missions consists of twenty-four members, half of whom are laymen, and one third are elected annually by the General Synod. It was reorganized in 1849, with a corresponding secretary exclusively devoted to its service. Previous to this, for a number of years, the duties of that office were performed voluntarily by settled pastors. All the Reformed churches were on missionary ground until the independent organization of the denomination was secured in 1771. Soon after this event, ministers and elders were occasionally sent out upon tours of exploration among destitute populations to preach the Gospel, and to establish mission stations and churches. As the result of these labors, a few new churches were organized — one in Virginia, six in Kentucky, six in Lower Canada, and elsewhere in the regions of the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers, and Central New York. It was then determined to concentrate efforts nearer home, and the distant churches — some of which yet live in other denominations — were left alone. In 1822 the "Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church" was organized in the city of New York. A Northern Board, located at Albany, was appointed by the Synod in 1828 to act under the society located at New York, and a new impetus was given to the work. In 1831 a new Board of Missions was constituted for the whole Church, all the mission work being confided to its care of which the present board is the, lineal successor. It was incorporated in 1867, and now holds its own funds. The Church Building Fund and the Sabbath-school interests of the denomination, excepting publications, are confided to its care. More than half of the churches of the

denomination owe their existence to the fostering care of this board. In the West, nearly the whole of the English churches of the Particular Synod of Chicago have grown up under its benign influence. The Holland churches have been mostly self-sustaining. During the year ending June, 1878, this board aided 102 churches, of which fifty-eight were at the East, forty-two in the West, and two in the South. The number of families in the Mission churches was 6787 and 8896 Church members, of whom 1040 were received during the year. There were 134 Sabbath-schools, with 11,339 scholars. The income from all sources for the missionary operationis was \$35,130.32. Since 1832 more than three hundred churches have been organized — about half of these in the single decade of 1850-60 — and many of these under the auspices of this board. Thousands of Hollanders, most of whom are in this denomination, have settled in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and adjoining states during the last thirty years. These have formed an important element in the missionary growth and extension of the Church in the North-west. Of its nearly 79,000 members, about 11,000 are Hollanders. 6. The *Board of Education*, which was organized as a voluntary society in the city of New York in 1828, was adopted by the General Synod in 1832. It consists of twenty-four members, who are elected for three years each, one third of whom are elected annually. It has the immediate care of all the beneficiaries and educational interests of the Reformed Church, including such beneficiaries as receive aid from the Van Benschoten and Knox funds, which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College. Every beneficiary must be a member in good and regular standing in the Reformed Church, and must also have been a member of some Protestant Church for one year previous to making his application for aid. He must be recommended to the board by the pastor and consistory of the Church, and by the classis to which said Church belongs, after sustaining a satisfactory examination as to his need of assistance, and physical, mental, and spiritual qualifications for study and for the holy ministry. Every precaution is taken against the introduction or continuation of improper candidates. Repayment of all money received from the board is required from those who do not complete their course of ministerial preparation, unless they are, in the judgment of the board, providentially hindered. The board will accept from all beneficiaries after their licensure two years' service under the care of the Board of Domestic Missions, as a full satisfaction for all aid rendered to them by the Board of Education. This is a wise provision, which has secured many excellent young laborers in the home missionary field. All the students are considered as tnder the pastoral

care of the corresponding secretary. In 1865 the powers of the board were enlarged to enable it to co-operate with the various classes in the establishment of academies and classical schools within their bounds. The board became incorporated in 1870, to enable it to hold legal possession of its funds and to secure others that may be devised to it by will. In addition to the Knox Fund (\$2000), the Van Benschoten Fund (\$20,313.57), the Smock Fund (\$500), the Mandeville Fund (\$2000), and the Voorhees Fund (\$26,000), which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College, and the interest of which is paid out to beneficiaries of this board, it holds twentyfive scholarships, ranging from \$1700 to \$10,000, making in all a capital of over \$120,000, besides the annual Church collections and private donations, amounting in 1877-78 to \$11,299.74 — all for the education of young men for the ministry. It also holds certain trust funds for Hope College, and receives moneys for parochial schools which are under its care. The total income for the year ending June 1, 1878, was \$33,508, and the total number of young men under its care for the same period was eighty-three.

About one third of the present ministry of the Church have been aided by this board in their studies for the sacred office. Its beneficiaries are not confined to any particular *literary* institution, but must study theology in one of the seminaries of the Reformed Church.

7. The *Board of Publication* was organized in 1855 by authority of the General Synod. It consists of twelve ministers and twelve laymen, one third of whom are elected annually by the Synod. To it are “intrusted, with such directions as may from time to time be given by the General Synod, the superintendence of all the publications of the Reformed Church, and the circulation of such works pertaining to the history, government, doctrines, and religious literature of said Church and of other evangelical denominations as shall be properly approved.” It has a corresponding secretary and general agent, and a depository located in the city of New York. Its printing and binding are done by contract. It publishes a semi-monthly newspaper called the *Sower and Gospel Field*, which is the accredited organ of all the boards of the Church. The catalogue of its books and tracts, for denominational and general uses, is large, and constantly receiving new additions. Sales are made at a moderate profit. Gratuitous distributions and liberal discounts are made to weak churches, poor Sunday-schools, and for missionary purposes. During the civil war in the United States, it sent forth large gratuitous supplies into the armies of

the Union; and since the cessation of hostilities it has done a good and large work of benevolent circulation in the South, particularly among the freedmen. In India it has published the Heidelberg Catechism in Tamil during the year ending June, 1870; and a supply of its elementary books for Sabbath-school and general instruction has been asked for and sent to Japan for use in the government schools under the care of the missionaries of the Reformed Church. The total assets of the board, June 1, 1878, were reported to the Synod as \$12,343.64. Receipts for the year, \$9,102.39.

8. The *Widows' Fund*, or *Relief Fund*, for disabled ministers and the widows and orphaned children of deceased ministers, was organized in 1837. Its benefits are limited to subscribing ministers who may pay \$20 in full, or \$10 or \$5 annually, and who shall receive, pro rata, the annuities which may be due upon personal disability, or, at, their own decease, by their families. Congregations are urged to secure an interest in the fund for their pastors by making the requisite contribution yearly. The funds, which are intrusted to the Board of Direction of Corporation, are invested in bonds and mortgages and in government bonds. One half of the annual payments by ministers, and donations, when specially directed by the donor, are considered income; the other half of the annual payments by ministers, all other donations, and church collections, are considered as principal, and the interest thereof only is used as income. The maximum amount to be paid to parties interested in the fund are: to a minister disabled by sickness or age, \$200 per year; to a minister's widow, \$200; to children of clergymen, both of whose parents are deceased, \$75 per year each until they are sixteen years of age. Other provisions regulate minor payments. The amount of each annuity is of course dependent upon the number of annuitants, and may vary yearly. The maximum may be increased when the state of the fund shall warrant it. The amount of this fund June 1, 1878, was \$49,307.99; and the sum paid to annuitants during the previous year was \$2,259.99.

9. The *Disabled Ministers' Fund*, which reaches a class who cannot avail themselves of the Widows', or Relief, Fund, was organized in 1855, under the title of the Sustentation Fund. It is also in trust of the Board of Direction of Corporation. Its moneys are to be kept invested, and to be "used for the support of disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers. *when such may be in need.*" Applications for aid are made through and recommended by the classes to which the applicants belong. Contributions which are donated specifically for principal are so used; all

other contributions go to the yearly disbursements, and any surplus that remains is carried to principal and placed at interest upon first-class securities. Aged and infirm ministers are thus assisted, and also the needy families of deceased clergymen. The amount of this fund reported June 1, 1878, was \$19,614.85, of which \$14,222 was appropriated to its beneficiaries.

10. The *Church-building Fund* is held in trust and dispensed by the Board of Domestic Missions at its discretion. Aid is given from it only to churches which shall have no debt after receiving assistance from this fund. A first bond and mortgage is taken from such church, and the Domestic Board may remit the interest thereon; but the church must then make a yearly contribution for the fund; and every church aided is to pay back the aid received as soon as practicable. The receipts for the year ending June 1, 1878, were \$9,659.80.

IX. *Correspondence.* — The General Synod holds official correspondence, by interchange of delegates (or by letter), with the following ecclesiastical bodies: the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church; the General Synod (triennial) of the (German) Reformed Church in the United States; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South); the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States; and the General Council of the Reformed Episcopal Church. With the Reformed Church in South Africa, and the Waldenses of Piedmont, occasional correspondence is held by letter, and also with the Free Church of Scotland and other ecclesiastical bodies in Europe. The spirit of this correspondence is well described by one of the Church's most venerated ministers, in these words, respecting her *catholic sentiments and action*:

“Our Church has been distinguished by a steady and united adherence to her standards and order, and at the same time by a kind and friendly relation to other evangelical denominations. She has enjoyed peace within her own bosom, while agitating questions have troubled, and even rent, other churches. She has borne a full proportionate share in contributions to Christian benevolent institutions, such as the American Bible Society, the American

Tract Society, and others. She is desirous and anxious, in a sense of privilegæ and responsibility, to employ greater efforts for increasing the degree and extent of her influence in doing all she can for the spread of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. Her pacific character, her freedom from the ultraisms of the day, her evangelical principles, the peculiar features of her government and order, and the attitude in which she has been found by the side of other evangelical denominations, all tend to commend her to the favorable regard of all the friends of evangelical truth who desire the ‘peace and prosperity’ of the Church of Christ.”

X. *Statistics.* —

1. *Numbers and Funds.* — In June, 1878, the Reformed Church embraced 4 particular synods, 33 classes, 505 churches, 542 ministers. 6 candidates for the ministry, 43,490 families, 78,666 communicants, of whom were received during the previous year 3940 in confession and 1966 by certificates; baptisms of infants, 3874; of adults, 1044; catechumens, 24,445; Sabbath-school scholars, 80,109; contributions for religious and benevolent purposes, \$203,103; for congregational purposes, \$788,222. In July, 1889, there were returned 546 churches, 566 ministers. 88,812 communicants.

2. *Periodicals.* — *The Christian Intelligencer*, weekly, owned and edited by private individuals; the *Sower and Gospel Field*, semi-monthly paper, organ of the Church boards; and *The Mission Monthly*, published by the Board of Foreign Missions.

XI. *Denominational Literature.* — The following are some of the most important publications:

1. *Theological and Exegetical.* — John H. Livingston, D.D., late Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, *Lectures on Theology; an Analysis* by Rev. Ava Neal (1 vol. 12mo, out of print); James S. Cannon, D.D., Professor of Church History and Government and Pastoral Theology, *Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (1 vol. 8vo, 616 pp.), an exhaustive work; Alexander McClelland, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Sacred Languages, *Canon and Interpretation of Scripture* (1 vol. 12mo, 336 pp.); John T. Demarest, D.D., *Commentaries on the 1st and 2d Epistles of Peter* (2 vols. 8vo); John T. Demarest, D.D., and William R. Gordon, D.D., *Christocracy* (1 vol. 12mo); other works by W. R. Gordon, D.D.: *Child's*

Guide in Reading the Scriptures, 132 pp.; *Supreme Godhood of Christ*, 188 pp.; *Particular Providence Illustrated by the Life of Joseph*, 492 pp.; *A Three-fold Test of Modern Spiritualism*, 408 pp.; *The Church of God and her Sacraments*, 208 pp.; A. R. Van Nest, D.D., *Life and Letters of George W. Bethune, D.D.* (1869, 1 vol. crown 8vo); Geo. W. Bethune, D.D., *Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism* (2 vols. crown 8vo); other works by the same author: *Sermons* (1 vol.); *Orations and Addresses* (1 vol.); *Poems* (1 vol.); *History of a Penitent*, being an exposition of Psalm 130 (1 vol.); *Early Lost, Early Saved* (1 vol.); *Fruit of the Spirit* (1 vol.); Rev. John Van der Kemp, *Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism* (2 vols. 8vo, out of print); *The Vedder Lectures*, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877. Among the American contributors to Schaff's edition of Lange's *Biblical Commentary* are Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D. (Genesis, Job, Ecclesiastes), M. B. Riddle, D.D. (Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians), T. W. Chambers, D.D. (Amos, Zechariah), John Forsyth, D.D., LL.D. (Joel), and C. D. Hartranft, D.D. (Numbers). A critical edition or version of the *Heidelberg Catechism* is now in process of preparation by a Committee of Synod, of which a tentative copy, with a historical introduction, was published in *Minutes of General Synod*, 1878, p. 185-222. See also list of works issued by the Board of Publication, including three vols. of *Tracts* and many miscellaneous books illustrating the history, polity, theology, and usages of the Reformed Church. Besides these are a number for general circulation, and not denominational. The *New Brunswick Review*, edited by the late Prof. John Proudfit, D.D., reached only a few numbers; the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., late professor of didactic and polemic theology, extended over about two complete volumes. Both of these reviews are valuable contributions to the literature of the Church.

2. Historical and Biographical. Brodhead, *History of New York* (2 vols.); *Colonial History of New York* (3 vols.); *Documentary History of New York* (4 vols.); David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, *History and Characteristics of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church* (1 vol. 12mo, 221 pp.); Benjamin C. Taylor, D.D., *Annals of the Classis and Township of Bergen* (1 vol. 12mo, 479 pp.); Sprague, *Annals of the Reformed Dutch Church*, vol. 9 with historical introduction; Rev. E. T. Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church in America* (1 vol. 8vo; 2d ed. revised and enlarged, 1879), an invaluable work; Alex. Gulinn, D.D., *Memoirs of Rev. John H. Livingston*,

D.D. (1 vol. 12mo); *Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church* (1827, 4 vols.), containing a valuable series of articles by the late Rev. John B. Romeyn, D.D., on the history of the Reformed Church in Holland and in this country; Rev. John A. Todd, D.D., *Memoirs of Rev. Peter Labagh, D.D.* (1 vol. 12mo); E. P. Rogers, D.D., *Historical Discourses on the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in Albany* (1858, 1 vol. 8vo, 120 pp.); Thomas De Witt, D.D., *Reformed Dutch Church in New York* (1857, 1 vol. 8vo, 100 pp.); *One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N. J.*, memorial volume, Richard H. Steele, D.D., pastor (1867, 1 vol. 8vo, 222 pp.); Francis M. Kip, D.D., *One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in Fishkill, N. Y.* (1866, 64 pp.); *Minutes of the General Synod, 1771-1870*; *Constitution and Digest of Acts of General Synod* (revised, 1874); articles published in the *Christian Intelligencer* by Thomas De Witt, D.D., mostly from original documents procured by loan from the Classis of Amsterdam, Holland, and others from John R. Brodhead, Esq., — the historian of New York; W. Carlos Martyn, *The Dutch Reformation* (Amer. Tract Society, N.Y., 1870, 1 vol. 12mo); *Eutaxia. or the Presbyterian Liturgies*, by a Presbyterian Clergyman (New York, M. W. Dodd, 1855, 259 pp.); Rev. George R. Williamson, *Life of David Abeel, D.D.*; Rev. J. B. Waterbury, *Life of Rev. John Scudder, I.D.*; *Works of Dr. Scudder and Dr. Abeel*; Von Alpen, *History of the Heidelberg Catechism*, translated by Prof. J. F. Berg, D.D. (Phila. 1854, 1 vol. 8vo). Dr. Berg also published several volumes on prophecy, the Second Advent, Church and State, etc.; *Centennial Discourses*, a series of twenty-two sermons delivered in the year 1876 by order of the General Synod, intended to set forth the relations of the Reformed Church to liberty and to faith and education, and other topics appropriate to the Centennial year of the republic (8vo, 601 pp.). *Quarter-Millennial Anniversary of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York, 1628-1878* (1879, 8vo, 104 pp.). (W.J.R.T.)

Reformed Episcopal Church

the official designation of a distinct body of Christians in America and Great Britain.

I. History. — This ecclesiastical organization took its rise in the city of New York December 2, 1873. The Rt. Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., assistant bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Kentucky, separated from that Church, in a letter to presiding bishop Smith

dated November 10, 1873. Within one month from that date, the Reformed Episcopal Church was organized, with Dr. Cummins as its first bishop. Bishop, Cummins was born December 11, 1822. He was related on the maternal side to the celebrated bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but was of Episcopal descent on both sides. He was graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1841, in the nineteenth year of his age. In the year 1843 he became connected with the Episcopal Church, and in 1845 was ordained to the diaconate by bishop Alfred Lee, of the diocese of Delaware. After a ministry of great eloquence, power, and success in different prominent fields of labor during twelve years, he was consecrated to the episcopate as assistant bishop of the diocese of Kentucky in 1866. During October, 1873, the Evangelical Alliance met in New York city. Bishop Cummins was in attendance, and on the eighth day of that month delivered an address on the subject *Roman and Reformed Doctrines on the Subject of Justification, Contrasted*. On the 12th, Sunday, the bishop participated in a joint communion in the Presbyterian Church of which Dr. John Hall is the pastor, delivering an address and administering the cup. The storm of adverse criticism that followed this act served to mature and intensify the conviction that had been gathering form and volume before in the bishop's mind, that the Church he had loved and served so well had fully and finally drifted from its old evangelical and catholic position. It was about this time, just at what point we do not know, that the thought of a separation from the old Communion arose, and ripened into fixed purpose. The first outward movement looking towards the organization of a separate Communion took place October 30. An account of the meeting then held is here given in the language of a prominent clergyman: — Rev. Dr. B. B. Leacock — who was present and participated in its deliberations:

“By invitation of bishop Cummins, five clergymen and five laymen were brought together at the residence of Mr. John A. Dake, of New York city. The bishop startled them by announcing his determination of withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Church. When urged to reconsider his decision, he promptly stated that this was not debatable ground — that it was a question between himself and God, and as such he had settled it, and that his determination was unalterable, he then said that his object in calling us together was to advise as to his future. There were two propositions before him. He had been invited to go to Mexico, and give himself to the work of the organization and building-up of the Church of Jesus.

Should he do this? or should he remain in this country, and here exercise his ministry and his episcopal office? Those who felt free to speak advised his remaining in this country by all means, and then and there he determined that this country should be the ‘sphere of labor’ to which he would transfer his ‘work and office.’ Steps were taken before the adjournment of this meeting looking towards placing in the hands of the printer the book which the bishop refers to in his letter of resignation, written Nov. 10 — ‘I propose to return to that Prayer-book sanctioned by William White.’ We may regard this meeting as the first movement, outside of bishop Cummins himself, towards the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church.” November 10, the bishop addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his superior in the diocese of Kentucky, and the presiding bishop of the general Church, resigning his position as a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. On the 12th of November he paid an unannounced visit to the Rev. Marshall B. Smith, at Passaic, N. J., seeking rest and quiet of mind. Mr. Smith had withdrawn from the same church, for the same causes, and connected himself with the ministry of the “Reformed Church of America” in the year 1869. During this visit, without any prearrangement, he was met by the Rev. Mason Gallagher, who had also withdrawn from the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1871, and Col. Benjamin Aycrigg, a prominent layman of that church in New Jersey, who had withdrawn October 30, 1873. These gentlemen testify that, in the deeply serious and interesting interview, which was greatly protracted, there was, in the beginning, no foreshadowing of its practical issue. They cannot recall the precise point in the conversation where the thought of concerted action took shape. Under what they fully believe Divine guidance, that thought did rise, take form and body, and grow into purpose, until, in the form dictated by the bishop, the call for a meeting of clergymen and laymen of like mind was written and issued. It was in these words, inserted here as important history: “NEW YORK, Nov. 15, 1873.

“DEAR BROTHER, — The Lord has put into the hearts of some of his servants who are, or have been, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the purpose of restoring the old truths of their fathers, and of returniug to the use of the Prayer-book of 1785, set forth by the

General Convention of that year, under the especial guidance of the venerable William White, D.D., afterwards the first bishop of the same church in this country. The chief features of that Prayer-book, as distinguished from the one now in use, are the following: 1. The word ‘priest’ does not appear in the book, and there is no countenance whatever to the errors of sacerdotalism. 2. The Baptismal Offices, the Confirmation Office, the Catechism, and the Order ‘or the Administration of the Lord’s Supper contain no sanction of the errors of baptismal regeneration, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements of the communion and of a sacrifice offered by a priest in that sacred feast. These are the main features that render the Prayer-book of 1785 a thoroughly scriptural liturgy, such as all evangelical Christians who desire liturgical worship can use with a good conscience. On Tuesday, the second day of December, 1873, a meeting will be held in Association Hall, corner of Twenty-third street and Fourth avenue, in the city of New York, at 10 o’clock A.M., to organize an Episcopal Church on the basis of the Prayerbook of 1785 — a basis broad enough to embrace all who hold ‘the faith once delivered to the saints,’ as that faith is maintained by the Reformed churches of Christendom; with no exclusive and unchurching dogmas towards Christian brethren who differ from them in their views of polity and Church order. This meeting you are cordially and affectionately invited to attend. The purpose of the meeting is to *organize*, and not to discuss the expediency of organizing. A verbatim reprint of the Prayer-book of 1785 is in press, and will be issued during the month of December. May the Lord guide you and us by his Holy Spirit.

“GEORGE DAVID CUMMINS.”

That meeting was held on the day appointed, and the “Reformed Episcopal Church” organized with eight clergymen and twenty laymen, all of whom were at the time. or had been, ministers or laymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church and actively identified with the Evangelical or “Low-Church” party in that Church, no one being allowed to vote but those who had signed the call. The Rev. Charles Edward Cheney, of Chicago, was elected bishop, his consecration to the office taking place later in the same month.

In justification of this action, writers in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church point to the actual state of the Evangelical school or party in the Protestant Episcopal communion. The errors and excesses of the Tractarian school had been in process of development for a period of nearly forty years. Often and thoroughly confuted on the ground of scriptural argument, they had grown to such widespread influence and strength as to be fast absorbing all the vital forces of the Church. They had become proscriptive, and, by legislative enactment and judicial trials, were repressing evangelical life and energy. Efforts had been made to procure the condemnation and expulsion of these errors from the Church. The results were of so partial and inadequate a character as to encourage rather than check the reactionary movement towards mediaeval error and superstition. Then efforts were made to secure revision of the Prayer-book, but only with humiliating failure. Petition after petition to the General Convention was treated with scarcely concealed contempt. Even the poor relief of liberty to use alternate phrases in the Baptismal Offices was unceremoniously denied to a numerously signed petition. In these efforts to obtain relief many participated who are not as yet in the Reformed Episcopal Church, but whose action shows how deeply and earnestly men who loved the pure truth of the Gospel then felt on the subject. Thus, at a meeting in Chicago, June 16 and 17, 1869, among others who strongly advocated revision of the Prayer-book was Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia, one of the ablest presbyters of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a member of the General Convention. Rev. Dr. Richard Newton, the present rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, introduced the following resolutions:

“Resolved (as the sense of this Conference), That a careful revision of the Book of Common Prayer is needful to the best interests of the Protestant Episcopal Church.”

“Resolved, That all words and phrases seeming to teach that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, or the Lord’s supper a sacrifice, or that regeneration is inseparable from baptism, should be removed from the Prayer-book.”

These resolutions were unanimously adopted. But neither these nor any other efforts to obtain redress were of any avail. An imperious and haughty majority bound and held every conscience, and the Church followed the sacramentarian drift unchecked. Those who organized the Reformed

Episcopal Church were convinced, by a long course of stubborn facts, that the cause dear to them, as the cause of the true Gospel of Christ, was at stake; that they must either sacrifice the truth or go outside of the old organization to defend and propagate it. Conviction and conscience led them to their action.

The Church thus taking shape in ecclesiastical history, though yet comparatively a small body, has, during the five years of its existence, grown, it is believed, with almost unexampled rapidity. Its apologists emphasize certain facts in this growth:

1. *The Extent of Territory it Covers.* — Christian denominations have, for the most part, been local in the early stages of their history, as the causes out of which they have sprung have been local. The imperative need of this Church is shown by the fact that it sprang up almost simultaneously in remote parts of the land, as from a soil quite prepared for the seed. Wherever the Episcopal Church was in existence, the reaction towards mediaeval corruptions in doctrine and ritual was more or less pronounced; and the recoil from these developments of error equally decided. The Reformed Church took immediate and strong hold of many and widely separated communities, quickly absorbing all the means and ministers which the infant communion could supply. Within two years from its origin it held positions at various points from South Carolina to Vancouver's Island, on the extreme west of the British North American possessions. The Church is now planted firmly in fifteen states in this country, in the maritime provinces and the various larger cities in the Dominion of Canada. In May, 1877, the General Council resolved, in answer to repeated solicitations, to introduce its work into Great Britain and Ireland. Already that work has extended into some ten or twelve dioceses.

2. *The Friendliness with which this Church has been received by Protestant Christians and Churches.* — The old Protestant Episcopal Church had met with opposition in many places, and the habitual complaint of its ministers and missionaries was that the growth of the Church was hindered by the prejudice and unfriendly criticism of the people. The Reformed Episcopal Church finds no such difficulty. The people everywhere seem willing that it should take its place in the sisterhood of churches, and gather from all communities its appropriate elements. The freedom from assumption in this Church thus wins its welcome, and opens for it that path of progress which, it is believed, leads on to a great future.

3. *The Overruling Hand of God in Harmonizing Internal Differences among the Leading and Influential Minds in the Church.* — It is no easy thing, under the most favorable auspices, for a number of men severing their connection with an old organization and constructing a new, to agree together in anything like a moderate position. In this case the difficulty was enhanced by the circumstances of the separation. The men who left the old Church, though actuated by a common opposition to particular errors in that body, held views, in many cases, divergent in regard to the positive principles to be incorporated in the new organization. These differences have at times appeared so grave that no human wisdom could find a path through them along which all could travel in harmony. Some conservative by habit of mind; others with an equally strong tendency to reach out towards the true ideal of a Church for the age we live in; and all men, by the very necessities of their stand, of a somewhat independent tone of mind, it was found by them hard to yield individual and personal views and preferences far enough to coalesce in a really organic structure. In every case of difficulty in the councils arising from these causes, however, the Spirit of the Lord appeared to lead the way. His presence and agency was at times so manifest as to awaken lively emotions of wonder and gratitude. Though in this Church at present, as in all others where intelligent men are free to think and to maintain their views, all do not think alike in everything, there is perhaps as much harmony as can be found in any, and much more than marks most other, communions. In this fact of special divine guidance, this Church seems to see the pledge of future growth and success in its work.

II. *Doctrines and Usages.* —

1. Speaking generally, the doctrines of the Reformed Episcopal Church may be identified as those of Orthodox and Evangelical Protestantism. The men who organized the Church were of that class of clergymen and laymen in the old Protestant Episcopal Church who had been largely associated with the Christians of other Protestant Churches, and harmonized with them in belief and practice. In their choice and adjustment of doctrinal standards, they could but give expression to this agreement. When they set forth in the “Declaration of Principles” the belief that “the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the sole Rule of faith and practice,” thus making the Bible the only ultimate fountain of authority in the settlement of religious questions; and when they revised the old Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, not changing their

substance, but making them more distinctive, and adapting them to present phases of life and thought, they but put the Church squarely on the great platform of Evangelical Christianity. This Church, if not broader, is somewhat less *particular* in its doctrinal basis than some of its sister Communion. Thus, like the old Episcopal Church, it holds in its bosom, and freely tolerates, clergymen of the Calvinistic and Arminian schools of thought. The eighteenth "Article of Religion," entitled "Of Election, Predestination, and Free Will," runs thus: "While the Scriptures distinctly set forth the election, predestination, and calling of the people of God unto eternal life, as Christ saith, 'All that the Father giveth me shall come to me,' they no less positively affirm man's free agency and responsibility, and that salvation is freely offered to all through Christ. This Church, accordingly, simply affirms these doctrines as the Word of God sets them forth, and submits them to the individual judgment of its members, as taught by the Holy Spirit; strictly charging them that God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, and that we can be saved only by faith in Jesus Christ." This is the only distinct effort we are aware of to unite in one article of religion the two hemispheres of truth that he, one on the side of divine sovereignty, the other on the side of man's freedom and responsibility. How far this effort has been successful, the judgment of Christian men must decide. One result of it, however, is evident. The general course of conviction among the clergy of this Church runs nearer the line of separation on these high ranges of doctrine than in most other Communion. The freedom to differ rather constrains to harmony than ministers to license. With but little disposition to censorious criticism, its ministers of either tendency of doctrinal thought find a fair field for united and harmonious action in extending and building up the kingdom of Christ.

In adopting the Nicene Creed as one of its symbols, this Church takes its stand on the historical Church doctrine of the Trinity, asserting not a mere modal distinction, but an essential, tri-personal distinction in the divine nature. Justification by faith, as held and taught by the clergy generally, is not a mere negative state of the remission of sin, but positive, resulting from the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The doctrines that cluster around these, as in a measure dependent upon them, are stated in the articles in harmonious and systematic order.

2. Among the distinctive usages of this Church, the following may be specially designated:

(a.) *Worship.* — The Reformed Episcopal is a Liturgical Church. Those who organized and those who, since its organization, have come into it and helped to form its system and direct its course in history, have been men either trained in the old Protestant Episcopal Church, where they had long practical experience of the value of liturgic forms in public worship, or convinced from experience, in churches whose worship is purely extemporal, of the importance of a liturgy from the actual lack of it. They have been convinced that the evils connected with liturgic services in the old parent Church are not justly chargeable to a liturgy as such, but to certain doctrinal corruptions retained in those services at the era of the Reformation. During the reign of Edward VI, rapid strides were made in the line of a thorough Protestant revision of the Service-book. Under Mary the reforming work was undone, and the Romish worship restored. Elizabeth, in the spirit of statecraft, enforced a revision that should, if possible, unite in common worship both the Reformed and the Roman Catholic classes of her subjects. The two streams of doctrine were forced into one channel of Church liturgy, where they have been confined in incongruous mixture ever since. Out of the stream thus formed, and flowing down through history, the exhalations of sacramentarianism and ritualism in this age have risen. In the revision of the Reformed Episcopal Church, it is claimed, these elements of erroneous doctrine have been taken out of the stream. The liturgy in this Church embodies the richest and best contributions yielded by the most devout ages of the Church's history, shorn of the accretions of superstition and error gathered in the descent. Though it does not claim to be perfect, it does claim to be Protestant, evangelical, scriptural. As such, its use is made obligatory on occasions; and, by usage that is almost common law, is seldom omitted on any occasions of regular public worship. Yet provision is made for free prayer. Meetings for extempore prayer are encouraged, when the stately services of the liturgy are laid aside, either wholly or in part. Even on occasions of regular public worship, the minister is free to add, extempore, to the prescribed prayer. Dignity and propriety are thus united to that warmth and earnestness which a more unstudied way of approach to God is suited to enkindle. Thus the continued use of liturgic forms, with their chastening and educating influence, is secured by law, and also that liberty for times and seasons when, by rising out of the limits of prescription, worship can be adapted to all the demands of evangelistic and revival work. This, it is believed, is as near an approach as can be made to a perfect system of worship.

(b.) Government. — This is distinctly a Church of Law. Neither in the individual membership, nor in the relations of the separate churches, nor yet in the connection of the larger ecclesiastical divisions is the bond of union that of mere association, under any proper conception of that term. Opinion, whether it refer to doctrine, to polity, or to Christian life, finds its legitimate expression in the councils. In this way, in free debate, it passes by vote into particular law under the organic law expressed in the constitution; and then all, whether sections or persons, are bound by the law. The legal system is a body of canons like the old historical episcopal canon law, simply shorn of those arbitrary and tyrannical features of the old system derived from monarchical institutions in the State and autocratic episcopal rule in the Church. The application of a system of government, whether strong or weak, to actual life in a Church is not easy; for there is a constant tendency under ecclesiastical rule either to arbitrary severity or to the entire relaxation of discipline, according to the temper of persons and times and the class of influences that prevail. But it is believed important advantages attend this system of government by canon law. It is *stable* government. That system which is historical, having stood the test of the ages in the stress of human passion and the strife of opinion and interest, cannot but be strong and conservative. Canon law has ruled nearly all the Christian ages, adjusting itself to each age and growing into greater definiteness of form in each. If, in the purification of the doctrines of the Church, wisdom dictates, not the destruction, but the cleansing and reforming, of the system, it would seem to follow that the same wisdom teaches a like course in relation to government. Purify it, take away its tyranny; in place of its arbitrary and unequal distribution of powers and functions, introduce the checks and balances of enlightened statesmanship, and you have in the Church a fair analogy to law in the State, where the principles and forms of the Roman law are not arbitrarily thrown aside, but enlarged, purified, developed into that grand system that secures the rights of men under the Christian civilization of this modern age. Such is the wvork this Church has sought to do. It has purified and adapted the old system of canon law, not abandoned it. Thus it has united steadfastness and liberty in its scheme of government.

This system of government by canon law is a *safeguard against the spread of error*. Where the churches of an ecclesiastical organization are independent, or only connected by certain rules of association having no other than moral force, there is apt to be less jealousy and less exciting

debate in the meetings of association, because the tendency of opinion and the results of controversy cannot crystallize into forms that bind under penalty. But this very fact is apt to lead to looseness of conviction and a light estimate of the responsibility of a teacher. And when error is taught, because the teacher cannot be arraigned under binding law, he cannot be hindered from spreading it to the full extent of his talents and influence. Under a system of canon law such as governs the Reformed Episcopal Church, such a result, with ordinary faithfulness on the part of those appointed to administer it, is impossible. Not only is dereliction in either doctrine or life liable to strict discipline, but the persons by whom and the processes in which such discipline is to be administered are prescribed, and the duty actually imposed upon the administrator. If soundness of doctrine can be enforced and innocency of life secured in a Church, such a system would seem to present the best means to the end.

(c.) *Constitution and Relations of the Ministry of this Church.* — In common with the parent Church, the Reformed retains a threefold distinction in the ministry — that of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. There is, however, this difference between the two communions in regard to the distinction in question. In the old Church it is generally regarded as a threefold distinction in *orders*. The prevailing view among the representative writers of that Church is that the Christian ministry is divinely constituted on the Jewish pattern, and answers, in the relations of the New-Test. Church, to the orders of high-priest, priest, and Levite in the Old-Test. economy. The Reformed Church rejects this view as unscriptural and unhistorical. The episcopate it regards as an *office* rather than a divine *order*. The opinion that the bishop is an apostle in the scriptural meaning of that term, and as such the divinely ordained fountain of Church authority, and Church life, and that the presbyterate *descends* from the episcopate in virtue of this inherent power to create it and to constitute it as a separate order, is rejected by the Reformed Episcopal Church. Looking at the subject historically, it finds the precise opposite of this to be the true statement. In the earliest infancy of the Church, under apostolic agency, deacons and elders were ordained and their respective functions assigned. About the close of the apostolic age, the emergencies of the growing Church created a need for supervision, not merely of individual flocks by the presbyters as settled pastors, but of the general Church, both pastors and flocks. This want was supplied by a gradual process, in which able and prominent presbyters were elevated to a general superintendence of the

churches. Thus they became ἐπίσκοποι, overseers by pre-eminence, presbyters in *order*, bishops in *office*. The Reformed Episcopal Church observes this distinction. Its episcopate, as in primitive times, is an office of supervision, not an order of divine command, separated from the presbyterate and with inherent control over it.

According to this scheme, the bishop has no inherent and necessary rights and powers above the legislative control of the Church. He cannot fall back upon essential, divinely given, irresponsible authority to rule. His office and its functions are, under God, wholly from the Church, to which, therefore, he is, in the entire range of his official position and work, responsible. Episcopal tyranny is well-nigh impossible in a system like this. Yet the episcopate is not degraded because deprived of the claim to inherent divine right. The bishops are overseers in the true and worthy sense. They draw to themselves not only personal respect and reverence for their characters, but intelligent official regard. In ordination and confirmation they are the chiefs, because the Church makes them so. In the difficulties in parishes their advice, or, in extreme cases, their acts of discipline according to canon law have full force, and have already settled troubles which, under another scheme, would have been formidable. They are evangelists so far as, in the infancy of the Church, they can be spared from parochial charges, and thus become a most important agency in Church extension.

The diaconate in this Church is a subordinate order. In theory the deacon is the helper of the presbyter; in practice his position is, thus far, only a sort of preparatory school for the presbyterate. Just what the office will become in the growth and development of the Church as it passes further into history can hardly be foreseen. Perhaps its relation to the general ministry will not differ greatly from that which prevails in the old Protestant Episcopal Church. This historic ministry is prized, not because of any belief in the notion of an "apostolic succession" in the ministry either as a doctrine or a fact, but partly because the historic element in a Church is always important, since Christianity itself is a historical religion, and partly because the peculiar mission of this Church is in the line of the English Reformation. In the vital and historical connection of its ministry with that of the English Reformers the Reformed Episcopal Church has the basis for its development and work. The ministry thus constituted, identical with that of the English Church, gives the Church a vantage-ground where it can stand on an acknowledged equality with the old communion, while it is purified from its errors, and is free to recognise the ministry of other

Evangelical Churches as equally valid with its own. It thus stands in the gap, never heretofore bridged, between Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. It has the ministry of both. It may be destined to be the medium of reconciliation between them, as it does not arrogate superiority to the one, and lacks nothing the other justly claims.

(d.) Church Councils. — These are of three grades, corresponding to the threefold organization of the Church — Parochial, Synodical, and General.

(1.) The individual parish is organized by charter under civil law, and is, in that relation, conditioned by the laws of the state in which it is situated. But in its own internal structure it is composed of rector or pastor, as the case may be, two wardens, and a certain number of vestrymen. The control of the temporal affairs of the Church is in the vestry, as also the choice of a pastor in case of vacancy. But, in addition to the vestry, provision is made for the election, by the communicants exclusively, of a Parish Council. The members of this council hold an advisory relation to the pastor, are associated with him in the reception and dismissal of members, and share with him the duty and responsibility of discipline. Thus the parish is organized for both the temporal and spiritual supervision of its interests. To the parish council is committed all the distinctly spiritual work of the given congregation outside of the pastor's immediate agency as the shepherd of the flock. It is possible this organization of the parish council may not be permanent in its present form, as there is some diversity of opinion on the subject in the Church. But either in its present form or by investing the wardens *ex officio* with the functions now restricted to the council elected by the communicants of the parish, this feature of polity will unquestionably become historic in the Church.

(2.) *The Synodical Council* is yet in its incipient stage, as the synod has not thus far taken practical existence and form in more than one or two instances. Provision is made for a certain number of parishes to form themselves into a synodical body under a bishop, who, though he may be nominated by the synod, must be confirmed by the General Council and hold his local position at its will. As the synods multiply in numbers, and their field of work and their immunities become clearly discriminated in the general system of the Church, there will be stated conciliar assemblies at which all legislative and routine business pertaining to the jurisdiction it covers will be transacted. Probably the basis of representation will be so

modified that instead of appointments from the several churches, as now, the synodical councils will elect representatives to the General Council.

(3.) *The General Council* is the largest representative body of the Church, and is vested with supreme authority of legislation. It meets, as yet, annually, as its relations in the infancy of the Church are directly, not mediately, to the parishes. Already, however, steps have been taken looking to a change in the system of representation in the council, decreasing its number of members and lengthening the intervals of meeting. Eventually this council will, it is believed, meet not oftener than, if so often as, once in three years, and confine its deliberations to those general questions of doctrine and polity that affect the whole Church.

(4.) There is looming up through the mists of the near future a representative assemblage of a still wider and more comprehensive character — like an *oecumenical council*. It is the policy of this Church, in the spirit of its founders, to preserve an organic unity, unbroken by the lines that separate states or nations. It is evident, however, that this can only be done by a large and liberal allowance for the peculiarities of peoples living under contrasted systems of civil government, and growing up with tastes and social habits and modes of thought of distinct types. The Reformed Episcopal Church in America and in England is the same Church, yet the streams that flow out of the one fountain, as they diverge into these several nationalities, are immediately modified by the civil, social, and ecclesiastical soil and climate they find. Identical in doctrine, spirit, and organic life, they vary somewhat in the forms of organization and worship that adapt them to their respective spheres. Already a policy is taking shape by which each national Church shall enjoy a limited independence of legislation, discipline, and worship, thus to work out its own history and destiny. Just what shall constitute the *nexus*, the vital ligature that shall make the Church, however widely extended, a unit, an organic body, cannot yet be identified. Such, however, will undoubtedly be the connection that it will embrace provision for the meeting of a council within a certain term, of years, and having under its control those wide questions that affect the character and interests of the Church as a whole. This Church was not organized for a day or for a place, but for the world and for time.

These statements in regard to doctrines, orders, worship, discipline, and general usages are little more than an expansion of the original declaration

of principles adopted at the organization of the Church, Dec. 2, 1873, which is given as a comprehensive summary:

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding “the faith once delivered to the saints,” declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the word of God, and the sole rule of faith and practice; in the creed commonly called the Apostles’ Creed; in the divine institution of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper; and in the doctrines of grace, substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

II. This Church recognises and adheres to episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church polity.

III. This Church, retaining a liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer, as it was revised, proposed, and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A.D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same, as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, “provided that the substance of the faith be kept entire.”

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God’s Word:

First, That the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity.

Second, That Christian ministers are “priests” in another sense than that in which all believers are a “royal priesthood.”

Third, That the Lord’s table is an altar on which an oblation of the body and blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father.

Fourth, That the presence of Christ in the Lord’s supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine.

Fifth, That regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism.

III. Statistics. — The statistics of this Church thus early in its history are necessarily few and simple. If, however, they are carefully noted, they will,

it is believed, indicate wider extension and more rapid growth than have marked most other ecclesiastical bodies in the beginning of their history.

1. *The Number of Clergymen* as reported to the council of 1878 was eighty-eight, of whom six were bishops, sixty-one presbyters, and twenty deacons. Already the list has swollen to more than one hundred, and is increasing as rapidly as places and means of support can be provided for those received or ordained; while the number of applicants for orders and for admission from the ministry in other churches, against whom the door is necessarily closed for want of ability to sustain them, is larger than ever before. The tabular report of the Committee on the State of the Church, covering other items made at the council, May, 1878, was very imperfect, as many of the parishes had failed to report. In its statement of the number of communicants it is thought to be very much below the actual number. It is as follows:

Communicants (assumed).....	10,000
Sunday scholars	7814
Sunday-school teachers	744
Baptized, i.e. during the year preceding....	744
Confirmed in said year.....	615
Contributions of the parishes for all objects during same year ...	\$280,785
Value of Church property at time of council	600,031
Other property for educational purposes....	200,000

“This exhibit shows an increase of more than \$172,000 over the amount reported in 1877, notwithstanding the perhaps unparalleled depression of the past year.” In July, 1890, there were returned 109 churches, 120 ministers, 10,100 communicants.

2. *Literary Institutions.* — Of these the Reformed Episcopal Church can, as yet, boast but one, and that only in the infancy of what it is hoped will, in due time of maturity, be a vigorous and influential life. The University: of the West is at present organized substantially on the plan of the London University. Non-resident professors prepare questions on which students are required to stand rigid examinations by written answers. In this university scheme, only the Martin College of Theology is thus far in organized working order. This has taken precedence to meet the wants of the Church in the education of its ministry. The times demand a ministry not only of thorough scholastic attainments, but well taught in theology in connection with the peculiarities of the Church they are to labor in. The

Church seeks to compass this end by subjecting all students in theology to a uniform system of questions in all departments of theological learning. The present plan may be modified when a sufficient endowment fund shall have been secured to meet the requirements of a local institution. Through the munificent liberality of a gentleman of the State of New York, Edward Martin, Esq., the Church is in possession of landed estate in the suburbs of Chicago of large present and much larger prospective value. On this property the authorities of the university propose, eventually, to erect suitable buildings for the several colleges as they shall, from time to time, take form. It is their purpose, as the ability of the Church increases, to spare no pains to make the institution worthy of the Church and of the country.

3. Church Literature. — The Reformed Episcopal Church supports two papers that set forth its principles and defend its interests. *The Episcopal Recorder*, published in Philadelphia, is a weekly paper which has become historic. It was the oldest weekly issue in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which, during more than a half of the century, it advocated those principles of ecclesiastical polity and Christian life and doctrine that are still emblazoned on its banner. Transferred to the Reformed branch of the Church, it but continues its old work in new relations, and proves a highly important agent in the defence and extension of the truth in the newly organized communion. *The Appeal* is published in Chicago and New York, and issued bi-weekly. While aiming specially to meet the needs of the Church in the great West, it has extensive circulation in all parts of the land; and, though only about three years of age, displays much energy and ability. Its editor-in-chief is the present presiding bishop, Dr. Samuel Fallows, and he is aided by an efficient staff of clergymen of large ability and culture. This paper exerts wide influence in the Church. So early in its history, and with the time and energy of its clergy severely taxed by initial parochial work, this Church has not as yet produced literary or theological works of extensive and standard character. Its ephemeral productions, however, from the nature of the case largely apologetic, are already numerous. Nearly all the prominent clergymen of this Church have been forced by attacks, often from the highest sources, to defend both their Church and their personal action in conforming to it. These writings constitute a body of argument, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to which the Church points all inquirers with entire confidence, and the more so since, so far as is known, there has been no attempt to confute any single one of

the many publications in question. Such, in brief, are the history and principles of the Reformed Episcopal Church — an organization called into existence, its advocates believe, by the providence and spirit of God, and destined to exert a very deep, extensive, and lasting influence, not only in the country of its birth, but in the world. (J. H. S.)

Reformed German Church

SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

Reformed Methodist Church

an American offspring of the Methodist Episcopal Church, had its origin in 1814, and was started by a body of local preachers and exhorters, the most prominent and influential of whom was the Rev. Elijah Bailey, an ordained local preacher in the Vermont Conference. They had become dissatisfied with the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and especially that part of it which relates to the powers and prerogatives of the episcopacy. They asserted that a leaning towards prelacy as it exists in the Roman Catholic hierarchy was developing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, their fears not receiving that general guard for which they prayed, they at length concluded to separate themselves from the old Church and found a new and reformed body. For the purpose of gaining a large number of ready, active laborers for their new organization, they resorted to the formation of a community of goods on a farm which they purchased at Bennington, Vt., and sustained for about two years. But the attempt to maintain themselves as a community proved abortive, and the members of it soon scattered to different parts of the states of Vermont and New York, and to Upper Canada. In the British territory they succeeded in raising up a number of Reformed societies. In the States, however, their success was small. The dispersion of the community above alluded to operated favorably to the interests of the Church as a whole, as, after that period, they were favored from time to time with gracious revivals of religion. Thousands, no doubt, in following years have been converted to God through the instrumentality of the preachers of this Church. As a denomination, however, they did not prosper like other organized orthodox churches. They suffered much from dissensions in their own ranks and important secessions from their numbers. About half of their ministers and many of their most flourishing societies left them and joined the Protestant Methodists; and at one time an entire conference of Reformed preachers went over to that denomination.

At the time of their greatest prosperity they had five annual conferences and about seventy-five ministers and preachers, and from three to four thousand members. After the organization of another Methodistic branch in the United States (the Wesleyan), most of the ministers and members of the Reformed Church became identified with that branch, and finally the body was merged into the so-called *Methodist Church*.

Doctrines. — In all matters of theology the “Reformers” are, or were, Methodistic, if we except their belief in the gift of healing, by which physical maladies might be removed through the power of faith. This belief had gained for the Reformers the names of fanatics and enthusiasts; but they have returned the compliment by accusing their calumniators of scepticism and infidelity.

Church Government. — The form of Church government selected by the Reformers was strictly congregational, admitting of lay representation in their general and annual conferences; the former body not meeting periodically, but only at the call of the latter bodies. Their general rules are similar to those of the parent body, with the addition of some forbidding war, slavery, etc.

The only periodical published under the auspices of this Church at any time was the *Luminary and Reformer*, edited by Mr. Bailey, a son of the founder of the Church. The paper, however, has for years been discontinued. *SEE METHODISM* (20).

Reformed Presbyterian Church

This body, like many others, is known by different names: its members have been designated as *Mountain Men*, *Old Dissenters*, *Cameronians*, and *Society People*; but their most common designation is *Covenanters*. The name of “Mountain Men” was given them because they are a remnant of those who were driven to hills, moors, and other uninhabited places by persecution in the reign of the Stuarts in Scotland. They are called “Cameronians” from Richard Cameron, one of their leaders during that persecution. They were called “Society People” because they were often confined to prayer-meetings in private as their only means of social worship when their ministers were killed or banished. For the name “Covenanters,” see that article in vol. 2 of this work. The *history* of these people has been given well, though briefly, under articles *SEE CAMERON*; *SEE COVENANTERS*; *SEE PRESBYTERIAN (REFORMED) CHURCH*;

SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. This article is intended to present their peculiar characteristics, the leading points in which they differ from other Presbyterian bodies.

1. A prominent feature is their separation from the State. In this country, as well as in the British isles, they withhold an oath to the government, whether in naturalization, in taking office, or anything which implies full allegiance; nor do they vote for any officer so qualified, whether the office be legislative, judicial, or executive; neither do they sit on juries under oath. This position they occupy, not as the Quakers, who object to an oath entirely as well as to the forcible execution of law. Covenanters in this country approve of the representative system, and of a definite constitution reduced to writing as a righteous measure, and one which should be adopted by every nation under heaven. From the beginning they gave their sanction and encouragement to the cause of American independence; and they would gladly enjoy the full privileges of citizenship were it not for the evils connected with the government. However they may fail in particular instances, their design and desire are to promote the influence of all the good regulations and laws of the country, and to live quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty.

2. They give great prominence to the universal dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ. They hold that as king in his Church, he has settled all her institutions and ordinances. Other denominations admit this in the general, while many claim the right of modifying altering, instituting, or abolishing religious observances With the decreeing of rites and ceremonies Covenanters have no sympathy. Besides this kingship in his Church, they claim for Christ, according to the gift of the Father, uncontrolled dominion over all things, outside of the Church as well as within; and that this extensive authority is used by him for the benefit of his body, the Church; that he may send his messengers into heathen countries; that he may use angelic powers at his pleasure; that he may supply his people with temporal support and subdue all their enemies; that he may raise the dead and judge the world at the last day (^{<BIB>}Psalm 2:6; 89:19; 110:3; ^{<BIB>}Isaiah 9:6, 7; ^{<BIB>}Daniel 7:14; ^{<BIB>}Matthew 11:27; 28:18; ^{<BIB>}Luke 1:32; ^{<BIB>}John 3:35; 5:27; 17:2; ^{<BIB>}Romans 14:9; ^{<BIB>}Ephesians 1:20; ^{<BIB>}Hebrews 2:8; ^{<BIB>}1 Peter 3:22).

3. They consider the Church and the State as the two leading departments of Christ's visible kingdom on earth, or, as Merle d'Aubigne has

designated them, the two poles of human society. In this view they labor much for the purity and power of the two great ordinances, the Gospel ministry and the civil magistracy; both being equally of God, both being under the sovereignty of Christ, and each, in its sphere, to be regulated, in a Christian land, by the *written law*. Where this law is either entirely disregarded Or flagrantly violated, they refuse to take any part either in Church or State.

4. They lay great stress on the *witnessing* character of the Church (²³⁶⁰Isaiah 43:10: “Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord”). This idea enters largely into the constitution of the New-Test. organization — ⁴⁰⁰⁸Acts 1:8: “But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ve shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” This presents the double aspect of the Church’s work — one, the salvation of men; one, the glory of God; both harmonizing in the services of ministers and people together (⁴⁰²²Acts 1:22; 2:32, 40; 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:39; 13:31; 20:21; 22:15, 18; 26:16, 22; 28:23; ⁶⁰⁰²Revelation 1:2, 9; 6:9; 11:3-12; 12:11, 17; 19:10).

This feature is presented often in the epistles, and implies three things:

- (a) setting forth the whole truth of God, keeping nothing back;
- (b) applying that truth to the parties addressed;
- (c) pointing out the contrary evils. Following out this idea, Covenanters have, besides their Confession
- (d), a Testimony specifying the evils of the time.

5. Among other things, they bear a practical testimony against the moral evils in the Constitution of the United States. In one important particular the Constitution has already been amended — the clauses bearing on slavery. In this amendment Covenanters rejoice, and take courage to labor for further advance. In the anti-slavery conflict they stood among the foremost; they preached, they wrote, they labored in all available ways against the slave-holding interest. The articles which they still wish to see amended are such as the following:

(1.) In all the Constitution there is no recognition of God, the Sovereign of the world and Source of all authority and power. Justice Bayard and other

authors labor earnestly in offering apologies for this defect; but all these apologies are set aside by the *Declaration of Independence*, in the simple fact that the Supreme is repeatedly acknowledged in that memorable document as nature's God, as the Creator, as Divine Providence, and as the Judge of the world; as One on whose protection the nascent empire could exercise a "firm reliance" while struggling for existence. When independence was achieved and a prosperous career fairly entered, his name is lopped off in the new Constitution; and, although the document has been repeatedly amended, the place for his name is still left a blank. In fact, Benjamin Franklin could not succeed in having prayer offered in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution. We think this is the first nation known to history that has set up a government without acknowledging any deity whatever. True it is that many of their deities were not worth the honor, while we as a nation have refused to honor "the God in whose hand our life is, and whose are all our ways." That he should be acknowledged in the Constitution and obeyed in the administration is shown by the following, among other considerations:

- (a.)** He is not only the Creator of men, but he is the Author of *national blessings*. He gave the nation its existence at the first, and holds the entire control of all its destinies.
- (b.)** Civil government is one of his institutions for the good of men and for his own glory among men. Not only did he direct the people of Israel to set up judges and officers, but in the New Test. he recognises such officers as his ministers, and their power as his ordinance. He claims obedience to them as his representatives, and that honor shall be given to them for his sake, while he tells all nations that there is no authority unless it be of God (~~<6131>~~ Romans 13:1-7; ~~<6023>~~ 2 Peter 2:13-17; ~~<6081>~~ Titus 3:1). All Christians are agreed that civil government set up on moral principles is the "ordinance of God." This implies, requires even, an acknowledgment of him in the Constitution as well as elsewhere.
- (c.)** There are many very solemn services in the exercise of civil rule. Take one of many: A fellow-mortal is charged with murder, and must be dealt with, whether he be a citizen or not. This dealing is a solemn affair in the sight of God:
- (i)** whether we let him loose on society;
 - (ii)** whether we hang him up by the neck until he is dead;

(iii) whether he is sent to the penitentiary for life;

(iv) whether he is found guilty or innocent of the charge. In any and all of these cases civil rulers have the destiny of that man in their control for life, as well as an influence which may reach, for good or for ill to eternity. This responsibility cannot be evaded, and it can be properly met in the fear of God only. So of war and peace, where thousands are involved at once. So of sanitary regulations. So of license to sell strong drink, gunpowder, and poisonous drugs.

(d.) He severely threatens and awfully punishes the nations that will not honor and serve him.

(e.) He has given abundant promises to nations who will serve him.

(f.) There is the same responsibility on a nation that there is on an individual to serve the Lord (~~839~~ Job 34:29).

(g.) The United States have received such favors from God, in quality and quantity, as have never been bestowed on any other nation, not even on the chosen family of Israel. Why should we not acknowledge in the most solemn and public manner the hand of him that gives?

(2.) The *qualifications for rulers* are very defective in the Constitution of the United States. Some officers are required to be of a certain age, and born in the country. It is taken for granted that they will be men of ability. This is right so far as it goes; but if a ruler is to be regarded as the minister of God, some degree of *moral character* ought to be required, and the Constitution is the proper place to begin; then the people can select men of the highest order of Christian morality.

(3.) The law of God as supreme law is formally set aside, superseded by three provisions: (a) the will of the people as stated in the preamble; (b) the Constitution itself as the expression of that will; (c) laws of Congress and treaties with foreign powers in carrying out the Constitution, art. 6 § 2. If these provisions meant no more than the relation to particular states, it would not be objectionable; but there is no allusion to a higher law in any part of the document.

6. Covenanters claim the universal application of the divine law to all the institutions of men, and to the man in all his relations — the Church, the family, the civil, military, commercial, financial legislative, judicial, social,

and all possible connections of man with man. They take no stock in street-car or railroad companies, or any institutions which desecrate the Sabbath or otherwise trench on any of the ten commandments. They have always excluded freemasons from their fellowship.

7. They hold the Old Test. as still the word of God, and of equal authority with the New.

8. In praise they use exclusively the book of Psalms. They also disapprove of instrumental music in churches.

9. They claim that the *prayer-meeting*, in which ministers and people stand on the same level, is a divine ordinance as much as family worship and public preaching. On this item they and the Methodists were long the only witnesses. For some twenty-five years the idea has been spreading, until all respectable bodies have their prayer-meetings, to say nothing of irregular associations. While other denominations regard rather the *utility*, *propriety*, and *expediency* of these meetings, Reformed Presbyterians stand for their *divine institutions* as well, basing their position on such Scriptures as the following: ^{<3025>}Hebrews 10:25; ^{<5036>}Colossians 3:16; ^{<3036>}Malachi 3:16; ^{<3039>}John 20:19; ^{<4463>}Acts 16:13.

10. Besides their adherence to the Scottish covenants, they hold that *covenanting* is an ordinance of the New Test. as well as of the Old. This they find held forth in prophecy (^{<2998>}Isaiah 19:18-21; 44:5; 42:4; ^{<2005>}Jeremiah 1:5) and exemplified in the apostolic Church (^{<4035>}2 Corinthians 8:5).

11. They hold strictly *close communion*, on a doctrinal as well as practical basis, according to ^{<4422>}Acts 2:42; ^{<5036>}2 Thessalonians 3:6; 14:15. (R. H.)

Reformed, True, Church

SEE TRUE REFORMED CHURCH.

Reformed Wesleyans

SEE WESLEYANS.

Reformers

SEE CAMPBELLITES.

Reformers, Wesleyan

SEE UNITED FREE CHURCH; SEE METHODISTS.

Refrigerium

Refreshment is one of the elements of happiness which the Church implores for her dead: “locum refrigerii,” says the *Memento of the Dead* of the mass canon, “ut indulgeas deprecamur.” These words are found in the oldest liturgies; we find them in a prayer (*Ante Sepulturam*) of St. Gelasius’s sacramentary (see Muratori, *Lit. Rom. Ver.* i, col. 749): “Ut digneris dare ei ... locum refrigerii,” and in a collect of the same liturgical monument (*ibid.* i, col. 760): “Dona omnibus quorum hic corpora requiescunt refrigerii sedem.”

I. The word *refrigerium* is generally employed by the sacred and ecclesiastical authors for a *meal*, or any refreshment of the body by food. In the Book of Wisdom (2, 1) the wicked express thus the idea that death puts an end to all material enjoyments: “Non est refrigerium in fine hominis.” Paul, speaking of the hospitable treatment he had experienced at the hands of Onesiphorus (²Timothy 1:16), says, “Soepe me refrigeravit.” Tertullian calls the *agape* a refreshment given by the rich to the poor (*Apolog.* 39): “Inopes refrigerio isto juvamus.” According to the same author the mitigations of the rigor of the fast (*De Jejun.* 10) are a refreshment for the flesh of the Christian (“carnem refrigerare”). In several passages of the *Acts of St. Perpetua*, “refrigerare” is used of those meals which the faithful were sometimes allowed to enjoy with the martyrs in their jails. “Why,” says Perpetua to the tribune, “do you not grant us some refreshments [Quid utique non permittis refrigerare]? We are noble convicts — Caesar’s own convicts — destined to fight on his anniversary. You ought to make it a point that we should appear on that occasion in good, fleshy condition [si pinguiores illo producamur].”

Paradise being in the Scriptures, especially in the New Test. (⁴²²Matthew 22:2; 25:10, etc.; ⁶⁶⁹Revelation 19:7, etc.), often compared to a banquet, it was but natural that refreshment should be used in a figurative sense for the heavenly banquet: “LJustus... si morte preoccupatus fuerit, in refrigerio erit.” The following passage of the ⁴⁰³Acts 3:20 is also understood of the refreshment at the Lord’s table: “Cum venerint tempora refrigerii a conspectu Domini.” Tertullian (*De Idol.* 43) employs the same image in describing the felicity of Lazarus, who, driven away, while living, from the

table of the rich man, sits down, after his death, with Abraham, to the eternal banquet: "Lazarus apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium consecutus." This same *refrigerium* is the favor which the faithful wife implores for her dead husband: "Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium adpostulat" (*De Monogam.* 10). St. Perpetua saw her brother Dinocrates in that place of refreshment: "Video Dinocratem refrigerantem" (*Act.* cap. 8). The prayer mentioned above, from the sacramentary of St. Gelasius, and which is still recited in the Roman Catholic Church, seems literally to request for the faithful soul a seat at the heavenly table ("refrigerii sedem").

II. This idea is expressed on a number of Christian tombs, the *refrigerium* being spoken of as enjoyed by the saints, or as wished to those from whom it is still withheld in expiation of their sins. With the former meaning we find: "In refrigerio" (Boldetti, p. 418); "In refrigerio anima tua" (Fabretti, p. 547); "In refrigerio et in pace" (Gruter, 1057, 10); "In pace et in refrigerio" (*Act. Sanct.* v, 122). In most cases it is a wish plainly expressed. The verb may be understood, as in "Ob refrigerium" (Fabretti, p. 114, n. 283); or "Dulcissimo Antistheni conjugii suo refrigerium" (Collect. of M. Perret [lxi, 5]). But we find the same wish expressed in a verbal form: "Victoria refrigereris spiritus tuus in bono" (Wiseman, *Fabiola*, p. 2); "Augustus in bono refrigeres dulcis" (*Act. Sanct.* v, 80); "Refrigera cuam spirita sancta" (Marangoni, *Cose Gent.* p. 460). The same formula is found on a marble of the year 291 (see Boldetti, p. 87): "*Caio Vibio Alexandro et Atisie Pompeie refrigeretis*" (Perret. v, xlvi, 10). If there were any doubt as to the meaning of these formulae, it would be removed by a comparison with those inscriptions in which the name of God appears, e.g.: "Antonia anima dulcis tibi Deus refrigeret" (Boldetti, p. 418); "Deus refrigeret spiritum tuum" (Lupi, *Sev. Epit.* p. 137); "Irefrigera Deus animam hom..." (Perret, 26:n. 115); "Spirita vestra Deus refrigeret" (Boldetti, p. 417); "Cuius spiritum in refrigeriutn suscipiat Dominus" (Muratori, *Nov. Thesaur.* p. 1922, 1). The following was found by Marchi on the cemetery of St. Callixtus, in Greek characters: "Deus Christus Omnipotens spiritum tuum refrigeret." Sometimes the refreshment is asked for the deceased by the intercession of the saints. — Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chretiennes*, s.v.

Refuge

SEE ASYLUM; SEE CHURCH.

Refuge, Cities Of.

SEE CITY OF REFUGE.

Refugee

(Fr. *refugie*), a name given to persons who have fled from religious or political persecution in their own country and taken refuge in another. The term was first applied to those Protestants who found an asylum in Britain and elsewhere at two different periods, first during the Flemish persecutions under the duke of Alva in 1567, and afterwards, in 1685, when Louis XIV of France revoked the Edict of Nantes and drove so many of the *Huguenots* (q.v.) into involuntary exile. Of the numerous French artisans who settled in England on this last occasion, the most part Anglicized their names, as by substituting Young for "Le Jeune," Taylor for "Tellier," etc., so that their posterity can now hardly be recognised as of foreign origin. According to Lower (*Patronymica Britannica*), De Preux became Deprose, and "Richard Despair, a pool man," buried at East Grimstead, was, in the orthography of his forefathers, Despard. There were also refugee families of a higher class, some of whose descendants and representatives came to occupy a place in the peerage. The Bouveries, earls of Radnor, are descended from a French refugee family. The refugee family of Blaquiere was raised to the Irish peerage; and Charles Shaw Lefevre (lord Eversley) is the representative of a family of Irish refugees. The military employment offered in Ireland after 1688 maintained a considerable number of foreign Protestants. General Frederick Armand de Schomberg was raised by William III to the peerage, becoming eventually duke of Schomberg. A Huguenot officer of hardly less celebrity was Henry Massue (marquis de Ruvigny), created by William III earl of Galway. Lord Ligonier was also of a noble Huguenot family, and England has had at least one refugee bishop in Dr. Majendie, bishop of Chester, and afterwards of Bangor. Among other refugees of note may be enumerated Sir John Houblon, lord mayor of London in 1695, one branch of whose family was represented by the late lord Palmerston; Elias Bouherau, or Boireau, D.D., whose descendant was created a baronet as Sir Richard Borough of Baselden Park, Berkshire; as well as Martineaus, Bosanquets, and Papillons, whose descendants have attained more or less eminence in the country of their adoption. The first French Revolution brought numerous political refugees to England, and Great Britain is noted throughout Europe for affording a ready asylum to refugees of all classes, both

political and religious. See Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time*, translated by Hardman (Lond. 1854); Burns, *History of the French, Walloon, Dutch, and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England* (Lond. 1846); Smiles, *The Huguenots, their Settlements, Industries, etc. in England, Ireland, and America* (N. Y. 1868).

Regale

the name given to the privilege by which the king of France claimed to enjoy the revenues of a see during its vacancy. *SEE REGALIA.*

Regalia

(or REGALE), RIGHT OF, is the possession of certain privileges in ecclesiastical things. As the *regalia Petri* we distinguish the various rights and high prerogatives which, according to Romanists, belong to the pope as a kind of universal sovereign and king of kings. Under *regale*, however, is generally understood the right which sovereigns claim in virtue of their royal prerogative. The question as to the extent of these privileges has frequently been the subject of controversy between kings and popes. It involved several points as to presentation to benefices, most of which formed the object, from time to time, of negotiation by concordat; but the most serious conflict arose out of the claim made by the crown to the revenues of vacant benefices, especially bishoprics, and the co-ordinate claim to keep the benefice or the see vacant for an indefinite period, in order to appropriate its revenue. This plainly abusive claim was one of the main grounds of complaint on the part of the popes as to the practice of lay investiture (q.v.), and it reached its height in England under the first Norman kings, especially William Rufus. The most memorable conflict, however, on the subject of the regalia was that of Innocent XI (q.v.) with Louis XIV, which was maintained with great pertinacity on both sides for several years, the king extending the claim to some of the French provinces which had until then been exempt from it, and the pope refusing to confirm any of the appointments of Louis to the sees which became vacant as long as the obnoxious claim should be persisted in. The dispute continued till after the death of Innocent, Louis XIV having gone so far as to seize upon the papal territory of Avignon in reprisal; but it was adjusted in the following pontificate, the most obnoxious part of the claim being practically abandoned, although not formally withdrawn. The contest grew

out of the interpretation of French canon law which gives the right to the kings of France to enjoy the revenues of all bishoprics during their vacancy, and also to present to their prebends and all other their dignities without cure of souls. Such presentations might be made whether the dignity were vacant both *de jure* and *de facto*, as by death, or only either *de jure*, as if the incumbent were convicted of a crime or had accepted another dignity, or *de facto*, as if the regale should open after the presentation of an incumbent, but before he had taken possession. The regale lasted till a new admission to the bishopric was fully completed by taking the oath of allegiance, when a mandate was issued by the Chambre des Comptes to the commissary of the regale to restore the revenues. This right had one or two singular privileges: it occurred not only on a vacancy, but also when a bishop was made a cardinal, and lasted till he repeated the oath of allegiance; it lasted thirty years as regarded patronage, so that if the king should leave a dignity vacant and the new bishop fill it up, the king might appoint a fresh incumbent at any time within this date; it was absolutely in the king's discretion, and subject to no other constitutions whatever. The regale was at different times deprived of much of its original extent: certain bishoprics, as those of Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphine, claimed entire exemption; and though a decision of Parliament pronounced. at one time that the right extended over the whole kingdom, this was afterwards quashed, and the question remained undecided. Abbeys which were formerly subject to the regale were discharged, and an attempt to replace them under it quite failed. Finally all right to the revenues was resigned by Louis XIII and that of patronage was retained. See *Commentaire de M. Dupuy sur le Traite des Libertes de M. Pithon*, 1, 146. **SEE SUPREMACY, PAPAL.**

Regals

(perhaps from *rigabello*, an instrument used prior to the organ in the churches of Italy), a small portable finger-organ in use in the 16th and 17th centuries, and perhaps earlier. Many representations exist of this instrument, including one sculptured on Melrose Abbey. The tubes rested on the air-chest, which was filled by the bellows; and the bellows were managed with one hand, and the keys with the other.

Re'gem

(Heb. *id.* מִגְר, *friend*; Sept. Ρεγέμ v. r. Ραγέμ), the first named of six sons of Jahdai (q.v.), apparently of the family of Caleb (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 2:47). B.C. post 1658.

Re'gem-me'lech

(Heb. *Re'gem Me'lek*, Ἐὶ μ,μγρ *friend of the king*; Sept. Ἀρβεσεὲρ [v. r. Ἀρβεσεσέρ] ὁ βασιλεύς; Vilg. *Rogommelech*), the name of a person who, in connection with Sherezer, was sent on behalf of some of the captivity to make inquiries at the Temple concerning fasting (^{<300>}Zechariah 7:2). B.C. cir. 517. In the A.V. the subject of the verse appears to be the captive Jews in Babylon and Bethel, or “the house of *God*” is regarded as the accusative after the verb of motion. The Sept. takes “the king” as the nominative to the verb “sent,” considering the last part of the name Regem-melech as an appellative, and not as a proper name. What reading the Sept. had it is difficult to conjecture. In the Vulgate, Sherezer, Regem-melech, and their men are the persons who sent to the house of God. The Peshito-Syriac has a curious version of the passage: “And he sent to Bethel, to Sherezer and Rab-mag; and the king sent and his men to pray for him before the Lord;” Sharezer and Rab-mag being associated in ^{<391>}Jeremiah 39:3, 13. The Hexaplar-Syriac, following the Peshito, has “Rab-mag.” On referring to Zech. 7:5, the expression “the people of the land” seems to indicate that those who sent to the Temple were not the captive Jews in Babylon, but those who had returned to their own country; and this being the case, it is probable that in ver. 2 “Bethel” is to be taken as the subject: “and Bethel,” i.e. the inhabitants of Bethel, “sent.” From its connection with Sherezer, the name Regem-melech (lit. “king’s friend,” comp. ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:33) was probably an Assyrian title of office. *SEE RAB-MAG.*

Regeneratio

a term applied to *baptism* because when any one becomes a Christian he enters upon a real and new spiritual life. *SEE BAPTISM.*

Regeneration

(παλιγγενεσία, ^{<415>}Titus 3:5, *a being born again*), that work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart. It is expressed in

Scripture by being born anew (^{<BIB>}John 3:7, “from above”); being quickened (Ephesians ii, 1); by Christ being found in the heart (Galations 4:19); a new creation (^{<BIB>}2 Corinthians 5:17); a renewing of the mind (^{<BIB>}Romans 12:2); the washing, i.e. the *purifying* of regeneration (^{<BIB>}Titus 3:5); a resurrection from the dead (^{<BIB>}Ephesians 2:6); a putting off the old man, and a putting on the new man (^{<BIB>}Ephesians 4:22-24). And the subjects of this change are represented as begotten of God (^{<BIB>}John 1:13; ^{<BIB>}1 Peter 1:3); begotten of the Spirit (^{<BIB>}John 3:8); begotten of water, even of the Spirit (ver. 5); new creatures (Galations 6:15); and partakers of the divine nature (^{<BIB>}2 Peter 1:4). The efficient cause of regeneration is the divine spirit. Man is not the author of the regeneration (^{<BIB>}John 1:12,13; 3:4; ^{<BIB>}Ephesians 2:8,10); the instrumental cause is the word of God (^{<BIB>}James 1:18; ^{<BIB>}1 Peter 1:23; ^{<BIB>}1 Corinthians 4:15). The change in regeneration consists in the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is, so as to love him supremely and serve him ultimately as our highest end. Regeneration consists in the implantation of the principle of love to God, which obtains the ascendancy and habitually prevails over its opposite. Although the inspired writers use various terms and modes of speech to describe this change of mind, styling it conversion, regeneration, a new creation, etc., yet it is all effected by the word of truth or the Gospel of salvation gaining an entrance into the mind through divine teaching, so as to possess the understanding, subdue the will, and reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature or regenerate man (Galations 5:6; ^{<BIB>}1 John 5:1-5). Regeneration, then, is the recovery of the moral image of God, and consequently of spiritual life, to a soul previously dead in trespasses and sins. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, opening the eyes of the mind, and enabling the sincere penitent to believe the Gospel and receive Christ as his only Saviour. This gracious work is in accordance both with the character of the Holy Spirit and with the constitution of man; hence, by it no violence is done to any physical, intellectual, or moral law or mode of action in human nature. The change is produced in the will, or heart, that is, in the *moral*, and not the natural, faculties of the soul. As depravity is wholly in the will and heart, the source and seat of all moral action, the divine operation consists in renewing the heart, and communicating a change of views, with a relish for the things of the Spirit. As justification places us in a new *relation* to God, so regeneration produces *in* us a new *state* of mind. In the case of children dying in infancy, they, of course, need regeneration to fit them for the eternal world. And there can be no difficulty in conceiving that they are

regenerated by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of Christ's death, in the same sense in which they are depraved, in consequence of Adam's transgression; the disposition to sin is removed, the disposition to holiness is implanted, and thus their salvation is secured. The evidences of regeneration are conviction of sin, holy sorrow, deep humility, knowledge, faith, repentance, love, and devotedness to God's glory. The properties of it are these:

1. It is a receptive work, and herein it differs from conversion. In regeneration we receive from God; in conversion we are active and turn to him.
2. It is a powerful work of God's grace (~~408B~~Ephesians 3:8).
3. It is an instantaneous act, for there can be no medium between life and death; and here it differs from sanctification, which is progressive.
4. It is a complete act, and perfect in its kind; a change of the whole man (~~408B~~2 Corinthians 5:17).
5. It is a great and important act, both as to its author and effects (~~408B~~Ephesians 2:4, 5).
6. It is an internal act, not consisting in bare, outward forms (~~408B~~Ezekiel 36:26, 27).
7. Visible as to its effects (~~408B~~1 John 3:14).
8. Delightful (~~408B~~1 Peter 1:8).
9. Necessary (~~408B~~John 3:3). *SEE CONVERSION; SEE NEW BIRTH.*

Our Lord in one instance (~~408B~~Matthew 19:28) uses the term *regeneration* for the resurrection state. Accordingly, Dr. Campbell translates it "the renovation," and remarks that the relation is here to the general state of things in the future world, where all things will become new. *SEE NEW CREATION; SEE RESTITUTION.*

Regeneration By Water.

In our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus (John 3) occurs this remarkable statement: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This coupling of water-baptism with spiritual regeneration as an essential condition to Christian privilege has

occasioned considerable difficulty to expositors, controversialists, and pious inquirers. A view of the entire context is important as a preliminary to the just interpretation of this passage.

Nicodemus sought a private interview with Jesus, evidently for the sincere purpose of information as to the Great Teacher's doctrine. Waiving all complimentary prefaces, Jesus at once propounds the one essential condition of discipleship — namely, the new birth. Nicodemus finds two difficulties in this — first, in his *age*, and, secondly; in the *physical* paradox itself. The latter perplexity evidently arose from his understanding the requirement in a literal sense. It is not so clear whether the former difficulty is but the same expressed in another form or an entirely different one — namely, the hardship of demanding a religious change in a person of such a confirmed standing as himself. In favor of the latter view are adduced the traditional allusions to the baptism of proselytes to Judaism (which, however, do not very certainly establish that custom, or, at least, its special significance), and especially the baptism by John (which excited no surprise, showing that its significance was readily understood); but there is little or no evidence that these or any similar Judaic illustrations were currently designated by the peculiar terms here employed, *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*, *born from above*, or *born again*. **SEE PROSELYTE**. But, however this may have been, it is plain that Nicodemus was chiefly stumbled by the apparent necessity of understanding the words of Jesus in a strictly literal or physical sense. Hence our Lord explains that not a *fleshly*, but a *spiritual*, birth is meant, and he repeats this distinction in varied form (the “water” and “Spirit” of ver. 5 respectively corresponding to and being further interpreted by “flesh” and “Spirit” in ver. 6). This serves to show that the expression “born of water” (*γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος*) has reference, not to a spiritual purification, but to a physical ablution; that is, to personal baptism, such as Nicodemus was already familiar with, and such as was to be instituted by Christ himself. (We discard as precarious and offensive an interpretation which we have heard propounded of this expression as referring to the *semen virile*, based upon the alleged use of *μυαῖ* in that sense in ^{2380E} Isaiah 48:1; for that signification is not well established anywhere, even in Hebrew, much less in the Aramaic, which it is assumed that Christ here spoke, and certainly not in the Greek by which the conversation is represented.) The only real difficulty to us in the passage arises from the conjunction of baptism and regeneration as being *both* requisite in the case; thus giving apparent

countenance to the dogma of baptismal regeneration, or, at least, to the doctrine that baptism is essential to a Christian's acceptance with God. This difficulty is relieved by the following considerations drawn from the passage itself and from others parallel with it:

1. The principal stress is laid by Christ upon the second part of the requirement — namely, the spiritual birth. This is evident from the omission of all reference to baptism in vers. 6 and 8.
2. The language of ver. 5 can, at most, only mean that baptism and regeneration are both essential, but not necessarily in the same sense or to the same degree; certainly not that they are identical, nor that one implies the other. The phraseology positively forbids such a confusion of the two.
3. The association herb of baptism with a spiritual change is no more emphatic than in several other passages similarly laying down the conditions of Christianity — e.g. “Teach all nations, baptizing them” (⁴¹³⁹Matthew 28:19); “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (⁴¹⁶⁶Mark 16:16; but note the omission in the clause following, “He that believeth not shall be damned”); “Repent and be baptized every one of you” (⁴¹²⁸Acts 2:38); “Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins” (22:16).
4. Our Lord himself dispensed with baptism in the admission of at least one member into his kingdom, namely, the dying thief (⁴²³²Luke 23:42, 43).
5. Christ certainly does mean to attach importance to water-baptism as an initiative rite into his Church or kingdom. The body of believers exists under two aspects, the visible and the invisible — the outward or nominal, and the inward or real. Baptism is as imperative a mark of admission to the former as spiritual new birth is to entrance into the latter. In order to full recognition as a member of both, the two acts are truly essential. This doctrine, which orthodox ecclesiastics have always maintained, is thus strictly in accordance with the tenor of the text in question.

On the dogma of *baptismal regeneration*, see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April; 1876; *Prot. Episc. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1860; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1854.

Regensburg

SEE RATISBON.

Reggio, Isaac Samuel

a Jewish writer, was born Aug. 15, 1784, at Gorz, in Illyria. As the son of a rabbi, he received a thorough Jewish education, and with his brilliant powers he soon became master of Jewish literature, and acquired an extraordinary knowledge of Hebrew. His talents and fame secured for him the appointment to the professorship of mathematics at the Lyceum when Illyria became a French province. He succeeded his father in the rabbinate of his native place, and died Aug. 29, 1855. Of his many writings, we mention, **פּוּמְצַח ׀ מַחְרַט רַמַּמ**, a treatise on the inspiration of the Mosaic law, incorporated in the introduction to the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1818): — **-טְרַט ס פּוּחַל א**, *colla Traduzione Italiana ed un Comento Ebreo*, an Italian translation of the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary and a most elaborate introduction, in which he gives an account of 148 Hebrew expositions of the Pentateuch of various ages (ibid. 1821, 5 vols. 8vo): — *On the Necessity of having a Theological Seminary in Italy*, written in Italian (Venice, 1822); in consequence of which the *Collegium Rabbinicum* was opened at Padua in 1829, for which he had drawn up the constitution: — **הַיַּפְּסוּל יִפְהוּ חַרְוֹת**, *Religion and Philosophy* (Vienna, 1827): — a disquisition, *Whether Philosophy is in Opposition to Tradition*, **חַרְוֹת פּוּא הַל בְּקִהְל א דְּגִנְת** (Leipsic, 1840): — *Il Libro d' Isaia, Versione Poetica fatta sull' Originale Testo Ebraico* (Vienna, 1831): — a historico-critical introduction to the book of Esther, entitled **רְטַסַּא תַּל גַּמְל אַ י תְּפִמ** (ibid. 1841). Besides these, Reggio wrote numerous treatises on various points connected with the Hebrew Scriptures and literature in the different Jewish periodicals. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:139-142; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bibl.* col. 2135-2137; Geiger, *Leo da Modena* (Breslau. 1856), p. 57-63; id. *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berlin, 1875), ii, 272; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, 3:346; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 534; Zlinz, *Die Monatstage des Kalende jahres* (Berlin, 1872; English transl. by the Rev. B. Pick in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y. 1874-75). (B. P.)

Regina Coeli

(Lat. for *Queen of heaven*), an appellation often given by the ancient Romans to *Juno*.

Region-round-about

THE (ἡ **περίχωρος**). This term had perhaps originally a more precise and independent meaning than it appears to a reader of the A.V. to possess. It is used by the Sept. as the equivalent of the singular Hebrew word *hak-kikkanr* (רַקְקָנָה literally “the round”), a word the topographical application of which is not clear, but which seems in its earliest occurrences to denote the *circle* or oasis of cultivation in which stood Sodom and Gomorrah and the rest of the five “cities of the *Ciccar*” (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10-12; 19:17, 25, 28, 29; ^{<0343>}Deuteronomy 34:3). Elsewhere it has a wider meaning, though still attached to the Jordan (^{<1082>}2 Samuel 18:23; ^{<1076>}1 Kings 7:46; ^{<1047>}2 Chronicles 4:17; ^{<1682>}Nehemiah 3:22; 12:28). It is in this less restricted sense that **περίχωρος** occurs in the New Test. In ^{<0185>}Matthew 3:5 and ^{<0188>}Luke 3:3 it denotes the populous and flourishing region which contained the towns of Jericho and its dependencies in the Jordan valley, enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Quarnanta, a densely populated region, and important enough to be reckoned as a distinct section of Palestine — “Jerusalem, Judaea, and all the *arrondissement* of Jordan” (^{<0185>}Matthew 3:5; also ^{<0177>}Luke 7:17). It is also applied to the district of Gennesaret, a region which presents certain similarities to that of Jericho, being enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Hattin and bounded in front by the water of the lake, as the other was by the Jordan, and also resembling it in being very thickly populated (^{<0145>}Matthew 14:35; ^{<0165>}Mark 6:55; ^{<0167>}Luke 6:37; 7:17). It is perhaps nearly equivalent to the modern Arabic appellation of the *Ghor*. **SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.**

Regionarii

one of the three classes of subdeacons at Rome, appointed in the 11th century, and employed in various occupations in the several *regiones* or districts of that city. The other classes were called PALATINI **SEE PALATINI** (q.v.) and STATIONARII **SEE STATIONARII** (q.v.).

Regis, Jean Baptiste De

a French Jesuit and geographer, was born at Istres, in Provence, about 1665, and was sent as a missionary to China about 1700. His scientific attainments gained him a place at court and the favor of the emperor Hanghe, who, in 1707, placed him at the head of a commission of Jesuits to

make a survey and draw up a map of the Chinese empire. His labors were interrupted in 1724 when the emperor Yung-ching proscribed the Christian religion. He wrote a full history of his labors, a condensation of which may be found in Du Halde's *Description de la Chine*. He translated into Latin the *Yih-king*, edited by Julius Mohl (Stuttgart and Tubingen, 1834, 2 vols.). The MS. is in the National Library, Paris.

Registers

SEE DIPTYCHS.

Registers Of Ordination

were first ordered to be preserved in 1237 in the bishop's house or in the cathedral.

Registers Parish,

were required to be kept as a record of baptisms, marriages, and burials in 1538 by Cromwell, by the royal injunctions of 1547, and the 70th Canon of 1603.

Regium Donum

a sum of money annually allowed by government to dissenting ministers. It originated in a donation, made in the way of royal bounty, by George II, in the year 1723, consisting of £500, to be paid out of the treasury, for assisting first of all the widows, and afterwards either ministers or their widows, who wanted help. The first motion for it was made by Mr. Daniel Burgess, who had for some time been secretary to the princess of Wales, and was approved by lord Townshend, secretary of state, and Sir Robert Walpole, chancellor of the exchequer, who entered readily into the measure because the Dissenters proved themselves very friendly to the house of Brunswick, and he wished to reward them for their loyalty. When the money was paid, a strict charge was given that the matter should be kept very secret. Some few years after, the sum was raised to £850 half-yearly; and at present, though no longer a *regium donum*, it is still annually granted by Parliament, amounting to about £5000, but including the relief granted to "Poor French refugee clergy, poor French Protestant laity, and sundry small charitable and other allowances to the poor of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and others."

Regium Donum, Irish,

a pecuniary grant, voted annually by the British Parliament, out of the national exchequer, to aid certain bodies of Presbyterians in Ireland by providing stipends for their ministers. This grant, which now amounts to about £40,000 a year, is divided among six different bodies of Presbyterians, viz.:

1. The General Assembly, comprising the two bodies formerly known as the Synod of Ulster and the Synod of Seceders.
2. The Secession Synod.
3. The Remonstrants, or Unitarian Synod of Ulster.
4. The Presbytery of Antrim.
5. The Synod of Munster, Unitarian.
6. The Presbytery of Munster, orthodox.

During the reign of James I Presbyterianism was introduced into Ireland, and under the mild sway of Usher their clergymen became incumbents of parishes, and were permitted to enjoy tithes and other emoluments. But after the accession of Charles II they were wholly dependent upon their flocks. In 1672 the king gave Sir Arthur Forbes £600 to be divided among them. William III issued an order, June 19, 1690, authorizing the payment of £1200 to Patrick Adair and six other clergymen. In the following year this bounty was removed from the customs, and made payable out of the Irish exchequer. Such was the origin of the Regium Donum in its present permanent character. There was this important change made, however: the power of allocating the amount was taken from the trustees and transferred to the lord lieutenant. In 1831 the grant was placed on the Irish miscellaneous estimates, and in 1838 the classification principle was abandoned, and £75 Irish currency was promised to every minister connected with the Synod of Ulster and the Secession Synod, with the proviso (1840) that he was to receive at least £35 of yearly stipend. The amount required was increasing at the rate of £400 a year, to meet the demands of new congregations. The Regium Donum was withdrawn by the act of 1869, which came into force Jan. 1, 1871, disendowing the Irish Episcopal Church.

Regius

the Latinized name of *Urban-Konig*, a learned theologian, preacher, and writer, and also an influential promoter of the Reformation. He was born in

1490 of parents in moderate circumstances, and resident at Langenargen, near Lake Constance. At the age of seventeen he was admitted to the University of Fribourg as a student of theology, and by his application and progress won the favor of his professors; but an injudicious defence of the disputations of John Eck, later the noted opponent of Luther, led to his suspension from the university and to his subsequent removal to Basle. After a brief sojourn in Basle, he was called to the chair of poetry and oratory in the University of Ingolstadt, where Eck was likewise employed as professor of theology, and where a circle of humanists were then striving to bring the classics into honor. Regius distinguished himself to such a degree as to receive from the hands of the emperor Maximilian a laurel crown in recognition of his services, and saw his classes grow continually. But his success was interrupted by the neglect of patrons to settle bills which he had been compelled to assume for their sons who were his pupils, so that, in utter discouragement, he became a soldier in the imperial army—a situation from which he was fortunately delivered by the interference of Eck, who secured his discharge from the army and also the payment of his debts, as well as an increased salary for the future.

Regius, however, began to dislike the studies in which he was engaged, and to manifest a growing predilection for theology. He was especially impressed with the influence of the Wittenberg reformatory movements, and found greater pleasure in the evangelical doctrines taught by Luther and Melancthon than in scholasticism. The consequence was a growing coolness between Eck and himself, which led him to seek a release from the university. The influence of John Faber, vicar-general of the see of Constance, and a book written by himself, entitled *De Dignitate Sacerdotum*, recommended him to bishop Hugo of Constance, and secured from that prelate the appointment of episcopal vicar *in spiritualibus*. A year later he was made doctor of theology (1520), and appointed preacher at the Augsburg cathedral. His evangelical attitude excited the opposition of the papal party against him, and compelled his removal; but he soon returned, and labored with great energy for the extension of the evangelical doctrines, from 1522 to 1530, by presenting them to the people in sermons from the pulpit of St. Ann's Church, and by disputations and controversial writings. Luther came to regard him as the principal supporter of evangelicalism in Suabia, while Eck charged him with black ingratitude, and persecuted him with passionate hatred and malicious cunning. It was perhaps owing to the bitterness of such experiences that he concluded to

imitate the example of other Reformers and establish for himself the refuge of a home. He married Anna Weissbruick, a native of Augsburg, who sustained him faithfully while he lived, and by whom he became the father of thirteen children.

The fame of Regius had in the meantime become so extended that his counsel and aid were frequently sought even by distant cities and countries. Duke Ernest of Lilneberg, surnamed the Confessor, urged him to assist in introducing the Reformation into that territory, and Regius pledged his services to that end, removing to Celle, and assuming the functions of court preacher. He was soon appointed general superintendent over the whole duchy, and in that position was enabled, by judicious counsels and restless activity, to rapidly advance the interests of the Reformation. Two years were spent in superseding the Romish clergy and their services with an evangelical ministry and worship, in improving the schools and gymnasia of the country, and also in establishing the infant Church on a legal foundation, and in securing the transfer of the confiscated goods of monasteries to the use of the Church and of schools. A call to return to Augsburg at this time (1532) was declined, and his life was thenceforward spent in the service of the prince and people of the duchy of Lineberg, though he took an active part in the introduction and development of Protestantism in other places: e.g. the county of Hoya, the cities of Hildesheim, Hanover, Brunswick, Minden, and Hdrter, the territory of Schaumburg, etc. He also responded to the request of count Enno for evangelical preachers by sending Martin Ondermark and Matthias Guinderich to East Eriesland. He ranks, accordingly, as one of the leading Reformers in North Germany. In 1537 he accompanied duke Ernest to the convention at Smalcald, and signed the *Smalcald Articles*; in 1538 he was present at the Convention of Brunswick, and in 1540 at Hagenau, where an abortive attempt at reconciliation between the papal and the evangelical parties was made, and where the king, Ferdinand, issued a decree for a religious conference at Worms. Physical inability prevented Regius from participating in the proceedings of the latter diet. A severe cold incurred on his return from Hagenau resulted in a dangerous sickness, and on May 23, 1541, he ended his useful life. The veneration of his contemporaries proved his worth.

In appearance, Regius was a man of medium height and spare and delicate figure, easy and yet resolute in his bearing, and characterized by an air of intelligence and moral earnestness. His writings breathe the same Christian

spirit which belonged to his personality. They number ninety-seven different works, which were published at Nuremberg in 1562, the German in four parts, and the Latin in three. His exegetical works deserve attention on account of their practical aim, and the thoroughness and skill with which the sense of Scripture is developed in them; and, in addition, the following are worthy of note: *Formulae quaedam caute et citra Scandalum Loquendi de Præcipuis Christianoe Doctrinæ Locis* (1535), which has almost reached the position of a symbolical book: — *Catechismus Minor* (1536), and *Catechismus Major* (1537), which are peculiar in that the questions are placed in the mouth of the pupil, and the answers are assigned to the teacher: — *Erklärung der zwölf Artikel des christlichen Glaubens* (1523); and others, among them several books on Church discipline, which have been often reprinted.

Literature. — The writings of Urban Regius himself contain sources respecting his life, as does also the *Vita Urbani Regii*, etc., written by his son Ernest. Comp. also Bertram, Ref. — *u. Kirchenhist. d. Stadt Liineberg* (1719); Meier, Ref. — *Gesch. d. Stadt Hannover* (1730); Lauenstein, *Hildesheim Reformation's historia* (1720); Geffken, *Dr. Urb. Regius, seine Wahl zum ersten Hamb. Superintendenten*, etc.; Schlegel, *Kirchen- u. Ref. — Gesch. v. Norddeutschl.* (Hanover, 1828), vol. ii; Havemann, *Gesch. d. Lande Braunschweig und Luneburg* (Götting, 1855), vol. ii; Heimbürger, *Urbanus Regius*, etc. (Hamb. and Gotha, 1851); Hagen, *Deutschlands lit. u. rel. Verhältnisse in Re: — Zeitalter* (Erlangen, 1841-44); Uhlhorn, *Urban Regius im Abendmahlsstreite*, in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie* (1860), vol. 5, No. 1. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.

Regius Codex

SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPT.

Regnum

a name for the tiara or diadem of the popes, encircled with three crowns. It is (says Innocent III. cir. 1200) the imperial crown, representing the pope's power as plenary and absolute over all the faithful. According to some authors, Hormisdas first wore a crown which had been sent to him as a mark of fealty by the emperor Anastasius, to whom Clovis had presented it in 550, while some refer it to a gift of Constantine to pope Sylvester. At the entrance of a church the pope, when borne on his litter, laid aside the regnum and put on a precious mitre, but resumed the former when he left

the building. Paul II made a new regnum, and enriched it with precious stones, when its use had long lain dormant. At first it was a tall round or conical cap, ending in a round ball, and wreathed with a single gold crown, representing regal and temporal power. It is mentioned in the 11th century. In the 9th century, on mosaics, Nicholas I is represented wearing two circles, the lower labelled "The crown of the kingdom, from God's hand," and the upper inscribed "The crown of empire, from St. Peter's hand." Boniface VIII (1294-1303) added a second or spiritual crown, while Benedict XII (1334), others say John XII or Urban V, contributed the third coronet of sacerdotal sovereignty, and about that time the ornament assumed an oval form, and was no longer straight-sided. The patriarch of Constantinople wears two crowns on the tiara. On putting on the tiara, the cardinal-deacon says to the pope, "Receive the tiara, adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art father of kings and princes, the ruler of the world." The crowns represent the three realms of heaven, earth, and purgatory, according to Baur; but as Jewel explains it, the three divisions of the earth — Europe, Asia, and Africa. Pope Adrian VI's effigy at Viterbo has no crowns on the tiara. *SEE TIARA.*

Regula Fidei

SEE FAITH, RULE OF.

Regular Canons

(Lat. *Canonici Regulares*, canons bound by rule), the name given, after the reform introduced into the system of cathedral clergy in the 11th century, to the members of those canonical bodies which adopted that reform. They were thus distinguished from the so-called "secular canons," who continued exempt from rule, and who are represented down to modern times by the canons, prebendaries, and other members of cathedral chapters, in those churches in which the full cathedral system of the Romii' Catholic Church is maintained. The rules of the regular canons being variously modified in different countries and ages, a variety of religious orders arose therefrom — Augustinians, Premonstratensians, etc. *SEE CANONS, REGULAR.*

Regular Clerks

are modern religious orders founded for preaching, medicine, or education. The principal are the Theatines (q.v.), founded by Paul IV, and the Oratorians (q.v.), instituted in 1550 by Philip Neri, of Florence.

Regulars Or Regulares

During the 4th and 5th centuries it was not customary to place monks, as such, on an equal footing with the clergy, nor were they regarded as part of the clerical body until the 10th century. Before this they were distinguished by the name of *religiosi* or *regulares*, and afterwards a distinction was carefully made between *clerici sceculares*, i.e. parish priests, and those who were charged with the care of souls, and *clerici regulares*, i.e. those belonging to monastic orders. This name was applied to the latter because they were bound to live according to certain rules (*regulae*). — *Riddle, Christian Antiq.*

Rehabi'ah

(Heb. *Rechabyah'*, **hyb] r]** enlarged by *Jehovah*; also, in the prolonged form, *Rechabya'hu*, **Whyb] r]** ^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 24:21; 26:25; Sept.

Ῥαβιά or **Ῥαβίας**, v. r. **Ῥαβιά** or **Ῥαβίας**), the only son of Eliezer, son of Moses; himself the father of many sons (^{<1337>}1 Chronicles 23:17), of whom the eldest was Isshiah (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 24:21) or Jeshaiiah (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 26:25). B.C. post 1618.

Rehearse

in the Prayer-book, is understood to imply distinctness of utterance, in opposition to a low and hesitating manner, as in the catechism — “Rehearse the articles of the belief.” Sometimes the word simply denotes saying or reading, or a recapitulation; as where Latimer remarks in a sermon, “I will therefore make an end, without any *rehearsal* or recital of that which is already said.”

Rehfuss, Carl

Dr., a Jewish rabbi, was born Feb. 9, 1792, at Altdorf, in Breisgau. When fifteen years of age he went to Yverdon, in Switzerland, to attend the lectures at the Pestalozzi Institution there. He then entered the lyceum at Rastatt, and after due preparation was enabled to attend the lectures at the

Heidelberg University, where he was promoted, Aug. 25, 1834, as doctor of philosophy. Having completed his studies, he was appointed preacher of the Jewish congregation at Heidelberg, where he died, Feb. 18, 1842. He translated into German the **מַיְיַן יָס**, a Jewish ritual used for the sick, etc. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1834). Besides, he published a number of school-books. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:142 sq.; Kayserling, *Bibliothek judischer Kanzelredner*, i, 358 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 115; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalendejahres* (Berlin, 1872; Engl. transl. by Rev. B. Pick in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y. 1874-75); *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1842, p. 248. (B. P.)

Re'hob

(Heb. *Rechob'*, **בַּי סַ** [twice **בַּוְּפָרַי**] ^{<10018>}2 Samuel 10:8; ^{<16011>}Nehemiah 10:11], a *street*, from its width; Sept. **Ῥαάβ** v. r. **Ῥοάβ**, etc.), the name of two men and also of three places in the north of Palestine.

- 1.** The father of the Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom David smote at the Euphrates (^{<10018>}2 Samuel 8:3,12). B.C. ante 1043. Josephus (*Ant.* 7:5, 1) calls him *Araïis* (**Ἀράϊος**), and the old Latin version *Arachus*. The name possibly had some connection with the district of Syria called Rehob, or Beth-rehob (^{<10018>}2 Samuel 10:6, 8).
- 2.** A Levite who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<16011>}Nehemiah 10:11). B.C. 410.
- 3.** The northern limit of the exploration of the spies who explored Canaan (^{<04132>}Numbers 13:21). It is specified as being "as men come unto Hamath," or, as the phrase is elsewhere rendered, "at the entrance of Hamath," i.e. at the commencement of the territory of that name, by which in the early books of the Bible the great valley of Lebanon, the Bika'ah of the prophets, and the Bfuka'a of the modern Arabs, seems to be roughly designated. This, and the consideration of the improbability that the spies went farther than the upper end of the Jordan valley, seems to fix the position of Rehob as not far from Tell el-Kady and Banias. This is confirmed by the statement of ^{<07838>}Judges 18:28, that Laish or Dan (Tell el-Kady) was "in the valley that is by Beth-rehob." Dr. Robinson (*Later Bib. Res.* p. 371) proposes to identify it with *Hunin*, an ancient fortress in the mountains north-west of the plain of Huleh, the upper district of the Jordan valley. But since the names Ruheib, of a valley, and *Deir-Rabba*, of an Arab ruin, are found near Bhnias, Thomson (*Land and Book*, 1, 391)

prefers that vicinity. There is no reason to doubt that this Rehob or Beth-rehob was identical with the place mentioned under both names in ^{<1006>}2 Samuel 10:6, 8, in connection with Maacah, which was also in the upper district of the Huleh. *SEE BETH-REHOB.*

4. One of the towns allotted to Asher (^{<0628>}Joshua 19:28), and which from the list appears to have been in close proximity to Zidon. It is named between Ebron, or Abdon, and Hammon. Schwarz, from some Jewish writer, gives it a position seven and a half miles east of Tyre, on the river Leontes; referring, perhaps, to the modern village *Rezieh* or *Harziyeh*.

5. Asher contained another Rehob (^{<0630>}Joshua 19:30).

One of the two was allotted to the Gershonite Levites (21:31; ^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 6:75), and of one its Canaanitish inhabitants retained possession (^{<0033>}Judges 1:31). The mention of Aphik in this latter passage may imply that the Rehob referred to was that of ^{<0630>}Joshua 19:30. This, Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomasticon*, s.v. "Roob") confound with the Rehob of the spies, and place four Roman miles from Scythopolis. The place they refer to still survives as *Rehab*, three and a half miles south of Beisan, but their identification of a town in that position with one in the territory of Asher is obviously inaccurate. The Rehob in question is possibly represented by the modern *Tell Kurdany*, south of the river Belus, near the northern base of which is a village with a perennial spring (Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 104).

Rehobo'am

Picture for Rehoboam (1)

(Heb. *Rechabdmn*, מ[ב]ר] *enlarger of the people* [see ^{<0324>}Exodus 34:24, and comp. the name Εὐρύδημος]; Sept. ῥοβοάμ; Josephus, ῥοβόαμος, *Ant.* 8:8,1), the only son of Solomon, by the Ammonitish princess Naamah (^{<1142>}1 Kings 14:21, 31), and his successor (^{<1114>}1 Kings 11:43). — Rehoboam's mother is distinguished by the title "the (not 'an,' as in the A.V.) Ammonite." She was therefore one of the foreign women whom Solomon took into his establishment (11:1). In the Sept. (^{<1124>}1 Kings 12:24, answering to ^{<1143>}1 Kings 14:31 of the Hebrew text) she is stated to have been the "daughter of Ana (i.e. Hanun) the son of Nahash." If this is a translation of a statement which once formed part of the Hebrew text, and may be taken as authentic history, it follows that the Ammonitish war into

which Hanun's insults had provoked David was terminated by a realliance. Rehoboam was born B.C. 1014, when Solomon was but twenty years old, and as yet unanointed to the throne. His reign was noted for the great political schism which he occasioned, and which continued to the end of both lines of monarchy. From the earliest period of Jewish history we perceive symptoms that the confederation of the tribes was but imperfectly cemented. The powerful Ephraim could never brook a position of inferiority. Throughout the book of Judges (~~<OR>~~Judges 8:1; 12:1) the Ephraimites show a spirit of resentful jealousy when any enterprise is undertaken without their concurrence and active participation. From them had sprung Joshua, and afterwards (by his place of birth) Samuel might be considered theirs; and though the tribe of Benjamin gave to Israel its first king, yet it was allied by hereditary ties to the house of Joseph, and by geographical position to the territory of Ephraim, so that up to David's accession the leadership was practically in the hands of the latter tribe. **SEE EPHRAIM, TRIBE OF**. But Judah always threatened to be a formidable rival. During the earlier history, partly from the physical structure and situation of its territory (Stanley, *Syr. and Palest.* p. 162), which secluded it from Palestine just as Palestine by its geographical character was secluded from the world, it had stood very much aloof from the nation **SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF**, and even after Saul's death, apparently without waiting to consult their brethren, "the men of Judah came and anointed David king over the house of Judah" (~~<OR>~~2 Samuel 2:4), while the other tribes adhered to Saul's family, thereby anticipating the final disruption which was afterwards to rend the nation permanently into two kingdoms. But after seven years of disaster a reconciliation was forced upon the contending parties; David was acknowledged as king of Israel, and soon after, by fixing his court at Jerusalem and bringing the tabernacle there, he transferred from Ephraim the greatness which had attached to Shechem as the ancient capital and to Shiloh as the seat of the national worship. In spite of this he seems to have enjoyed great personal popularity among the Ephraimites, and to have treated many of them with special favor (~~<OR>~~1 Chronicles 12:30; 27:10, 14), yet this roused the jealousy of Judah, and probably led to the revolt of Absalom (q.v.). Even after that perilous crisis was passed, the old rivalry broke out afresh and almost led to another insurrection (~~<OR>~~2 Samuel 20:1, etc. [comp. ~~<OR>~~Psalm 78:60, 67, etc., in illustration of these remarks]). Solomon's reign, from its severe taxes and other oppressions, aggravated the discontent, and latterly, from its irreligious character, alienated the prophets and provoked the displeasure

of God. When Solomon's strong hand was withdrawn, the crisis came (B.C. 973). Rehoboam selected Shechem as the place of his coronation, probably as an act of concession to the Ephraimites, and perhaps in deference to the suggestions of those old and wise counsellors of his father whose advice he afterwards unhappily rejected. From the present Hebrew text of ^{<1111>}1 Kings 12 the exact details of the transactions at Shechem are involved in a little uncertainty. The general facts, indeed, are clear. The people demanded a remission of the severe burdens imposed by Solomon, and Rehoboam promised them an answer in three days, during which time he consulted first his father's counsellors, and then the young men "that were grown up with him and which stood before him," whose answer shows how greatly during Solomon's later years the character of the Jewish court had degenerated. Rejecting the advice of the elders to conciliate the people at the beginning of his reign, and so make them "his servants forever," he returned as his reply, in the true spirit of an Eastern despot, the frantic bravado of his contemporaries, "My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins. . . I will add to your yoke; my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (i.e. scourges furnished with sharp points; so in Latin, *scorpio*, according to *Isidore Orig.* v, 27], is "virga nodosa et aculeata, quia arcuato vulnere in corpus infligitur?" [Facciolati, s.v.]). Thereupon arose the formidable song of insurrection, heard once before when the tribes quarrelled after David's return from the war with Absalom:

***"What portion have we in David?
What inheritance in Jesse's son?
To your tents, O Israel?
Now see to thy own house, O David!"***

Rehoboam sent Adoram or Adoniram, who had been chief receiver of the tribute during the reigns of his father and his grandfather (^{<1046>}1 Kings 4:6; ^{<1114>}2 Samuel 20:24), to reduce the rebels to reason, but he was stoned to death by them, whereupon the king and his attendants fled in hot haste to Jerusalem. So far all is plain, but there is a doubt as to the part which Jeroboam took in these transactions. According to ^{<1113>}1 Kings 12:3 he was summoned by the Ephraimites from Egypt (to which country he had fled from the anger of Solomon) to be their spokesman at Rehoboam's coronation, and actually made the speech in which a remission of burdens was requested. There is no real contradiction to this when we read in ver. 20 of the same chapter that after the success of the insurrection and

Rehoboam's flight, "when all Israel *heard* that Jeroboam was come again, they sent and called him unto the congregation and made him king." We find in the Sept. a long supplement to this, 12th chapter, possibly ancient, containing fuller details of Jeroboam's biography than the Hebrew. **SEE JEROBOAM**. In this we read that after Solomon's death he returned to his native place, Sarira in Ephraim, which he fortified, and lived there quietly, watching the turn of events until the long-expected rebellion broke out, when the Ephraimites *heard* (doubtless through his own agency) that he had returned, and invited him to Shechem to assume the crown. From the same supplementary narrative of the Sept. we might infer that more than a year must have elapsed between Solomon's death and Rehoboam's visit to Shechem, for, on receiving the news of the former event, Jeroboam requested from the king of Egypt leave to return to his native country. This the king tried to prevent by giving him his sister-in-law in marriage; but on the birth of his child Abijah, Jeroboam renewed his request, which was then granted. It is probable that during this year the discontent of the northern tribes was making itself more and more manifest, and that this led to Rehoboam's visit and intended inauguration. The comparative chronology of the reigns determines them both as beginning in this year.

Picture for Rehoboam (2)

On Rehoboam's return to Jerusalem he assembled an army of 180,000 men from the two faithful tribes of Judah and Benjamin (the latter transferred from the side of Joseph to that of Judah in consequence of the position of David's capital within its borders), in the hope of reconquering Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by the prophet Shemaiah, who assured them that the separation of the kingdoms was in accordance with God's will (^{<11124>}1 Kings 12:24). Still, during Rehoboam's lifetime peaceful relations between Israel and Judah were never restored (^{<4125>}2 Chronicles 12:15; ^{<1140>}1 Kings 14:30). Rehoboam now occupied himself in strengthening the territories which remained to him by building a number of fortresses of which the names are given in ^{<4106>}2 Chronicles 11:6-10, forming a girdle of "fenced cities" round Jerusalem. The pure worship of God was maintained in Judah, and the Levites and many pious Israelites from the North, vexed at the calf-idolatry introduced by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Egyptian worship of Mnevis, came and settled in the southern kingdom and added to its power. But Rehoboam did not check the introduction of heathen abominations into his capital. The lascivious worship of Ashtoreth was allowed to exist by the side of the true

religion (an inheritance of evil doubtless left by Solomon), “images” (of Baal and his fellow-divinities) were set up, and the worst immoralities were tolerated (^{<1112>}1 Kings 14:22-24). These evils were punished and put down by the terrible calamity of an Egyptian invasion. Shortly before this time a change in the ruling house had occurred in Egypt. The twenty-first dynasty of Tanites, whose last king, Pisham or Psusennes, had been a close ally of Solomon (3:1; 7:8; 9:16; 10:28, 29), was succeeded by the twenty-second of Bubastites, whose first sovereign, Shishak (Sheshonk, Sesonchis, Sovuarmci), was himself connected, as we have seen, with Jeroboam. That he was incited by him to attack Judah is very probable. At all events, in the fifth year of Rehoboam’s reign the country was invaded by a host of Egyptians and other African nations, numbering 1200 chariots, 60,000 cavalry, and a vast miscellaneous multitude of infantry (B.C. 969). The line of fortresses which protected Jerusalem to the west and south was forced, Jerusalem itself was taken, and Rehoboam had to purchase an ignominious peace by delivering up all the treasures with which Solomon had adorned the Temple and palace, including his golden shields, 200 of the larger and 300 of the smaller size (10:16, 17), which were carried before him when he visited the Temple in state. We are told that after the Egyptians had retired, his vain and foolish successor comforted himself by substituting shields of brass, which were solemnly borne before him in procession by the body-guard, as if nothing had been changed since his father’s time (Ewald: *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3:348, 464). Shishak’s success is commemorated by sculptures discovered by Champollion on the outside of the great temple at Karnak, where among a long list of captured towns and provinces occurs the name *Judah Malkah* (kingdom of Judah). It is said that the features of the captives in these sculptures are unmistakably Jewish (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 2, 376, and *Bampton Lectures*, p. 126; Bunsen, *Egypt*, 3:242). After this great humiliation the moral condition of Judah seems to have improved (^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 12:12), and the rest of Rehoboam’s life to have been unmarked by any events of importance. He died B.C. 956, after a reign of seventeen years, having ascended the throne at the age of forty-one (1 Kings 14:21: ^{<1423>}2 Chronicles 12:13). In the addition to the Sept. already mentioned (inserted after ^{<1124>}1 Kings 12:24) we read that he was sixteen years old at his accession—a misstatement probably founded on a wrong interpretation of ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 13:7 where he is called “young” (i. e. *new to his work, inexperienced*) and “tender-hearted” (**bbi** אֶרִי; *wanting in resolution and spirit*). He had eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty-eight sons, and sixty daughters. The wisest

thing recorded of him in Scripture is that he refused to waste away his sons' energies in the wretched existence of an Eastern zenana, in which we may infer, from his helplessness at the age of forty-one, that he had himself been educated, but dispersed them in command of the new fortresses which he had built about the country. Of his wives, Mahalath, Abihail, and Maachah were all of the royal house of Jesse. Maachah he loved best of all, and to her son Abijah he bequeathed his kingdom. See Kiesling, *Hist. Rehabeami* (Jena, 1753). *SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.*

Re'hoboth

[many *Reho'both*] (Heb. *Rechoboth'*, **חבב** **ח**) [once **חבב**] ^{<1101>}Genesis 10:11], *wide* places, i.e. *streets*, as in ^{<1022>}Proverbs 1:20, etc.), the name of three places.

1. REHOBOTH THE WELL (Sept. **εὐρυχωρία**; Vulg. *latitudo*), the third of the series of wells dug by Isaac in the Philistines' territory (^{<1252>}Genesis 26:22). He had dug several wells before, but was obliged to abandon them in consequence of the quarrels of the Philistines. When this one was completed they did not strive for it. He celebrated his triumph and bestowed its name on the well in a fragment of poetry of the same nature as those in which Jacob's wives gave names to his successive children: "He called the nam of it Rehoboth (*room*) and said,

***'Because now Jehovah hath made room for us
And we shall increase in the land.'***

The name was intended to indicate the fact that th patriarch had at length got *space* to rest in. Most of the ancient versions translate the word, though it mus evidently be regarded as a proper name. Isaac has left the valley of Gerar and its turbulent Inhabitant before he dug the well which le thu4 commemorates (ver. 22). From it he, in time, "went up" to Beershebf (ver. 23), an expression which is always used of motion towards the land of promise. The position of Geram has not been definitely ascertained, but it seems to havs lain a few miles to the south of Gaza and nearly due east of Beersheba. In this direction, therefore, if anywhere, the wells Sitnah, Esek, and Rehoboth should be searched for. The ancient Jewish tradition confines the events of this part of Isaac's life to a much narrower circle. The wells of the patriarchs were shown near Ashkelon in the time of Origen, Antoninus Martyr, and Eusebius (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 589); the Samaritan version identifies Gerar with Ashkelon; Josephus (*Ant.* i, 12, 1)

calls it “Gerar of *Palestine*,” i.e. of *Philistia*. It is a remarkable fact that the name clings to the spot still. In the wilderness of et-Tih, about twenty-three miles south-west of Beersheba, is a wady called *er-Ruhaibeh*, in which and on the adjoining heights are remains of antiquity thus described by Robinson: “In the valley itself is the ruin of a small rough building with a dome, built in the manner of a mosque. On the right of the path is a confused heap of hewn stones, the remains of a square building of some size, perhaps a tower. On the acclivity of the eastern hill we found *traces of wells*, a deep cistern, or rather cavern, and a fine circular threshing-floor, evidently antique. But on ascending the hill on the left of the valley we were astonished to find ourselves amid the ruins of an ancient city. Here is a level track of ten or twelve acres in extent entirely and thickly covered over with confused heaps of stones, with just enough of their former order remaining to show the foundations and form of the houses, and the course of some of the streets. The houses were mostly small, all solidly built of bluish limestone, squared and often hewn on the exterior surface. Many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock; and these still remained quite entire. Once, as we judged upon the spot, this must have been a city of not less than twelve or fifteen thousand inhabitants” (*Bib. Res.* i, 106). This identification is adopted by Rowlands (in Williams, *Holy City*, i, 465), Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 343), Stewart (*Tent and Khan*, p. 343), and Bonar (*Desert of Sinai*, p. 316). Dr. Robinson could not find the well itself. Dr. Stewart found it “regularly built, twelve feet in circumference,” but “completely filled up.” Mr. Rowlands describes it as “an ancient well of living and good water.”

2. REHOBOTH THE CITY (Heb. *Rechoboth* ‘*Ir*, **רְחֹבֹת** [*re*], i.e. *Rehoboth City*; Sept. **Ῥοωβὼθ πόλις** v. r. **Ῥοωβῶς**; *Vulg.* *platece civitates*), one of the four cities built by Asshur, or by Nimrod in Asshur, according as this difficult passage is translated. The four were Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah (^{OLD}Genesis 10:11). It has been supposed by recent commentators that these four constituted one *great city*. They argue that the first name, *Nineveh*, is the chief, and that the other three are subordinate. “He built Nineveh, with (taking not as a copulative, but as the sign of subordination) Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah.” From this it would follow that the four places formed a large composite city, or range of towns, to which the general name “Nineveh” was given (see Keil and Delitzsch, *ad loc.*). This appears to put too great a strain upon the passage; and it is better, because

more natural, to take them as distinct places. They were most probably not far distant from each other; and as Nineveh and Calah stood on the Tigris, the others may be looked for there also. The Samaritan seems to understand *Sittace* in South Assyria, which was thence called Sittacene (Ptolemy, 6:1, 2), and is different from the Mesopotamian Sittace near the Tigris (Xenoph. *Anab.* ii, 4, .13; comp. Mannert, *Geogr.* v, ii, 383 sq.), upon the site of the modern Old Bagdad. Ephrem has *Adiabewe*, a well-known district of Assyria; but not, as Michaelis supposes (*Spicil.* i, 243), also a city. Schulthess (*Parad.* p. 117) refers it to the Euphrates, and considers it the same as *Rehoboth Han-nahar* (No. 3, below). In that case we must understand Assyria in a wide sense, as the Assyrian empire, which is improbable. Bochart gives a far-fetched supposition, resting on conjectural etymology (*Phaleg*, 4:21). Jerome, both in the Vulgate and in his *Questiones ad Genesim* (probably from Jewish sources), considers Rehoboth-ir as referring to Nineveh, and as meaning the “streets of the city.” The readings of the Targums of Jonathan, Jerusalem, and rabbi Joseph on Genesis and 1 Chronicles, viz. *Platiah*, *-Platiuttha*, are probably only transcriptions of the Greek word *πλατεῖαι*, which, as found in the well-known ancient city Plataea, is the exact equivalent of Rehoboth. The name of *Rahabeh* is still attached to two places in the region of the ancient Mesopotamia. They lie, the one on the western and the other on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, a few miles below the confluence of the Khabtir. Both are said to contain extensive ancient remains. That on the eastern bank bears the affix of *malik*, or royal, and this Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*) and Kalisch (*Genesis*, p. 261) propose as the representative of Rehoboth. Its distance from Kalah-Sherghat and Nimrud (nearly 200 miles) is perhaps an obstacle to this identification. Sir H. Rawlinson (*Athenaeum*, April 15, 1854) suggests *Selemyah* in the immediate neighborhood of Kalah, “where there are still extensive ruins of the Assyrian period,” but no subsequent discoveries appear to have confirmed this suggestion.

3. REHOBOTH BY THE RIVER (Heb. *Rehoboth' hanNahar'*, רַחֲבֹתַיַּתְּנָחַר]

i. *Rehoboth of the River*; Sept. Ῥωβὼθ [Iv. r. Ῥωβὼθ] ἢ παρὰ πόταμον; Vulg. *de fluvio Roboth*, or *Rohohoth, quae juxta anenem sita est*, the city of a certain Saul or Shaul, one of the early kings of the Edomites (^{<1357>}Genesis 36:37; ^{<13148>}1 Chronicles 1:48). The affix “the river” fixes the situation of Rehoboth as on the Euphrates, emphatically “the river” to the inhabitants of Western Asia (see ^{<13121>}Genesis 31:21; 15:18; Deuteronomy i, 7; ^{<12781>}Exodus 23:31). The Targum of Onkelos adds,

“Rehoboth, *which is on the Phrat.*” There is no reason to suppose that the limits of Edom ever extended to the Euphrates, and therefore the occurrence of the name in the lists of kings of Edom is possibly a trace of an Assyrian incursion of the same nature as that of Chedorlaomer and Amraphel. At all events, the kings of Edom were not all natives of that country. Schultens in his note (*Index Geogr. in Vit. Salad.* s.v. “Rahaba”) identifies it with Rehoboth of ^{<10357>}Genesis 36:37; and this is the view of Bochart (*Opp.* i, 225), Winer, Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1281), and others; but as the Euphrates was far distant from the site of Nineveh, there is a strong probability against this opinion. *Rahabak* is mentioned by Abulfeda. In his day there was a small village on the site. The name still remains attached to two spots on the Euphrates — the one, simply *Rahabeh*, on the right bank, eight miles below the junction of the Khabur and about three miles west of the river; the other four or five miles farther down on the left bank. The latter is said to be called *Pahabeh-malik*, i.e. “royal” (Kalisch, Kaplali), and is on this ground identified by the Jewish commentators with the city of Saul. The existence of the second locality, however, rests but on slender foundation. It is shown on the map in Layard’s *Nineveh and Babylon*, and is mentioned by the two Jewish authorities named above; but it does not appear on the map of colonel Chesney. The other locality is unquestionably authentic. Chesney says, “On the right bank of the Euphrates, at the north-western extremity of the plain of Shinar, and three and a half miles south-west of the town of Mavadin, are extensive ruins around a castle still bearing the name of Rehoboth” (1, 119; 2, 222).

Re’hum

(Heb. and Chald. *Rechum*’, $\mu\psi j r$] *compassionate*; Sept. ^{<10357>}Ῥεούμ, but in ^{<10357>}Nehemiah 3:17 ^{<10357>}Ῥαούμ), the name of five men.

1. One of the “children of the province” who returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (^{<10357>}Ezra 2:2). B.C. 536. In the parallel passage (^{<10357>}Nehemiah 7:7) he is called NEHUM.
2. One of the priests who returned from Babylon at the same time (^{<10357>}Nehemiah 12:3). B.C. 536. In a subsequent verse (ver. 15) he seems to be called HARIM *SEE HARIM* (q.v.).
3. A Persian officer in Samaria, joint author with Shimshai of a letter which turned Artaxerxes against the building-plans of the Jews (^{<10357>}Ezra 4:8; 9, 17, 23). B.C. 535. “He was perhaps a kind of lieutenant-governor of the

province under the king of Persia, holding apparently the same office as Tatnai, who is described in ^{<1578>}Ezra 5:6 as taking part in a similar transaction, and is there called ‘the governor on this side the river.’ The Chaldee title, $\mu[\text{€}\text{A}] [\text{B}]$ *bel-te4m*, literally ‘lord of decree,’ is left untranslated in the Sept. **Βαλτάμ** and the Vulg. *Beelteem*; and the rendering ‘chancellor’ in the A.V. appears to have been derived from Kimchi and others, who explain it, in consequence of its connection with ‘scribe,’ by the Hebrew word which is usually rendered ‘recorder.’ This appears to have been the view taken by the author of 1 Esdras 2:25, **ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα**, and by Josephus (*Ant.* 11:2, 1), **ὁ πάντα τὰ πρατόμενα γράφων**. The former of these seems to be a gloss, for the Chaldee title is also represented by **Βεελτέθμος** “

4. A Levite, son of Bani, and one of the builders of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (^{<1617>}Nehemiah 3:17). B.C. 445.

5. One of the chief Israelites who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1615>}Nehemiah 10:25). B.C. 410.

Re'i

(Heb. *Rejy'*, $\gamma[\text{æ}]$ *friendly*; Sept. **Ῥήι** v. r. **Ῥησί**), one of king David's officers, who refused to rebel with Adonijah (^{<1008>}1 Kings 1:8). B.C. 1015. “Jerome (*Qucest. Hebr.* ad loc.) states that he is the same with ‘Hiram the Zairite,’ i.e. Ira the Jairite, a priest or prince about the person of David. Ewald (*Gesch.* 3:266, note), dwelling on the occurrence of Shimei in the same list with Rei, suggests that the two are David's only surviving brothers, Rei being identical with RADDAI. This is ingenious, but there is nothing to support it, while there is the great objection to it that the names are in the original extremely dissimilar, Rei containing the *Ain*, a letter which is rarely exchanged for any other, but apparently never for *Daleth* (Gesenius, *Theaur.* p. 976)”

Reich

GEORG, a German doctor of theology, was born in 1813, and died Oct. 1, 1862, as pastor of Reicheisheim, in Hesse. He wrote, *Die Afferstehung des Urerrin als Heilsthatsache*, with special reference to Schleiermacher (Darmstadt, 1845): *Die Lehrfortbildung in der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche, auf adm Grund den augsburgischen Confession* (Hamburg ans Gotha, 1847) — *Die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche im*

Grossherzogthum Ressen (Stuttgart, 1855). See *Zuchold Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1043, 2355, 1369. (B. P.)

Reichardt, John Christian

a minister of the Episcopal Church, was born at Ruhrort, on the Rhine, in 1803. He was educated first at the public school in his native place, and afterwards pursued his studies at the gymnasium at Duisburg. Feeling a desire to devote himself to missionary work, he was recommended to the missionary society at Barmen, which received him, and he was sent by it to the excellent Janicke's Missionary Institution at Berlin. Janicke had no funds at command to enable him to send forth missionaries, but the missionary societies in England, in Holland, and elsewhere were thankful to avail themselves of those who had been trained by the venerable pastor in Berlin. In the year 1824 the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews appointed Mr. Reichardt for the mission in Poland, in connection with Mr. Becker, a former pupil of father Janicke. During 1825 and 1826 he travelled extensively through Poland; from 1827 to 1830 he was engaged in frequent missionary journeys in Holland and Bavaria, and in 1831 he was active, together with the late Rev. M. S. (afterwards bishop) Alexander, in preaching the Gospel to the Jews in London and the principal towns of England. From that time his permanent residence was at London, in prosecution of the missionary work in behalf of his society. In October, 1857, Mr. Reichardt left England on a special mission to Jerusalem, where he also remained for a time. After his return from Jerusalem, his time and efforts were mainly directed to the work of the society in England, with occasional visits to various missionary stations. His main work, however, was the revision of the text of the Hebrew New Test., which was printed and published several times, and in correcting for the press multiplied editions of the Old Test., which the London Society, as well as the British Bible Society. published. He also took part in the training of candidates for missionary employment, and, after he was permitted to labor until his death, March 31, 1873. In connection with his missionary work, he published a number of pamphlets, which have been translated by his fellow-laborers into Dutch, French, etc., viz. **dywd ^b j yçm**, or *Proofs that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of David* (Lond. 1851, and often): — - **h j mx j yçm**, or *Proofs that the Messiah, the Son of David, is also the Son of God* (ibid. 1851, and often): — **wnyhl a h l arçy [mç dj a h**, *The Scriptural Doctrine of the God of Israel* (ibid.

1851, and often): — - **twtyrbh ytç**, *The Two Covenants, or Mosaism and Christianity* (2d ed. *ibid.* 1857): — *-Investitigaion of the Prophet Joel with Special Reference to the Coming Crisis* (*ibid.* 1867). See *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond.), 1851, p. 427 sq.; 1867, p. 34 sq.; May, 1873; *Dibre Emeth, oder Stimme der Wahrheit* (Breslau, 1873), p. 97 sq.; Delitzsch, *Saat auf Hoffing* (1873), 10:228 sq.; Fiirst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:143; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1044. (B. P.)

Reiche, Johann Georg

a German doctor and professor of theology, was born in the year 1794 at Leese, in Hanover. Having completed his studies, he was appointed in 1817 collaborator at the gymnasium in Celle, and in 1819 he became *Repetent* at Gottingen. In the year 1821 he travelled extensively, and after his return in 1822 he commenced his private lectures at the University of Gottingen. In 1827 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology, and in 1835 doctor and ordinary professor, which position he occupied till his death, Aug. 9, 1863. Reiche is best known, as a commentator on the New Test., and as such he published, *Authentioe Posetioris ad Thessalonienses Epistoloe Vindicioe* (Gottingen, 1829): — *Versuch einer ausführlichen Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Romer* (*ibid.* 1832, 1834, 2 pts.): — *Codicum MSS. N.T. Graecorum aliquot Insigniorum in Bibliotheca Regia Parisiensi Asservatorum Nova Descriptio et cum Textu Vulgo Recepto Collatio praemiiss quibusdam de Neglecti Codicum MSS. N.T. Studii Causis Observationibus* (*ibid.* 1847): — *Commentarius Criticus in N.T., quo Loca Graviora et Diiciliora Lectionis Dubice accurate Recensentur et Explicantur* (*ibid.* 1853-62, vol. i-iii): — *Commentarii in N.T. Critici Specimen* (*ibid.* 1863). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 89, 257, 258, 414, 450, 725; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1044 sq.; *Liferarischer Handweiser fürs kathol. Deutschland*, 1864, p. 73. (B. P.)

Reichel, John Frederick,

a distinguished bishop of the Moravian Church, was born at Leuba, in Altenburg, Germany, May 16, 1731. His father and grandfather were both Protestant clergymen, and the latter was expelled from Bohemia on account of his faith. Reichel studied theology at the University of Jena, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church, but after a service of only four years he joined the Moravian communion, for which he had always

had a strong predilection. He labored in various capacities and in various countries until 1769, when he was elected to the executive board of the *Unitas Fratrum*, known as the Unity's Elders' Conference. In this body he remained for forty years. until his death. After his consecration to the episcopacy in 1775, he undertook many official visitations, extending them as far as the East Indies and the Cape of Good Hope. The most remarkable was that which he held in America in the midst of the Revolutionary War, from 1778 to 1782. He visited nearly all the Moravian churches of this country, in many of which the war had caused unfortunate agitations and strife, and succeeded in restoring peace. He died at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony, Nov. 17, 1809. (E. de S.)

Reid, Adam

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wishaw, Lanarkshire, Scotland, Jan. 4, 1808, was educated in Glasgow University, and at the Theological Seminary of the Secession Church under Dr. Dick. Having completed his studies in 1842, he came to America. He supplied the First Presbyterian Church in Amenia, N. Y., about a year and a half, when he was called to the Congregational Church of Salisbury, Conn. His reputation as a preacher was very extensive, and he received calls at different times to important charges in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, and Buffalo. His habits were very regular; he gave a part of each evening to the preparation of his sermons, which he wrote out with great care and regularly committed to memory. As a memoriter preacher he was unusually effective. His style was logical and impressive, being adorned with the choicest diction. He did very little pastoral work, but his congregation was more than paid by the richness of the intellectual feasts which he constantly served. He was above the medium height, slender and straight as an arrow, and very clerical in his appearance, which gained for him the sobriquet of "priest Reid," by which he was known in all the surrounding country. When at home he wrote a sermon every week, many of which, however, he never preached. When he had passed his seventieth year, his congregation reluctantly accepted his resignation and appointed him pastor emeritus. He died Nov. 2, 1878. (W. P.S.)

Reid, John Wilson

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras Co., N. C., in 1807. He pursued his early studies amid many embarrassing circumstances. and his

literary and scientific studies chiefly under Dr. John Robinson, of North Carolina. In 1831 he removed to Georgia and opened a classical school, during which time he studied theology under the direction of S. K. Talmage, D.D., of Augusta, Ga., was licensed by Hopewell Presbytery in September, 1833, and soon after ordained by the same presbytery, and was subsequently connected with Olivet, South Liberty, Lincolnton, Double Branches, Salem, Woodstock, Bethany, and Lexington churches, and also as a general domestic missionary agent. He died at his residence in Woodstock, Ga., July 11, 1867, Mr. Reid for about thirty years laboriously followed the occupation of teaching in connection with the exercise of his ministry. The village of Woodstock, Oglethorpe Co., Ga., was built up by the subject of this sketch and a few other gentlemen of wealth and intelligence, for the sake of social, educational, and religious privileges. For a few years Mr. Reid carried on simply a high-school; but his capacity, skill, and success in training young men rapidly increased his reputation: it was thought, therefore, advisable to secure still greater privileges by establishing a more regular organization. Consequently, quite a full literary, classical, and scientific curriculum was arranged in four divisions, and the school henceforth took the name of Philomathean Collegiate Institute. The change was made at the suggestion and by the aid of the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, and the organization accomplished all that its friends expected. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 365. (J. L. S.)

Reid, Joseph

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1842, near Romeo, Mich. He was of Scots parentage and received a careful religious training. He was graduated at the Michigan University and received his theological training in Union Seminary. He was regularly ordained, and went to Kansas to enter the missionary field. At a place called Manhattan, and the region around, he spent five years of arduous toil, when he returned to Michigan, that he might be near his parents and comfort them in their feebleness. He remained in Michigan, preaching as opportunity permitted, and was looking forward to a settlement when he was attacked with a disease which ended his life. He died at Romeo in 1877, after a ministry of only seven years. (W. P. S.)

Reid, Thomas

a celebrated Scotch divine and metaphysician, was born at Strachan in 1710. He was educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and became its librarian, a position which he resigned in 1736. In 1737 he was presented by King's College, Aberdeen, to the living of New Machar, Aberdeenshire, and was appointed professor of moral philosophy in the abovenamed college in 1752. In 1764 he succeeded Adam Smith as professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow, retiring in 1781. He died Oct. 7, 1796. He published, *Essays on the Powers of the Human Mind* (Edinb. 1819, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Inquiry into the Human Mind* (Edinb. 1763; 5th ed. 1801, 8vo). These and numerous *Essays*, etc., were collected and published under the title of *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D., now fully Collected*, etc. (6th ed. Edinb. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. **SEE SCOTTISH PHILOSOPHY.**

Reid, William Shields

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in West Nottingham, Chester Co., Pa., April 21, 1778, and graduated with honor at Princeton College in 1802. He was then for about two years assistant teacher in an academy in Georgetown, D. C., afterwards in Shepherdstown, Va.; then, about 1804, he became professor in Hampden Sidney College, and finally president of that college some two years later. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Winchester in the spring of 1806, and dissolved his connection with the college about eighteen months afterwards. In 1808 he settled at Lynchburg, Campbell Co., Va., where he opened a school for males as a means of support, and at the same time labored to build up a Presbyterian Church in the village. In this he succeeded, and was installed as pastor in 1822. Still, his principal field of labor was his school, which after a while became a boarding-school for young ladies, and stood first among similar institutions in Virginia. Here his labors for the good of his charge were crowned with distinguished success. Having become incapacitated for public labor, he resigned his charge in 1848, and lived in retirement till his death, June 23, 1853. — Sprague, *Annals of the Amen. Pulpit*, 4:388.

Reily, James Ross

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Meyerstown, Lebanon Co., Pa., Oct. 31, 1788. He began his theological studies with Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md., in 1809, was licensed in 1812, and became

pastor of churches in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa. In 1813 he was sent as an exploring missionary to North Carolina, after which he returned to his charge. He was called to Hagerstown, Md., in 1819; resigned in 1825, to accept the appointment of agent to go to Europe with a view of securing aid from the Reformed churches there for the endowment of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church and collecting books for its library. In this he was successful, returning in November, 1826. He became pastor in York, Pa., in 1827. His health failing, he resigned in July, 1831. He now supported himself in a secular calling amid continued ill-health, and died March 18, 1844. Mr. Reily was a man of great energy and originality, and withal somewhat eccentric; in the pulpit he was grave, earnest, and more than ordinarily eloquent. He preached in German and English.

Reily, John

a minister in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Ireland about 1770, and came to this country when about seventeen. He engaged in teaching in Philadelphia and vicinity for several years, but studied theology, and was licensed to preach by the Special Presbytery at Philadelphia, May 24, 1809. He was taken on trial Aug. 15, 1812, ordained in 1813, and sent as missionary to South Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. He had not been long in South Carolina before he was installed as pastor of the united congregations of Beaver Dams and Wateree, where he labored with great acceptance and success until his death, August, 1820. Mr. Reily was a man of childlike simplicity, godly sincerity, singleness of purpose, and undaunted intrepidity. — Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:60.

Reimarus, Hermann Samuel

a learned German philologist, was born at Hamburg, Dec. 22, 1694, and studied first under his father and afterwards under Wolf and Fabricius. He next went to study at Jena, and later at Wittenberg. After having travelled over Holland and England, he was appointed rector at Weimar in 1723, and in 1729 was called to Hamburg as teacher of Hebrew in the gymnasium. He died there, March 1, 1765. His theological writings are a *Dissertatio de Assessoribus Synedrii Magni* (Hamb. 1751, 4to): — *Die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der natuirlichen Religion* (ibid. 1754), and a few others of less importance. He is especially credited with the editorship of

the famous *Wolfenbittel Fragments* (q.v.). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Reinbeck, Johann Gustav

a German theologian and philosopher, was born Jan. 25, 1683. His father, Andreas, was superintendent at Brunswick, and published two enormous volumes on the Hebrew accents. Johann studied theology at Halle, pursuing Hebrew -under Michaelis, and philosophy under Wolf. He was called in 1709 as preacher to the Friedrichswerder Church in Berlin, and in 1716 became pastor of the Church of St. Peter at Cologne. He was a favorite with Frederick William I, and also with Frederick the Great. He died Aug. 21, 1741. Reinbeck is the author of several Biblical, homiletical, and philosophical works, which are enumerated in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reineccius, Christian

a Lutheran divine, was born Jan. 22, 1668, at Grossmuhlingen, in Zerbst, and died Oct. 18, 1752, at Weissenfels, where for about thirty years he had acted as rector of the academy. Reineccius was a voluminous writer, and his *Dissertations*, which he published as rector of Weissenfels, are still very valuable. Besides his edition of Lankisch's *Concordantice Bibliorum Germanico-Hebraico-Graecae* (Lips. 1718), and of *Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum, una cum Libris Apocryphis*, etc. (ibid. 173057), he published ⲙⲃⲱⲧⲧⲕⲱ ⲙⲃⲁⲃⲛ ⲙⲣⲱⲧ, i.e. *Biblia Hebraica, ad Optimorum Codicum et Editionum Fidem Recensita*, etc. (ibid. 1725). In the preface we are told, as is already indicated in the title-page, that in editing this Bible MSS. have been perused, but their use is nowhere pointed out. An alphabetical table of the Parashioth and a table of the Haphtaroth are given at the end. The type is correct. A second edition of the Hebrew Bible was published in 1739, which is but a reprint of the first, repeating even its mistakes, and making still greater ones. A third edition was published in 1756, after Reineccius's death, by C. G. Pohl, who also wrote the preface, in which he speaks of the changes made by him. In 1793, Doderlein and Meissner published Reineccius's Bible *Cum Variis Lectionibus ex Ingenti Codicum Copia a C. Kennicotto et J. B. de Rossi Collatorum*, which is very valuable. It was republished by Knapp (Halle, 1818). Reineccius also wrote, *Index Memorialis, quo Voces Hebraicae et Chaldaicae V. T. Omnes*, etc. (Lips. 1723, and often),

which is appended to some editions of his Hebrew Bible: — *Manuale Biblicum ex Concordantiis Graecis Adornatum in quo Voces Graecae Onnes in LXX Interpretum Versione Bibliorum Graeca et in Apocryphis V. T., nec non in Textu Originali Graeco N.T. Occurrentes*, etc. (ibid. 1734): — *Biblia Sacra Quadrilingua V. T. Hebr.* giving the Hebrew, Greek (according to Grabe's text), the German of Luther, and Latin translation of Seb. Schmid, 3 vols., the three containing the Apocrypha in Greek, Latin, and German (ibid. 1751): — *Janua Hebraico Linguae V. T.* etc. (ibid. 1704; last ed. by Rehkopf, 1788). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:144 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Handbuch fur die Literatur*, i, 236 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 35, 39, 47, 120, 321, 527, 591; ii, 726; *Theol. Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra* (2d ed. 1748), p. 408, 425; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v. (B. P.)

Reinhard, Franz Volkmar

an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born in the duchy of Sulzbach in 1753. He studied with his father, a clergyman, until he was sixteen, when he entered the gymnasium of Ratisbon. Here he remained five years, and in 1773 removed to the University of Wittenberg. In 1782 he was appointed professor of theology, and in 1784 preacher to the university and assessor of the consistory. In 1792 he was preacher to the court at Dresden, ecclesiastical counsellor and member of the supreme consistory, and held these positions until his death, Sept. 6, 1812. He published, *Sermons* (Sulzbach, 1811, 36 vols.): — *Christian Ethics* (5 vols.): — *Confessions*, etc.

Reinhard, Lorenz

a German doctor of theology, was born Feb. 22, 1700, at Hellingen, in Franconia. After the completion of his studies, he was first tutor and afterwards professor at the gymnasium in Hildburghausen. In 1727 he was called as deacon and professor of the gymnasium to Weimar, and in 1744 as superintendent to Buttstadt, where he died, Nov. 15, 1752. He wrote, *De Libro Sapientiae non Canonico*, etc. (Wittenb. 1719): — *Die Theologie der Patriarchen vor und nach der Suindfluth*, etc. (Hamb. 1737): — *Observationes Philol. exeg. in Evangel. Marci Selectissimae* (Lips. 1737): — *Breviar. Controversiar. cum Reformatis, una cum Breviario Controversiar. cum Arminianis* (Weimar, 1735): — *Chronotaxis Cantici Cantorum Salomonis*, etc. (ibid. 1741): — *Commentatio de Assapho*,

etc. (ibid. 1742): — *Erklärung und Zergliederung des Buches Hiob*, etc. (Leips. 1749-50). See Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, i, 247, 35.3; ii, 727; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:147. (B. 1.,)

Reins

a name for the *kidneys*, derived from the Latin *renes*, and in our English Bible employed in those passages of the Old Test. in which the term for kidneys (**תַּיִת** **קַי** *kelayoth*) is used metaphorically, i.e. except in the Pentateuch and in ⁽²³¹⁶⁾Isaiah 34:6, where this word is rendered “kidneys.” In the ancient system of physiology the kidneys, from the sensitiveness of that part of the person, were believed to be the seat of desire and longing, which accounts for their often being coupled with the heart (⁽¹⁵⁷⁰⁾Psalms 7:9; 26:2; ⁽³⁴¹²⁾Jeremiah 11:20; 17:10.; etc.). *SEE KIDNEYS.*

The word “reins” is once used (⁽²³¹⁶⁾Isaiah 11:5) as the equivalent of **חַלְצַיִם** *chalatsayim*, elsewhere translated “loins” (q.v.).

Reischl, Wilhelm Carl

a German Roman Catholic divine, doctor and professor of theology at Munich, was born in that city Jan. 13, 1818. Having completed his studies in his native place, he was made a priest in 1835, and, after having occupied several positions as priest and chaplain, he was promoted in 1842 as doctor of theology. For some time he lectured at Munich, but in 1845 went to Amberg, occupying the chair of professor of dogmatics and exegesis. In 1851 he was called to Regensburg as professor of Church history and canon law, till he was recalled to his native city in 1867 as professor of moral philosophy, where he died, Oct. 4, 1873. In connection with others, he published a commentary on the Holy Bible, the New-Test. part being his sole work. *See Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 494. (B. P.)

Reiser, Anton

a German theologian, was born at Augsburg, March 7, 1628. He was first preacher at Schemnitz, and in 1659 became pastor of the Lutheran church at Presburg. Having in 1672 espoused Calvinism, he was thrown into prison and at length banished. Eventually, however, he served as rector of the gymnasium at Augsburg, preacher at Oeringen, and after 1678 as pastor of the Church of St. James at Hamburg, where he died, April 27,

1686. He Was the author of a number of theological treatises, enumerated in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reiske, Johann

a German theologian, was born May 25, 1641, and died at Wolfenbittel, Feb. 20, 1710. He is the author of *Exercitatio Philologica de Sadduceis* (Jena, 1666): — *Theocratia, Respublica sine Exemplo* (ibid. 1670): — *De Lingua Vernacula Jesu Christi* (ibid. 1670): — *-Conjecturce in Jobuum et Proverbs Salom.* (Lips. 1679): — *De Scriptorum Romanorum Judaicam circa Historiam Falsis Narratiunculis*, etc. (Wittenb. 1691): — *Exercitationes de Vatican. Sibyll.* (Lips. 1688). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:150; Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, i, 137, 557, 562; ii, 728; Jicher, *Gelehrten-Lex.* s.v. (B. P.)

Reissmann, Johann Valentin Von,

a German doctor of theology, and bishop of Wiirzburg, was born Oct. 12, 1807, at Allersheim, in Lower Franconia. He completed his studies at the University of Wurzburg, which honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy and theology. Towards the end of the year 1830 he was ordained priest and appointed to Volkach, but in 1834 he was called to Wiirzburg as ordinary professor of exegesis and Oriental languages. This prominent position he occupied till Dec. 7. 1846, when he became a member of the chapter, and for a number of years he stood at the head of the diocesan government. In 1861 he was made provost' of the cathedral; and when, in 1870, his bishop died, he was appointed by the king of Bavaria, Oct. 23, 1870, bishop of Wurzburg, and confirmed by the pope in the following year. He occupied the episcopal see only a few years, and died Nov. 17, 1876. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 53 sq. (B. P.)

Reiter, Ernst Anton

a Roman Catholic priest, was born in 1821 at Arnsberg. He received holy orders in 1846, and came in 1854 as missionary to the United States. In 1859 he was appointed-pastor of the German church of the Trinity at Boston, Mass., and died May 5, 1873, at Erie, Pa. He wrote a very important work on the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, entitled *Schenatismus der katholischen deutschen Geistlichkeit in den Ver. Staaten Nordamerikas* (N. Y. 1869). See

Literarischer Handweiser für das katholische Deutschland, 1869, p. 465 sq.; 1873, p. 271. (B. P.)

Reiter, William

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Sept. 13, 1799, and spent his youth in Westmoreland County, Pa. He studied theology privately with several ministers successively in Stark County, O., preaching meanwhile in the way of missionary tours under their direction. He was ordained in 1823, and took charge of a number of German Reformed congregations in Tuscarawas County, O., in whose service he continued up to the time of his death, May 8, 1826. He was a diligent student, and a minister that had much of the true missionary spirit.

Reithmayr, Franz Xaver,

doctor and professor of theology, a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born in 1809 at Illkofen, near Regensburg. In 1832 he was made priest; in 1836 the Munich University made him doctor of theology; in 1837 he was extraordinary professor; in 1841 ordinary professor of the New Test. exegesis, and died Jan. 26, 1872. Reithmayr was one of the most prominent theologians of the Roman Catholic Church, and published in 1838 a work on patrology, in 1845 a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Regensb. 1845). In 1832 he published his *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament* (ibid.); and in 1865 a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. His last great work was the edition of a German translation of the fathers, which he edited in connection with others, and which is still in the course of publication at Kempten, under the title *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 977, 1051; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1871, p. 52 sq., 106; 1872. p. 142. (B. P.)

Re'kem

(Heb. *id.* מִקְר, *variegation*, or perhaps i.q. *Regem*), the name of three men, and of a city.

1. (Sept. Ῥοκόμ; A.V. *Rakem*, the name being "in pause," מִקְ* ר.) Brother of Ulam, and a descendant of Machir, the son of Manasseh, by his wife Maachah; .apparently a son of Sheresh (^{<13776>}1 Chronicles 7:16). B.C. ante 1619.

2. (Sept. ^ϛ Ροκόμ v.r. ^ϛ Ρεκόμ.) One of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the Israelites along with Balaam (^{<08108>}Numbers 31:8; ^{<08121>}Joshua 13:21). B.C. 1618.

3. (Sept. ^ϛ Ροκόμ, ^ϛ Ραέμ, v. r. ^ϛ Ρεκόμ.) The third named of the four sons of Hebron, and father of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah (^{<13243>}1 Chronicles 2:43, 44). B.C. post 1618. “In this genealogy it is extremely difficult to separate the names of persons from those of places. Ziph, Mareshah, Tappuah, Hebron, are all names of places, as well as Maon and Beth-zur. In ^{<08127>}Joshua 18:27, Rekem appears as a town of Benjamin, and perhaps this genealogy may be intended, to indicate that it was founded by a colony from Hebron”

4. (Sept. ^ϛ Ρέκεμ) A city in the territory of Benjamin, mentioned between Mozah and Irpeel (^{<08127>}Joshua 18:27). Josephus, in speaking of the Midianitish kings slain by Moses (*Ant.* 4:7:1), mentions a city named after Rekem (No. 2, above), which was the chief city of all Arabia, and was called *Ἀρεκέμη*, *Areceme*, by the Arabians, but *Petra* by the Greeks. This is, of course, different from the Rekem of Benjamin. As the latter is in the group situated in the south-west quarter of the tribe, the site was possibly that of the present ruins called *Deir Yesit*, about three miles west of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 141; Badeker, *Palastina*, p. 288).

Rekesh

SEE HORSE.

Reland, Adriaan

a celebrated Orientalist, was born July 17, 1676, at Ryp, a village in Northern Holland, where his father was pastor. He early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages under Leusden, with the aid of Henry Sicke. After staying six years for this purpose at Utrecht, he went to Leyden to finish his theological studies. He was soon afterwards offered a professor's chair at Linigen, but he preferred to return to his aged father. In 1699 he was made professor of philosophy and Oriental languages at Harderwivck, and two years afterwards was called to teach Oriental languages and ecclesiastical antiquities at Utrecht, a position which he filled to the end of his days, having in 1713 refused a professor's chair at Franeker, and in 1716 another at Leyden. He died of small-pox, Feb. 5, 1718. Reland is admitted to have been by far the greatest Orientalist of his

day, and his writings display exhaustive learning; the most painstaking accuracy, and sound judgment. He was also not lacking in imagination, as some of his earlier productions show. To these admirable qualities he added great affability of manners and a noble sweetness of character. Of his numerous writings we here mention only the most important: *Analecta Rabbinica* (Ultraj. 1702): — *De Religione Mohammedica* (ibid. 1705 and later): — *Dissertationes Miscellaneae* (ibid. 1707): — *Antiquitates Veterum Hebraeorum* (ibid. 1708): — *De Numis Vet. Hebraeorum* (ibid. 1709): — *Palestina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata* (ibid. 1714), a work which in its way can never be superseded: — *De Spoliis Templi* (Traject. 1716): — *Elenchus Philologicus* (Ultraj. 1709). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.

Relic-case

SEE RELIQUARY.

Relics

By this term are usually understood the bodies or clothes of saints and martyrs, or the instruments by which they were put to death or suffered torment, which were so revered in the Romish Church as to be worshipped and carried about in procession. The honoring of the relics of saints, on which the Church of Rome afterwards founded her superstitious and lucrative use of them, as objects of devotion, as a kind of charms, or amulets, and as instruments of pretended miracles, appears to have originated in a very ancient custom that prevailed among Christians, of assembling at the cemeteries or burying-places of the martyrs for the purpose of commemorating them and of performing divine worship. Here they displayed their affection for their brethren by such rites as were dictated by fervent affection and were consistent with the principles of religion. In the 4th century the boundary between respect and worship was passed. Helena, the mother of Constantine, made a journey to Jerusalem and there discovered, as she supposed, the wood of the true cross, a part of which she gave to the city of Jerusalem, and sent the other part to Constantine, who encased it in his own statue and regarded it as the palladium of his new city. When the profession of Christianity obtained the protection of the civil government, under Constantine the Great, stately churches were erected over sepulchres, and the names and memories of the departed were treated with every possible token of affection and respect.

This reverence, however, gradually exceeded all reasonable bounds; and those prayers and religious services were thought to have a peculiar sanctity and virtue which were performed over their tombs; hence the practice which afterwards obtained of depositing relics of saints and martyrs under the altars in all churches. This practice was early thought of such importance that St. Ambrose, in the 4th century, would not consecrate a church because it had no relics; and the Council of Constantinople, in Trullo (A.D. 692), ordained that those altars should be demolished under which were found no relics. Such was the rage for them at one time that even Mabillon, the Benedictine, justly complains that the altars were loaded with suspected relics, numerous spurious ones being everywhere offered to the piety and devotion of the faithful. He adds, too, that bones are often consecrated which, so far from belonging to saints, probably do not belong to Christians. From the catacombs of Italy, Sicily, and other places which had served as the burial-places of the primitive Christians, although the catacombs have both before and since been used for other purposes, numerous relics have been taken. Even as early as 386 Theodosius was obliged to pass a law forbidding the people to dig up the bones of martyrs or traffic in their remains. The superstition grew until, in the 9th century, these relics were not only treated with veneration, but were supposed to have the virtue of healing disorders of body and mind and defending their possessors against the devices and assaults of the devil. Nor was this efficacy destroyed or lessened when the relic was distributed in fragments. In the 11th century relics were tried by fire, and those which did not consume were reckoned genuine, and the rest not. Relic-collecting has been carried to great lengths in Europe, the Italian churches especially being full of fictitious relics. The following is only a sample of those in the Church of Santa Croce de Gerusalemme: three pieces of the true cross, the title placed over the cross; two thorns from the crown of our Lord; the sponge extended to our Lord with vinegar and gall; a piece of the veil and hair of the Virgin; a phial full of the blood of Jesus; some of the manna gathered in the desert, etc.

Relics of saints were regarded as the palladia of cities, as St. Martin's body was carried out to the gates of Tours in 845 to repel a siege by the Danes. St. Werburgh's relics were borne in procession to quell a fire at Chester, and the canons bore them through the diocese to invite alms for the erection of Salisbury Cathedral. At Lichfield the bells were rung at their departure and return. In the 6th century the custom of swearing upon

relics, as later upon the Gospels, began. Relics were, and still are, preserved on the altars whereon mass is celebrated, a square hole being made in the middle of the altar large enough to receive the hand, and therein is deposited the relic, being first wrapped in red silk and enclosed in a leaden box. In Catholic countries these relics are popularly esteemed the most precious treasures of the churches, and in earlier times they had even a high marketable value, large sums having been often raised by necessitous princes by the sale or mortgage of pieces of the “true cross,” etc. Before the Reformation relics were in demand in Scotland, and their sale was a fertile source of revenue to the monks. They were forbidden to be brought into England by several statutes, and justices were empowered to search houses for them and to deface and destroy them when found. This folly has not been without learned and labored defence, antiquity and Scripture both having been appealed to in its support. Bellarmine cites the following passages: ~~<1339>~~ Exodus 13:19; ~~<1346>~~ Deuteronomy 34:6; ~~<1232>~~ 2 Kings 13:21; 23:16-18; ~~<2310>~~ Isaiah 11:10; ~~<4090>~~ Matthew 9:20-22; ~~<4152>~~ Acts 5:12-15; 19:11, 12. But there is no doubt that the worship of relics is an absurdity, without the guarantee of Scripture, directly contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, and irreconcilable with common-sense. Latin monographs upon relics and relic-worship have been written by Cellarius (Helmst. 1656), Jung (Hanov. 1783), Kortholt (1680), Morellus (Rome, 1721), Steger (Leips. 1688), Batti (1655), Kiesling, Rambach (Hale, 1722). See Barnum, *Romanism as It Is; Methodist Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1866; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Church*.

Relief Synod

(or CHURCH). *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES OF.*

Religion

(Lat. *relego, religo*). This word, according to Cicero (*Div. Instit.* 4), is derived from, or rather compounded of, *re* and *legere*, to read over again, to reflect upon or to study the sacred books in which religion is delivered. According to Lactantius (*De Civit. Dei*, lib. 10:c. 3), it comes from *re-ligare*, to bind back, because *religion* is that which furnishes the true ground of obligation.

Religion has been divided into natural and revealed. By natural religion is meant that knowledge, veneration, and love of God, and the practice of those duties to him, our fellow-creatures, and ourselves, which are

discoverable by the right exercise of our rational faculties, from considering the nature and perfections of God, and our relation to him and to one another. By revealed religion is understood that discovery which he has made to us of his mind and will in the Holy Scriptures. As respects natural religion, some doubt whether, properly speaking, there can be any such thing; since, through the fall, reason is so depraved that man, without revelation, is under the greatest darkness and misery, as may be easily seen by considering the history of those nations who are destitute of it, and who are given up to barbarism, ignorance, cruelty, and evils of every kind. So far as this, however, may be observed, the light of nature can give us no proper ideas of God, nor inform us what worship will be acceptable to him. It does not tell us how man became a fallen, sinful creature, as he is, nor how he can be recovered. It affords us no intelligence as to the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future state of happiness and misery. The apostle, indeed, observes that the Gentiles have the law written on their hearts, and are a law unto themselves; yet the greatest moralists among them were so blinded as to be guilty of, and actually to countenance, the greatest vices. Such a system, therefore, it is supposed, can hardly be said to be religious which leaves man in such uncertainty, ignorance, and impiety. *SEE NATURAL THEOLOGY*. Revealed religion forms the correlate of natural religion, or the religion of reason. It is not the result of human investigation, but being the result of an extraordinary communication from God, is therefore infallible; whereas, on the contrary, all processes of human thought are more or less subjected to error. Hence we can explain why it is that religion gives itself out to be, not a product of the reason merely, not anything which originated from human inquiry and study, but a result of a divine revelation. The religious feeling is undoubtedly a propension of human nature; yet without a divine revelation the mind would sink in dark and perpetual disorder. Of the whole family of man, existing in all ages, and scattered over every quarter of the globe, there is not one well-authenticated exception to the fact that, moved by an inward impulse, and guided by revelation or tradition, man worships something which he believes to be endowed with the attributes of a superior being. Even the occasional gleamings of truth found in the various idolatrous systems are but the traditions of ancient revelations, more or less corrupted, which have descended from the first worshippers. Revealed religion comprehends, besides the doctrines of natural religion, many truths which were beyond the reach of human reason, though not contradictory thereto, and for a knowledge of which we are indebted directly to the Old

and New Testaments. While other religions had been variously accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they flourished, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human family. It is the one thing needful for the elevation of our race, and is destined alike to universality and perpetuity.

In all forms of religion there is one part, which may be called the *doctrine* or dogma, which is to be received by faith; and the *cultus*, or worship, which is the outward expression of the religious sentiment. By religion is also meant that homage to the Deity in all the forms which pertain to the spiritual life, in contrast with theology, the theory of the divine nature and government. *SEE THEOLOGY.*

Religion, Philosophy Of,

the science of religion; the application of philosophical principles to the discussion of its general character, origin, and claims. It presents,

- 1, religion in general;
- 2, revealed religion;
- 3, the Christian religion;
- 4, the Christian Church.

This subject is discussed by Apelt (1860), Beneke (1840), Chateaubriand, Deuzinger (1857), Fichte, Hegel (*Werke*, vol. xi), Kant (*Religion innerhalb*, with Kirchmann's notes), Krug (1819), Morrel (*Philosophy of Religion*; see the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, Oct., 1850), Pascal (*Pensees*), Otto Pflleiderer (1869), Heinrich Ritter (1858, 1859), Arnold Ruge (1869), Schleiermacher (*Monologen*), F. X. Schmid (1857), and Spinoza. See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, p. 854.

Religion, Primitive.

Far in the distance, behind Buddhism, Brahminism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and all the ten religions so graphically set forth by Freeman Clarke, there lies a primitive faith of great power, to which our attention is called in ^{<SIB>}Hebrews 11:2: "For by it the ancients obtained a good report." To this primitive religion all the later forms of truth, of error, and of idolatry, with all the mixtures of good and evil pertaining to religions now ancient, owe their origin, whether we can or cannot trace the genealogy. The faith of all the patriarchs anterior to the call of Abraham may be reckoned to this early form of the knowledge, fear, love, and service of the

true God. How it came that descendants of Shem, of Ham, of Japhet, are soon found precipitated in ignorance, crime, and abominable idolatry, we are told in ^{<0128>}Romans 1:28: “And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind.” Thus they lost that faith in which they had been instructed by Noah during three centuries after the deluge. Some there were who held the truth in part long centuries after others had become utterly apostate. Abraham kept the straight course of truth, broadening, deepening, and accumulating strength, through Moses, David, Solomon, Ezra, John the Baptist, Christ himself, the apostles, Wycliffe, Luther, and the Reformed churches, to the present day. Deviations of more or less latitude from this line have been found in every age, as well as in our own, many of these deviations holding enough of the Gospel to secure for long periods the validity of their claim to a *share* of the primitive religion, bringing glory to God and salvation to men. To delineate briefly the relation of these to the main trunk is the object of this article.

I. Egyptian. — When Abraham went to Egypt to escape the famine (^{<0120>}Genesis 12:10), he found that the Lord held intercourse with Pharaoh, and, that Pharaoh and his men had regard to the Lord’s will, and rendered that obedience which is better than sacrifice. This fear of the Lord we find very happily developed in the time of Joseph, when he had interpreted Pharaoh’s dreams. The king of Egypt not only believed the revelation, as from God, but he and his counsellors went to work to improve their opportunity. “The thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of all his servants. And Pharaoh said to his servants, Can we find such a one as this is? a man in whom the Spirit of God is?” (^{<0438>}Genesis 41:38). It might be well for the nations now that are nominally Christian to take lessons from this king and his court. Whatever was the form of their religion, it is there recognised as valid for the welfare of the nation. And when Joseph, at a later date, bought up the land for Pharaoh, the land of the priests was reserved to them. When Joseph’s father is introduced to Pharaoh, the king, after conversing with him, condescended to receive the blessing of Jacob, when it was well understood that “the less is blessed by the better.” It was not until another dynasty took possession of the throne — a king that knew not Joseph — that we hear in that court the haughty challenge, “Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.” Under this new *regime*, Egypt was transformed into an apostasy, on which were executed the ten plagues;

and, finally, the king and his army were precipitated to the bottom of the sea. The sphinx of Egypt belongs to this ancient religion, and had nothing to do with the grovelling ideas of worshipping crocodiles and other crawling things. Even in Joseph's time, and no doubt in Abraham's, the ancient religion had declined, or the Egyptians would not have held "every shepherd" in abomination, as Moses was in danger of being stoned should he offer sacrifice in their land.

II. Philistine. — Abimelech, king of the Philistines, had a remnant of the true religion. When Abraham came to Gerar, he thought, "Surely the fear of God is not in this place." This proved to be a great mistake, for God came to Abimelech in a dream by night; Abimelech heeded the warning, restored Sarah, sought reconciliation through Abraham's prayer, and dealt very liberally with the patriarch, giving him presents, and offering him his choice of the land. Soon after Abraham's return from the Philistine country, Abimelech and Phicol, the general of his army, made a visit, and entered into a friendly covenant with him at Beersheba. Although the friendly feeling was much diminished in the days of Isaac, the Philistine government entertained a high respect for Isaac, not merely as Abraham's son, but as the Blessed of the Lord. Abimelech, Ahuzzath, and Phicol the general, came to Isaac and renewed their covenant of peace at the same place where they had made it with his father. During the time of Jacob we find no friendly association with the Philistines. In Joshua's time their land was to be given to Israel. During the period of the Judges we find only hostility, civil and religious. The worship of Dagon and other idols had now supplanted every vestige of the ancient faith. Beelzebub was the god of Ekron. David burned the images that he found in the conquered camp. The overthrow of Saul was published in the house of their idols, and his armor deposited in the temple of Ashtaroath. Their soothsaying is noted by ²⁰¹⁶Isaiah 2:6. The illegal associations formed with Ashdod in the days of Nehemiah were most damaging to the people of the Lord. Goliath defied the God of Israel, and cursed David by his gods.

III. Canaanitish. — Another illustration of the primitive religion we have in Melchizedek and his people. He was king of Salem, priest of the Most High, and a very eminent type of the expected Deliverer. While Melchizedek lived, and others of the same faith, in sufficient numbers to have influence in the nation, it was announced to Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites was "not yet full." Some four hundred years were yet

allowed them to improve or misimprove their privileges. A very few, like Rahab of Jericho, were willing to obey the truth; but the seven nations, as such, had wholly apostatized to the grossest idolatry. It is possible, almost probable, that there was still some regard for the true religion among those known as Jebusites, although they did not surrender to Joshua. The following considerations are in their favor:

- (a.) They were long spared after the other nationalities had been broken up. They held their capital till the time of David.
- (b.) This capital was the ancient seat of Melchizekek, where we might expect the truth to be kept in families when the nation had given it up.
- (c.) Araunah the Jebusite is honorably noted in the history of David, after their capital had surrendered.
- (d.) At Araunah's threshingfloor the destroying angel suspended his work.
- (e.) He made to David a noble offer — victims for the sacrifice, and wood to burn it from his farming implements.
- (f.) He is living in Jerusalem, not as an idolater, but apparently like the people around him.
- (g.) In ^{<1023>}2 Samuel 24:23, the Hebrew reading is, "All these did king Araunah give to the king." This would indicate that he was a lineal descendant of the royal line of Melchizedek, and was king of the Jebusites when they surrendered to David. At all events, he was possessor of the soil, though a conquered subject; and he readily fell in with the new religion, although it was an advance on that of his ancestors. For some such reasons; he readily sold the old homestead — the *floor* for fifty shekels of silver, the *farm* for six hundred shekels of gold.

IV. Mesopotamian. — Terah and his sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran, in Ur of the Chaldees, were brought up in this. primitive religion; but it had become corrupted by idolatrous excrescences, and although they belonged to the witnessing line, they became involved in the idolatry, as we read (^{<1024>}Joshua 24:2), "They served other gods." To preserve yet a faithful testimony, Abraham was called out of that land when he was about seventy years old, had the covenant of God renewed to him, and commenced a renovated service on the basis of the old faith, with new revelations. Abraham, after the death of his father, removed to Canaan, leaving a

residue at Haran, where he had resided five years. Thus freed from all family connections, except those under his own control, he carried down the true religion in its purity to Isaac and Jacob, with their adherents, all living as strangers in a foreign country. The ancient religion still received new developments of the coming Deliverer, super-added to all former revelations; nor was it a new religion, but a new edition of the old, that was given to Moses. Meantime, the old religion retained, in the family of Nahor, some at least of the old corruptions. The teraphim, for example, Rachel wished to introduce into Jacob's family. Laban called these his gods; the Sept. calls them idols. On what terms of religious observance Jacob lived in Laban's family we have nothing specific; but after the parting we find that each had his own distinct religion. Laban swears by the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor the God of their father. Jacob appeals to the God of Abraham, *and the Fear of Isaac* (⁽⁰³⁴⁾Genesis 31:42, 53). The memorial pillar points to him who is the Rock of Ages, while the heap of gathered stones seems to indicate the Church's confession of imperishable truths, on which we all hold communion with one another and with God in his ordinances. How long this imperfectly organized Church continued in Padan-aram we have no indication, but we know that the Aramites were no friends to Israel in the days of the kings. A very interesting item on the religion of Bethuel's family is connected with the visit of Abraham's prime minister. The friends of Rebekah recognise Jehovah, the covenant God; and they give their farewell blessing in the name of the promised Deliverer: "Let thy seed possess the gate of those who hate *him*." Excepting Luther, translators have made sad work with this verse (⁽⁰²⁶⁾Genesis 24:60).

Perhaps to this connection belongs Balaam the soothsayer; from Aram, from the mountains of the east, from the river of his people, from Pethor of Aram-naharaim. From some source he had obtained a profound knowledge of God and of his ways; yet so perverted was his heart that he endeavored to bring all that knowledge to effect the destruction of Israel. From the tops of the rocks he could see the Deliverer coming, yet so deep was his malignity that he could meet death in this world and damnation in the next rather than have this man rule over *him*. He furnishes an awful example of those who hold the truth in unrighteousness.

V. Midianitish. — In those days we have brought up a most beautiful example of the ancient faith — Jethro, the prince and priest of Midian. It is true that the Midianites were descended from Abraham by Keturah; but their relations with Isaac and his descendants would not have kept up, and

did not keep up, the faith of Abraham in its advanced stages. All that they received directly from Abraham needed some kind of support after they were sent away from Isaac; this support could come only from the scattered fragments of primitive religion floating among their new associations, and collected into a focus by such a man as Jethro. So soon as he is off the stage, superannuated or dead, and his son Hobab has joined the camp of Moses, we find no more faith among the Midianites, nor any friendship for the people of the Lord.

VI. Magian. — In the court of Persia, as late as the captivity, we find traces of the primitive religion. Not only was Cyrus individually called for special service, but there was much favor shown to the Jews by native Persians, while foreign satraps, like Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem, used all their craft, as well as their power, to frustrate the labors of Nehemiah in restoring the city. How often they obtained a partial success needs not to be told here; nor does this invalidate the idea of friendly relations when these could have fair play. Writers like James Freeman Clarke, after tracing far into antiquity the Zoroastrian faith, are unwilling to recognise an ancient faith to which belong the *griffin*, the *serpent*, the *sacred fire*, the *sacred tree*, and other items, while traces of it are found mixed in with later observances. Such writers can see any religion only as the philosophical outgrowth of the human mind, but not as a divine revelation. Of a different cast is a late writer in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, the Rev. J. Murray Mitchell, LL.D. When treating of another, though adjoining, country, he uses the following phraseology: “While we can now trace the great religion of India without interruption almost up to its fountain-head... for nearly four thousand years, *it is far otherwise with the ancient religion of Persia.*” See the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1879. India itself! Is there not enough truth (though seen through a distorted medium) to carry us far beyond the period of the Vedas? To say nothing of moral precepts, a *Creator*, a *Triad* — Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva — the *Incarnation* of Vishnu in the ten Avatars, these and other items claim our attention as remnants of patriarchal revelation.

However much or little they may have learned from the return of Balaam’s retinue, after he was killed in battle (^(-OBIB-)Numbers 31:8), certain it is that the primitive religion furnished a healthy stock on which to engraft the “Star of Jacob” in Persia and all over the East, whence came the Magi to Jerusalem when Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judaea.

VII. Arabian. — Among the very interesting details of the ancient religions we find Job and his friends. Without going into minute inquiry, let us place him somewhere about the period of Terah, the father of Abraham. He is classed with “the sons of the East;” yet we cannot locate him in the far East like the Persian Magi. His own name, and the names of his friends, resemble more than any other the names of the Seirites, among whom, in later times, Esau and his posterity intermingled and intermarried. In ~~Gen~~ Genesis 36 we find the names *Tensanite, Jobab, Eliphaz, Teman*, with others not identical, but of the same general cast as the names of Job’s associates. The faith of these godly men, wherever they may have lived, is of a very high order, and their knowledge of God and of his ways is of the highest degree. Neither by Job nor by any of his friends is there the least allusion to the covenant of Abraham. Whatever mistakes they labored under, they are recognised as true worshippers, and God deals with them as his own.

VIII. Assyrian. — Late discoveries by Layard and Rawlinson have brought us into contact with the ancient Assyrians in much of their religion, as well as war and civil policy. Among the sculptures exhumed, none are more interesting than the winged quadrupeds finished off with a human head, or the human form with eagle’s head and wings. These carry us back to the early cherubim, the forms of which must have been preserved by Noah and his sons. At first sight these Assyrian images may seem no more than mere idols — false gods; but that would not account for their close affinity with the living creatures of Ezekiel and the *τεσσαρα ζῶα* of John’s Revelation. While no one of the Assyrian sculptures embodies the four principles of Ezekiel and John, yet two of them, taken together, do embody the four identical principles, *and no more*. The winged lion and the winged ox have the *aspect* of a man, lion, eagle, ox, and nothing besides. The reason for making them double arose from the difficulty of distinguishing the body of the ox from that of the lion in the same figure. Nor is it impossible that the Assyrians could have borrowed from Ezekiel; almost equally certain that they did not borrow from Moses. This leaves us the only course, that of authentic tradition from Noah and Shem, as *they* had the figures down from the garden of Eden. Whether these winged figures were worshipped by the Assyrians or not, it is of importance to notice that they were not the highest objects of adoration, for they are found bowing themselves before the Supreme, the symbol of Supreme Deity being a human form sitting in a winged circle or globe. While the

races of Shemites occupied one part of Mesopotamia and the Hamites another, they were sufficiently contiguous to afford the opportunity of corrupting one another in the matter of worship, as well as in the manner. We have already seen that the best family of the Shemites — Terah and his sons — had gone into idolatry in connection with the true worship, and needed reformation in the days of Abraham; we may safely infer that other Shemites, as well as the families of Ham, were more deeply involved, and went still further from the truth till the days of Sardanapalus, Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar. Whether in the Abrahamic line there was kept any physical type of the original, cherubim until renewed by Moses is nowhere recorded. Yet there are some hints worthy of our serious consideration. (a.) Rebekah went somewhere to inquire of the Lord and received a specific answer. May not this have come from sacred utensils still in the custody of Abraham? (b.) Before Moses had set up the new tabernacle there was some kind of tabernacle in use (~~Exodus~~ Exodus 33:7). (c.) A sacred chest belonged to many of the ancient idolatries. Was it copied from a true original? (d.) In the higher rank of families the teraphim were long retained in connection with the true religion. Not only did Rachel import them from Laban's house, but Michal brought one into David's; and they are classed with recognised symbols in ~~Hosea~~ Hosea 3:4. On the other side they are classed with idols, and were used by the king of Babylon for idolatrous purposes. May they not have been like the brazen serpent, at first a mere memorial of truth, afterwards turned into an object of false worship. **SEE TERAPHIM.**

IX. Inferences. — Other ancient religions we must pass over here in order to take a survey of the leading features of the primitive, from which they are all derived, and from which they all inherit some features in common, while each seems to have dropped other matters, according to their various tastes and circumstances (see *Princeton Rev.* July, 1872; Tayler Lewis, *The Primitiv Greek Religion*).

On what foundation did the primitive faith rest its confidence?

1. The knowledge, fear, and reverence which Adam retained even after the fall. Let it be fairly admitted that Adam, by transgression, was *lost* — lost to all spiritual good accompanying salvation; that the first of all the commandments — love — was completely obliterated in his heart; that he was *dead* in trespasses and sins. Still the apostle tells us that where the law of love had been written there was still left τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου

γράφον, the “work” of the law, which work is still written in the heart of even the heathen (^{<4124>}Romans 2:14, 15). This *work* he places largely in the domain of knowledge, and even conscience, yet it is not in any degree the law of love (1:32): “Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” This by nature is our own moral state; yet, blessed be God, knowledge, memory, reason, conscience, have not been entirely destroyed, though conscience has been seared, and all the faculties greatly debilitated. Adam, on leaving the garden, still retained the sad remembrance of happiness in great variety, now lost, lost! lost!! Lost *forever* through the former channel. With all that he had lost, who is there among us that would not travel a long, long pilgrimage to hear him tell the beauty of the garden inside; the perfect satisfaction of everything he saw, heard, felt, while innocent; the nature of that holiness which is only now to be regained by incessant labor, suffering, and watching; unimpeded communion with God. Darwin himself, and the modern race of improved baboons, might envy the intellect which he retained even then. Acquaintance with God! Fellowship of the Spirit! Seeing him as he is! Social worship in the holy family! The first Sabbath-day!

2. The promise of a Seed, a coming Deliverer, while as yet he had no child. Modern theologians can see in the first promise a deliverance, but many of us cannot see a personal Deliverer. It was not so with Eve, the mother of all living (^{<001>}Genesis 4:1): “I have obtained a man, the Lord.”* What if she were mistaken in the time, the individual, and many other material considerations? What if she were a Millenarian? An *Adventess*? Such can be found under brighter skies to-day. She had faith in One who is able to save to the uttermost. *SEE SEED OF PROMISE*. Through all those ancient faiths noted above there are traces of the coming One. Some of them retain this idea while they have lost many others, and sunk into dark paganism. Witness the ten Avatars of Vishnu, as well as the “Desire of all nations” (^{<3017>}Haggai 2:7).

3. The institution of sacrifice. This needs not here to be discussed; how early it was observed, how extensively propagated, however altered and perverted, it held a place in all ancient religions, teaching in some sense or other the doctrine of atonement by blood, as well as of purification by blood and water. *SEE ALTAR; SEE ATONEMENT; SEE SACRIFICE*.

4. The cherubim. For the structure and uses of these, see the word. For their spiritual meaning, *SEE LIVING CREATURES*; *SEE SERAPHIM*. Set over against the sword of flame, they were the symbols of mercy to those reconciled by the sacrifice. Their place in the ancient religions is well known, even after those religions had departed far from primitive rectitude, both in ritual and moral code.

The sphinx of Babylon and Egypt; the griffin of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the Serapis of Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the apes of Egypt; the Moloch of Moab and the Ammonites; the Baals of Syria, in all their variety; the ox of Bengal; the live buffalo of Calcutta; the triform idol of Chiun; and hundreds of other sacred images, including the teraphim—these all were derived from the original cherubim at the east of Paradise. At first these imitations may have been considered as mere memorials of the early devotion of honored and godly ancestors; but, in process of theological improvements, they became associated with the sun, moon, stars, fructifying and other general powers of nature, as well as with the more spiritual demands of man's higher nature, till they are seen clothed with the attributes of deity, and worshipped and served more than the Creator. To the tradition of the early cherubim, we think, more than to the inventive genius of any priesthood, must be traced these homogeneous idols with all their diversities of aspect. The true symbolism of the cherubim belonged to the universal and primal religion; the idolatrous imitations had their diversities from human fancy. This will account for the worship of the golden calf, to which the Israelites themselves were so easily seduced. Of all the depreciated forms of the early cherubim the Assyrian quadrupeds are the most complete. Layard passes high encomium on the skill and judgment of the inventors (?) in selecting the four highest forms of mundane life to represent the higher sphere of existence, while he utterly ignores the divine originals from which they were copied.

The cherubs at the Garden of Eden set over against the sword of flame, as well as those seen by Ezekiel evolved from a mass of fire, evidently were intended to symbolize that mercy which rejoices against judgment and delivers from wrath to come.

5. The flaming sword kept before the mind of worshippers the Justice to be satisfied. Whether we trace this to the sword of flame, the death of the victim, or the universal conscience, it is equally a portion of the primitive religion. The soul that sinneth deserves to die (~~☞~~ Romans 1:32). And we

know no better symbol that could have been introduced to exhibit the wretchedness of those who are twice dead.

6. The tree of life, untouched, waved its laden branches in the garden long after the expulsion of our first parents. While this emblem must of necessity call up the feeling of deep regret, it would, at the same time, after the door of mercy was opened, call for all the joy and all the effort that belong to a well-grounded hope. *That* tree could never be regained, perhaps not desirable *now* that it should be; but another Tree of Life in a higher paradise yields its fruit every month (~~621~~ Revelation 22).

Here it may be proper to observe that each of these early emblems of man's recovery is, from the very gate of Eden, carried uninterruptedly down the stream of revelation till we come to the last chapter of the last book; while other emblems have been added as occasion might demand. The rainbow had an early place and holds its position till: the last (~~600~~ Revelation 10:1). 7. Occasional revelations made to such men as Enoch Noah, and perhaps Lamech, the father of Noah (~~0629~~ Genesis 5:29), were still added to the former stock, and thus were all advances made to rest on the word of God. Before the use of writing, and even after, we find appeals made to what had been taught to the ancestors, whether by Providence or by revelation (~~888~~ Job 8:8; 15:10, 18; ~~693~~ Deuteronomy 4:31; 32:7; ~~940~~ Psalm 44:1). We think that none of the revelations that God has made have ever been lost.

X. Features. — Having seen the sure basis of this early religion, it is proper to glance at some of its characteristics.

1. It was a universal religion, adapted to *man as such* in every climate and for all time, having its primary relation to eternity. It was the work of evil men *then*, as it is *now*, to lop off and add to the truth of God till they had as many religions as languages throughout the world.

2. It was monotheistic: one Lord, one faith, one Spirit, one Mediator, one God and Father of all. The question whether the Persians borrowed from the Hebrews or the Hebrews from the Persians has no place here; the origin of both from one primitive source is sufficient to account for all the items of similarity, or even identity, in the two religions. So, also, we may reckon of the Hebrews and Egyptians, the Hebrews and the Greeks, and all affinities of this kind. While the primitive religion was monotheistic, there are many indications of a plurality of persons, as in ~~0000~~ Genesis 1:1, where

a singular verb is joined with *μυηταῖς*, as in a thousand other instances. So, too, ch. 1:24 and 3:22.

3. Delight in all that God has revealed of himself — the fact, as well as the doctrines, of inspiration. Adam was extensively a prophet — a seer. Not merely had he the intimation of the Deliverer, but there was given to him the future history of the whole race — the standing, irrepressible conflict, the numerous progeny, the heavy labor, the sore pain, the deep sorrow, all ending in the death of the body and its return to dust. On the other hand, the productiveness of the soil for constant support, acceptance of his service, occasional victories over evil, final triumph over sin and Satan in the One Seed. The third chapter of Genesis is too little studied. If John the Baptist could point to the Lamb of God, Adam had the first intimation of his coming, whether Adam was born of woman or not. So happily and largely are the words of inspiration connected with our redemption that Christ is pleased to wear the happy name, the Word of God.

But here, again, while the nations in separating from one another took, each one, some degree of respect for the Word revealed, or for some part of it, it was reserved to one nation only to preserve it pure and entire. “To the Jews were committed the oracles of God.” Other nations retained a glimmering tradition, a tetragrammaton, a holy phrase, of which they knew not the meaning and used it merely as a charm—a *φυλακτήριον*. How the true believer in every age and country appreciates the *word*, we may learn, if not by happy experience, by ~~EBOD~~ Psalm 119. Under these beams of the Sun of Righteousness, Enoch walked with God. Light and life and love are again restored. If we come to the particular doctrines of this primitive religion, we have many scattered hints of, say, acceptance with God, in the sacrifice of Abel; a higher life, in the translation of Enoch; retribution, in the conscience of Cain; calling on the name of the Lord, in the days of Enos; judgment combined with mercy, in the deluge and the cities of the plain; intercession, by Abraham; and from the same source, that the Judge of all the earth will do right; family government and instruction; covenant with God; precepts given to Noah; and many, very many, of the doctrine of of Christianity. But what a vacuum we should have just here were it not for the book of Job! Wherever the patriarch may have lived, or in whatever age, besides the *lesson* of his own biography we have, in the speeches of himself and of his friends: a very full development of the patriarchal theology. Whether each particular doctrine of Watson’s *Institutes* or Hodge’s *Outlines* could be deduced from the book of Job, or whether each

expression in it is to be relied on as correct, we shall not here inquire; but certain it is that each chapter contains a mass of theological thought befitting our age as well as that in which it was delivered. It opens with the doctrine of holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Next we have God's blessing on all that Job possessed, as in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 107:38. Then his anxiety about his children — their liability to sin. We have the atonement in his offering sacrifices; particular atonement, "to the *number of them all*." The humblest resignation when all was taken from him "Blessed be the name of the Lord." The Kinsman — a living Redeemer, and his coming to the earth. The speciality of providence is iterated and reiterated. But, not to dwell on the more common doctrines, we find some of those which would be an attainment even in our own time. Civil-service reform is taught, or rather taken for granted, in ch. 34:17, 18; and national reform in all its depth comes in ver. 29, 30: "When he giveth quietness, who then can give trouble? and when he hideth his face, who then can behold him? whether it be done against a nation or against a man only: that the hypocrite reign not, lest the people be ensnared." Let any one take up the book of Job under this aspect, and he will see how much of the Gospel there is in such passages as ch. 22:21-30; 33:14-30. Altogether, apart from the plot of the poem, there is wrought into the speeches a vast amount of the deep knowledge of God, not by the inspiration of the several speakers, but by their earnestness in using the floating capital which belonged to the patriarchal faith. The occasion was such as made an extraordinary call on their knowledge, and on their skill in using it.

We must here pass in silence the ancient religions of those respective nations which issued in the many gods of Greece and Rome, of the Celtic tribes, and the Gothic hordes. There was truth underlying them all, but oh, how deeply buried in the filth and rubbish of ages!

It is not to be denied that the worship of mere nature furnished the element of these fallen religions. We have enough of that in ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 44 among the chosen people. But it is never to be admitted that any religion was ever *originated* by man, however it may have been manipulated "by art and man's device." No historian can feel that Mohammed, even with the assistance of the monk Sergius, originated Islam; his claim was to restore the ancient religion of the world. Mecca was a place of pilgrimage ages before he was born. All his revelations were ostensibly to restore and improve the primitive faith of Adam, of Abraham, and of Ishmael. A large amount of popery, even, is, independent of divine revelation, brought down

from ancient traditions much later than the primitive faith. Paul preached at Athens the service of God, who made the world and all things therein (as the people had been taught by their own poets); though he was still, in a great measure, the Unknown, and the apostle was esteemed a setter-forth of strange deities. While we rejoice in the abundance of our Scriptures, it is to be remembered that Adam, Seth, and Enos did not require so much as we do. They were born to a bright inheritance near the throne of their heavenly Father. "Adam who was the son of God." Thus, while we have added line upon line as it was needed, the true religion is, like its Author, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." (R. H.)

* The particle **ta** here, however, is correctly rendered "front" in the English version. — ED.

Religiosi

a term applied, until the 10th century,) to those who led a monastic life, to distinguish them t from the clergy and laity. They were also called Canonici and Regulares (q.v.).

Religious

in a general sense, is something that relates to religion; and, in reference to persons, that which indicates that they give their attention to religion, and are so influenced by it as to differ from the world. It was also applied to members of monastic orders. *SEE RELIGIOSI.*

Religious Corporations.

In the United States, as there is no civil patronage to the Church, societies for public worship are incorporated in accordance with the statutes of the several states. In most of them there is a provision enabling any body of persons composing a fixed congregation to constitute themselves a corporation, and to elect trustees to hold and manage the property in its behalf. Some of the older denominations are incorporated under special acts and with particular regulations. A convenient digest of these legal prescriptions is given in Hunt's *Laws of Religious Corporations* (N. Y. 1876, 8vo). In many states there are likewise general laws for the incorporation of most kinds of benevolent, literary, and other bodies of a religious and social character. *SEE CHURCH AND STATE.*

Religious Education.

Both nature and revelation teach that it is the duty of parents to care for the religious education of their children. The mind of the child is in a receptive condition, and the first light it receives should be light from heaven, the first truths those that are eternal and immutable, never to desert them. The mind of the child cannot be shut up until he is of an age to investigate and determine for himself. It becomes, therefore; a high duty to furnish the expanding intellect with truths such as piety cherishes. The apostle says, "Fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (~~and~~ Ephesians 6:4). In the education of children several mistakes are to be avoided:

- (1.) That the habits of children only are to be regarded, and that, in time, principles will follow of course. Habits, without principles of piety, are nothing better than a citadel ungarrisoned and uncommanded.
 - (2.) That many of the subjects of religion are beyond the capacity of children, and that, therefore, to instruct them in Christianity is only to load their memories with words. Yet we do not defer other kinds of instruction till their nature and use can be completely understood by the pupil. But, in fact, the principles of religion are some of the most simple and intelligible which can be proposed to the human mind.
 - (3.) That to furnish children with religious ideas is to infuse into them prejudices. But we must be careful to discriminate between religious ideas and prejudices, for the latter is an unexamined opinion. And, further, by this very conduct we prejudice him against religion as something unworthy his concern, or beyond his comprehension. We do not so treat literature, politics, or science.
 - (4.) That the child will acquire in school and the public institutions of the Gospel an adequate sentiment and knowledge of religious truths. But if the love or natural interest of the parent in the child does not stimulate him to this duty, can it be expected that it will be voluntarily assumed by others? The institution of Sunday-schools does not diminish, in the least, the responsibility of those having charge of children to train them for God.
- SEE PEDAGOGICS.*

Religious Liberty

is the absolute freedom of religious opinion and worship based upon the fact that all men are bound by the laws of God and are responsible to him. From this primary and supreme obligation the conscience cannot be freed, and hence no human government has a right to hinder any form of religion, nor to support any to the injury of others. This implies the equality of all churches, religious associations, or persons in the matter of protection or restraint by the civil powers. We must not confound religious liberty, with religious toleration, for the latter is the assumption of the right by civil process to regulate religious affairs; and to permit implies the right to prevent. This severance of spiritual and civil affairs- is emphatically taught by our Lord: "My kingdom is not of this world" (~~John~~ John 18:36). A distinctive American principle of government is that what is religious is necessarily, from its very character, beyond the control of the civil government. In the United States, therefore, religious liberty is an absolute *personal* right. All denominations, churches, and religious faiths are equal and free in the eye of the law, none receiving gratuities, none subjected to inequalities. There is, thus, an entire divorce of Church and State. The Constitution of the United States contains these two articles: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The state constitutions are equally emphatic, and generally more specific in the expression of their jealousy of ecclesiastical ambition and sectarian intolerance. This example was set by Rhode Island, which has the honor of being the first state in the world to incorporate in its organic law, and to practice, absolute religious liberty. Under the influence of this American principle of government much change has been wrought in other countries. Toleration is becoming general, and the tendency is towards unrestrained liberty of worship. France bestows patronage upon several denominations; Germany, though claiming the management of ecclesiastical affairs, interferes but little with the right of worship. In Russia, Spain, and Italy there is less of former exclusiveness, and in the two latter countries different forms of faith are entitled to protection. Under English rule the colonies enjoy perfect religious liberty; the Anglican Church has been disestablished in Ireland, and there is in Great Britain no public position, not ecclesiastic, for the tenure of which a particular religious belief is required, except the throne and governorship of a few colleges. The

connection of Church and State is increasingly regarded as corrupting to the Church, destructive of the purity and spirituality of religion, and antagonistic to the rights of men. See Brook, *History of Religious Liberty*; Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance*; Wayland, *Discourses*.

Religious Societies,

associations for the promotion of personal piety established among members of the Church of England about 1678, and which existed until the rise of the Methodist. They began with a few young men who had been impressed by the preaching of Dr. Horneck, preacher at the Savoy, and of Mr. Smithies, lecturer at St. Michael's, Cornhill. The organization was somewhat similar to the societies of St. Vincent de Paul in Paris, or like those of the Collegiants and other pietistic communities in Holland and Germany. The members met once a week for religious conference and devotion, the meetings being conducted with singing, Scripture reading and exposition, and with special preparation for the holy communion. They added also practical works of charity, the establishment and maintenance of schools, the visitation of the poor, and support of missions in America. They were closely connected with the Society for the Reformation of Manners, established in 1691, and efficient allies to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. That at Oxford was joined by John and Charles Wesley, and by George Whitefield. — One of the last of the annual meetings of the London religious societies was held at Bow Church in 1738. See Woodward, *Rise and Progress of Religious Societies*; Nelson, *Address to Persons of Quality*; id. *Festivals and Fasts* (Preface); Blunt, *Hist. of Sects*, etc., s.v.

Reliquary

Picture for Reliquary (1)

a vessel for holding relics, and enclosed, in the 13th century, three grains of incense in honor of the Holy Trinity. It usually took the form of the building in which it was kept, as at the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris and Nivelles at the end of that century. In the 14th century cathedrals adopted for their reliquaries the form of a church, while in chapels and parish churches preference was given to images of gold and silver. Sometimes they take the shape of a coffer, or a transparent bier carried by ecclesiastics; a case-like cruet, a rose, a quatrefoil, a canister in an angel's hand; horns, as at Canterbury; a triptych, like the triple entrance of a

church; a lantern tower and spire, etc. In some cases the church bearing the name of a saint has his monument, but in other cases the relics only were preserved in portable shrines. Sometimes the reliquary took the form of some popular saint, a chest, or an altar. At Chichester the relic-chest of St. Richard is of oak, contains a door which was opened when the relics were exposed, and a slit for the reception of offerings in the cross-bar below it. At first the reliquaries were portable, to form accessories of a procession. In 745, relics and the cross were carried in the Rogation processions in England. At Rome the "three relics" are exhibited on Good-Friday-the portion of the true cross, the blade of the spear that pierced the Redeemer's side, and the veronica (q.v.). About the beginning of the 13th century the reliquaries upon the altar took the form of the limb or bust, called a corset (or corselet). They were arranged on great festivals on the rood-beam or retable above the high-altar.

Picture for Reliquary (2)

Relly

SEE RELLYANITES.

Rellyanites

or RELLYAN UNIVERSALISTS, the followers of Mr. James Relly. He first commenced his ministerial character in connection with Mr. Whitefield, and was received with great popularity. Upon a change of his views he encountered reproach, and was pronounced by many as an enemy to godliness. He believed that Christ as a Mediator was so united to mankind that his actions were theirs, his obedience and sufferings theirs, and, consequently, that he has as fully restored the whole human race to the divine favor as if all had obeyed and suffered in their own persons and upon this persuasion he preached a finished salvation, called by the apostle Jude "the common salvation." The Rellyanites are not observers of ordinances such as water baptism and the sacrament, but profess to believe only in one baptism, which they call all immersion of the mind or conscience into truth by the teaching of the Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit they are enabled to feed on Christ as the bread of life, professing that in and with Jesus they possess all things. They inculcate and maintain good works for necessary purposes, but contend that the principal and only work which ought to be attended to is the doing real good without religious ostentation; that to relieve the miseries and distresses of mankind according

to our ability is doing more real good than the superstitious observance of religious ceremonies. In general they appear to believe that there will be a resurrection to life and a resurrection to condemnation; that believers only will be among the former, who as first-fruits, and kings and priests, will have part in the first resurrection, and shall reign with Christ in his kingdom of the millennium; that unbelievers who are after raised must wait the manifestation of the Saviour of the world under that condemnation of conscience which a mind in darkness and wrath must necessarily feel; that believers, called kings and priests, will be made the medium of communication to their condemned brethren, who, like Joseph to his brethren, though he spoke roughly to them, in reality overflowed with affection and tenderness; that ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength; and thus every enemy shall be subdued to the kingdom and glory of the Great Mediator. Rely was succeeded (in 1781) by an American preacher, Elhanan Winchester, who had been a Calvinistic Baptist, but the congregation in London was soon broken up. This movement by Rely was the first attempt to consolidate a sect of which Universalism should be the leading tenet. A Mr. Murray belonging to this society emigrated to America, and preached these sentiments at Boston and elsewhere. Mr. Rely published several works, the principal of which are, *Union: — The Trial of Spirits: — Christian Liberty: — One Baptism: — The Salt of Sacrifice: — Antichrist Resisted: — Letters on Universal Salvation: — The Cherubimical Mystery.* **SEE UNIVERSALISTS.**

Rely, Jean De

a French preacher, was born about 1430. He was made doctor of theology at Arras, and became successively canon, chancellor, and archdeacon of Notre Dame at Paris, and rector of the university. In this capacity he drew up in 1461 the *Remonstrances* which the Parliament presented to Louis XI for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction, written with remarkable energy of style, and often reprinted both in French and in Latin. In 1483 he was deputy to the States-General of Tours, and presented to Charles VIII the result of their deliberations. In 1490 he became canon of St. Martin of Tours, and in Dec., 1491, he was elected bishop of Angers. He accompanied Charles VIII to Italy, where he was charged with several duties near pope Alexander VI. Rely died at Saumur March 27, 1499. Besides the *Breviary* of St. Martin of Tours, he revised by royal

commission the translation of the historical books of the Bible by Guyart de Moulins (1495, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Remali'ah

(Heb. *Renmalyahu*, Whyj ꞑirꞑ] *protected of Jehovah*; Sept. Ῥαμελίος or Ῥομελίος, v. r. Ῥομελία), the father of Pekah, king of Israel (^{<1215>}2 Kings 15:25, 27, 30, 32, 37; 16:1, 5; ^{<1436>}2 Chronicles 28:6), probably a man whose character was such as to make his name a reproach to his descendants (^{<2370>}Isaiah 7:4, 5; 8:6). B.C. ante 756. *SEE PEKAH*.

Rembrandt

commonly called *Rembrandt van Rhyn*, was the son of Hermann Gerritsz, and was born in his father's mill on the banks of the Rhine, between Leyderdorp and Koudekerk, near Leyden, June 15, 1606 (or 1608). The former date rests on the authority of Orlers, *Description of Leyden* (1641). The latter date rests on the painter's marriage certificate, lately discovered, dated June 10, 1634, in which Rembrandt's age is stated to be twenty-six. He became the pupil of Jacob van Swanenburg, with whom he remained three years. He studied also under Pieter Lastman at Amsterdam, and Jacob Pinas at Haarlem. He settled at Amsterdam in 1630, and appears to have died there, according to Immerzeel, July 19, 1664; but no register of his burial has yet been discovered. Rembrandt was equally distinguished as an etcher and a painter. His etchings amount to nearly 400, and they are dated from 1628 to 1661. The chief characteristic of his works is forcible light and shade. Among his most remarkable historical paintings are *Moses Destroying the Tables of the Law*: — *The Sacrifice of Abraham*: — *The Woman Taken in Adultery*: — *The Descent from the Cross*: — *The Nativity*: — *Christ in the Garden with Mary Magdalene*: — and *The Adoration of the Magi*. There are 640 of his paintings specified in Smith's *Catalogue*. The best of them are still owned in Holland. He is well represented in the National Gallery, and his influence has been more direct upon the British school of painters than that of any other master. See Immerzeel, *Aanteekeningen op de Lofr'edd op Rembrandt*, also *De Levens en Werken der Hollandsche en Vlaamsche Kunstschilders*, etc. (1843); Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*; Burnet, *Rembr. and his Works* (1848); Middleton, *Etched Work of Rembr.* (Lond. 1879).

Re'meth

(Heb. *id.* תמר, *height*; Sept. Ῥαμμάθ v. r. Ῥαμμάς), a city in the territory of Issachar (^{<1692>}Joshua 19:21), called, as it seems, RAMOTH *SEE* *RAMOTH* (q.v.) in ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 6:73. As the place is named in the first of the above passages next to En-gannim (Jenin), the site is possibly represented by a *tell* with ruins south of Zerin (Jezreel) between Sundela and Mukeibileh. Dr. Porter (in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s.v.) suggests that the place may be identical with the ruined fortress and village called *Wezar*, perched upon the northern rocky face of Mt. Gilboa (Robinson, *Researches*, 3:157, 160; new ed. 3, 339).

Remi

SEE *REMIGIUS*.

Remigius Of Auxerre

was a learned French Benedictine monk in the 9th century, and was brought up in the abbey of St. Germain, Auxerre. He was appointed teacher to the schools belonging to the monastery, afterwards taught at Rheims, then went to Paris and opened the first public school in that city after learning had sunk under the ravages of the Normans. His works are, *Commentarius in Omnes Davidis Psalmos* (Cologne, 1536): — *Enarrationes in Posteriores XI Minores Prophetas* (Antwerp, 1545), with the *Commentaries* of OEcumenius on the Acts and Epistles, and those of Arethas on Revelation: — and *Expositio Missa*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Lyons,

a celebrated French archbishop in the 9th century, and grand almoner to the emperor Lothaire, succeeded Amolo in the above see about the year 853 or 854. It is supposed to be this St. Remigius who, in the name of the Church of Lyons, wrote an answer to the three letters of Hincmar of Rheims, and others, in which he defends St. Augustine's doctrine on grace and predestination. This answer may be found in the *Vindicie Predestinationis et Gratice* (1650, 2 vols. 4to), and in the library of the fathers. He presided at the Council of Valence in 855, and others of the same kind; and, after founding some pious institutions, he died Oct. 28, 875. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Rheims,

a very celebrated French archbishop, was raised to the see of Rheims about 460. He distinguished himself by his learning and virtue, converted and baptized king Clovis, and died Jan. 13, 533. Some *Letters* and a *Testament* in the library of the fathers are attributed to him. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Remigius, Or Remi Of Strasburg,

a bishop known only for having founded the monastery of Aschau. He died in 803. He is often confounded with *abbe* REMI of Munster, who died in 768. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reminiscere

(*remember*), a name sometimes given to the second Sunday in Lent, from the first word of the *Introit*, "Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies," etc. (^{<19216>}Psalm 25:6).

Remling, Franz Xaver

a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1803 at Edenkoben. In 1827 he was ordained a priest, and in 1852 he became a member of the chapter. In 1853 the Academy of Munich appointed him as corresponding member, and in 1856 the Munich University honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy. He died June 28, 1873. He wrote, *Das Reformationswerk in der Pfalz* (Mannheim, 1846): *Geschichte der Bischöfe zu Speyer* (Mainz, 1852-54, 2 vols.): — *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Speyer* (ibid. 1852, 1853 sq.). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1054; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1865, p. 443 sq.; 1866, p. 298; 1873, p. 430. (B. P.)

Rem'mon

(^{<16917>}Joshua 19:7). *SEE RIMMON.*

Rem'mon-meth'oar

[some *Metho'ar*] (^{<16913>}Joshua 19:13). *SEE RIMMON.*

Remoboth

and SARABAITES, names given to associations of hermits in the early Church who refused to submit to monastic regulations. The *Remoboth*, whose name originated in Syria, are mentioned as belonging to this class by Jerome (*Ep. 18 ad Eustochium, De Custodia Virginitatis*). He says that they were more numerous than other monks in Svria and Palestine; that they lived in the towns in complete independence, and in companies of not more than two or three persons; that they supported themselves by labor, and often quarrelled among themselves. A similar class of hermits, living in Egypt, is mentioned in Cassian (*Collatio*, 18 c. 7) under the name *Sarabaites*, said to have been applied to them because they separated themselves from the monasteries and personally made provision for their needs. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Remond (Or Raemon), Florimond De,

a French historian, who was born about 1540, and died in 1602, is noteworthy here only for his spleen against the Huguenots, which he vented especially in his *Antichrist*. He also wrote in refutation of the story of the popess Joan (q.v.), as did likewise his son, *abbe* CHARLES REMOND, among other things. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Remonstrance

a complaint framed by the Commons of England in 1628, and addressed to Charles I, setting forth the increase of popery in consequence of the relaxation of the penal laws; the preferments given to papists; and a commission being issued to compound for the penalties incurred by popish recusants. It also described the discouragement shown to orthodox preachers and teachers, and the prohibition of their books. The king attempted to suppress this remonstrance, and afterwards published an answer to its allegations.

Remonstrants

a name given to the ARMINIANS *SEE ARMINIANS* (q.v.) by reason of a remonstrance which, in 1610, they made to the States of Holland against the decree of the Synod of Dort, which condemned them as heretics. Episcopus and Grotius were at the head of the Remonstrants. The

Calvinists presented a counter-address, and were called *Contra-remonstrants*.

Rem'phan

Picture for Remphan

(Ὶ Ρεμφάν v. r. Ὶ Ρεφάν) is named in ^{<407B>}Acts 7:43 as an idol worshipped by the Israelites in the desert, in a passage quoted by Stephen from ^{<308B>}Amos 5:26, where the Sept. has Ὶ Ραιφάν (v. r. Ὶ Ρομφᾶ), for the Heb. ^{~WYKæ} *Chiun*. In the following discussion we review the various explanations given of this Word. Much difficulty has been occasioned by this corresponding occurrence of two names so wholly different in sound. The most reasonable opinion seemed to be that Chiun was a Hebrew or Shemitic name, and Remphan an Egyptian equivalent substituted by the Sept. The former, rendered *Saturn* in the Syriac, was compared with the Arabic and Persian *Kaywan*, “the planet Saturn,” and, according to Kircher, the latter was found in Coptic with the same signification; but perhaps he had no authority for this, excepting the supposed meaning of the Hebrew Chiun. They, indeed, occur as such in the Coptic-Arabic Lexicon of Kircher (*Ling. Egypt. Restit.* p. 49; *Edip. Egypti*, 1, 386); but Jablonski has long since shown that this and other names of planets in these lexicons are of Greek origin, and drawn from the Coptic versions of Amos and the Acts (Jablonski, *Remphan Egyptior.*, in *Opusc.* ii, 1 sq.). Egyptology has, moreover, shown that this is not the true explanation. Among the foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt, two, the god Renpu, perhaps pronounced Rempu, and the goddess Ken, occur together. Before endeavoring to explain the passages in which Chiun and Remphan are mentioned, it will be desirable to speak, on the evidence of monuments, of the foreign gods worshipped in Egypt, particularly Renpu and Ken, and of the idolatry of the Israelites while in that country.

Besides those divinities represented on the monuments of Egypt which have Egyptian forms or names, or both, others have foreign forms or names, or both. Of the latter, some appear to have been introduced at a very remote age. This is certainly the case with the principal divinity of Memphis, Ptah, the Egyptian Hephaestus. The name Ptah is from a Shemitic root, for it signifies “open,” and in Heb. we find the root **j tP**; and its cognates, “he or it opened,” whereas there is no word related to it in Coptic. The figure of this divinity is that of a deformed pygmy, or

perhaps unborn child, and is unlike the usual representations of divinities on the monuments. In this case there can be no doubt that the introduction took place at an extremely early date, as the name of Ptah occurs in very old tombs in the necropolis of Memphis, and is found throughout the religious records. It is also to be noticed that this name is not traceable in the mythology of neighboring nations, unless, indeed, it corresponds to that of the Πάταικοι or Παταϊκοί, whose images, according to Herodotus, were the figure-heads of Phoenician ships (3:37). The foreign divinities that seem to be of later introduction are not found throughout the religious records, but only in single tablets, or are otherwise very rarely mentioned, and two out of their four names are immediately recognised to be non-Egyptian. They are Renpu, and the goddesses Ken, Anta, and Astarte. The first and second of these have foreign forms; the third and fourth have Egyptian forms: there would therefore seem to be an especially foreign character about the former two.

- (1.) Renpu, pronounced Rempu (?), is represented as an Asiatic, with the full beard and apparently the general type of face given on the monuments to most nations east of Egypt, and to the Rebu or Libyans. This type is evidently that of the Shemites. His hair is bound with a fillet, which is ornamented in front with the head of an antelope.
- (2.) Ken is represented perfectly naked, holding in both hands corn, and standing upon a lion. In the last particular the figure of a goddess at Maltheiyyeh, in Assyria, may be compared (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 212). From this occurrence of a similar representation, from her being naked and carrying corn, and from her being worshipped with Khem, we may suppose that Ken corresponded to the Syrian goddess, at least when the latter had the character of Venus. She is also called Ketesh, which is the name in hieroglyphics of the great Hittite town on the Orontes. This in the present case is probably a title, hvdqj it can scarcely be the name of a town where she was worshipped, applied to her as personifying it.
- (3.) Anata appears to be Anaitis. and her foreign character seems almost certain from her being jointly worshipped with Renpu and Ken.
- (4.) Astarte is of course the Ash-toreth of Canaan. On a tablet in the British Museum the principal subject is a group representing Ken, having Khem on one side and Renpu on the other; beneath is an adoration of

Anata. On the half of another tablet Ken and Khem occur, and a dedication to Renpu and Ketesh.

We have no clue to the exact time of the introduction of these divinities into Egypt, nor, except in one case, to any particular places of their worship. Their names occur as early as the period of the 18th and 19th dynasties, and it is therefore not improbable that they were introduced by the Shepherds. Astarte is mentioned in a tablet of Amenoph II, opposite Memphis, which leads to the conjecture that she was the foreign Venus there worshipped, in the quarter of the Phoenicians of Tyre, according to Herodotus (2, 112). It is observable that the Shepherds worshipped Sutekh, corresponding to Seth, and also called Bar (that is, Baal), and that under king Apepi he was the sole god of the foreigners. Sutekh was probably a foreign god, and was certainly identified with Baal. The idea that the Shepherds introduced the foreign gods is therefore partly confirmed. As to Renpu and Ken we can only offer a conjecture. They occur together, and Ken is a form. of the Syrian goddess, and also bears some relation to the Egyptian god of productiveness, Khem. Their similarity to Baal and Ashtoreth seems strong, and perhaps it is not unreasonable to suppose that they were the divinities of some tribe from the east, not of Phoenicians or Canaanites, settled in Egypt during the Shepherd period. The naked goddess Ken would suggest such worship as that of the Babylonian Mylitta, but the thoroughly Shemitic appearance of Renpu is rather in favor of an Arab source. Although we have not discovered a Shemitic origin of either name, the absence of the names in the mythologies of Canaan and the neighboring countries, as far as they are known to us, inclines us to 'look to Arabia, of which the early mythology is extremely obscure.

The Israelites in Egypt, after Joseph's rule, appear to have fallen into a general, but doubtless not universal, practice of idolatry. This is only twice distinctly stated and once alluded to (~~16244~~ Joshua 24:14; ~~23107~~ Ezekiel 20:7, 8; 23:3), but the indications are perfectly clear. The mention of Chiun or Remphan as worshipped in the desert shows that this idolatry was, in part at least, that of foreigners, and no doubt of those settled in Lower Egypt. The golden calf, at first sight, would appear to be an image of Apis of Memphis, or Mnevis of Heliopolis, or some other sacred bull of Egypt; but it must be remembered that we read in the Apocrypha of "the heifer Baal" (Tobit 1:5), so that it was possibly a Phoenician or Canaanitish idol. The best parallel to this idolatry is that of the Phoenician colonies in Europe, as

seen in the idols discovered in tombs at Camirus in Rhodes by M. Salzmann. and those found in tombs in the island of Sardinia (of both of which there are specimens in the British Museum), and those represented on the coins of Melita and the island of Ebusus.

We can now endeavor to explain the passages in which Chiun and Remphan occur. The Masoretic text of ~~<10B>~~ Amos 5:26 reads thus: “But ye bare the tent [or “tabernacle”] of your king and Chiun your images, the star of your gods [or “your god”], which ye made for yourselves.” In the Sept. we find remarkable differences; it reads, *Καὶ Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὓς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς.* The Vulg. agrees with the Masoretic text in the order of the clauses, though omitting Chiun or Remphan. “Et portastis tabernaculum Moloch vestro, et imaginem idolorum vestrorum, sidus dei vestri, quae fecistis vobis.” The passage is cited in the Acts almost in the words of the Sept.: “Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them” (*Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς*). A slight change in the Hebrew would enable us to read Moloch (Malcam or Milcom) instead of “your king.” Beyond this it is extremely difficult to explain the differences. The substitution of Remphan for Chiun cannot be accounted for by verbal criticism. The Hebrew does not seem as distinct in meaning as the Sept.; and if we may conjecturally emend it from the latter, the last clause would be “your images which ye made for yourselves;” and if we further transpose Chiun to the place of “your god Remphan,” in the Sept., *μκλ m twks ta* would correspond to *ˆwyk μkyhl a bkwk ta*; but how can we account for such a transposition as would thus be supposed, which, be it remembered, is less likely in the Hebrew than in a translation of a difficult passage? If we compare the Masoretic text and the supposed original, we perceive that in the former *μkym l x ˆwyk* corresponds in position to *μkyhl a bkwk*, and it does not seem an unwarrantable conjecture that *ˆwyk* having been by mistake written in the place of *bkwk* by some copyist, *μkym l x* was also transposed. It appears to be more reasonable to read “images which ye made” than “gods which ye made,” as the former word occurs.. Supposing these emendations to be probable, we may now examine the meaning of the passage.

The tent or tabernacle of Moloch is supposed by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v. **טבאקס**) to have been an actual tent, and he compares the **σκηνὴ ἱερά** of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. 20:65). But there is some difficulty in the idea that the Israelites carried about so large an object for the purpose of idolatry, and it seems more likely that it was a small model of a larger tent or shrine. The reading *Moloch* appears preferable to “your king;” but the mention of the idol of the Ammonites as worshipped in the desert stands quite alone. It is perhaps worthy of note that there is reason for supposing that Moloch was a name of the planet Saturn, and that this planet was evidently supposed by the ancient translators to be intended by Chiun and Remphan. The correspondence of Remphan or Raiphon to Chiun is extremely remarkable, and can, we think, only be accounted for by the supposition that the Sept. translator or translators of the prophet had Egyptian knowledge, and being thus acquainted with the ancient joint worship of Ken and Renpu, substituted the latter for the former, as they may have been unwilling to repeat the name of a foreign Venus. The star of Remphan, if indeed the passage is to be read so as to connect these words, would be especially appropriate if Remphan were a planetary god; but the evidence for this, especially as partly founded upon an Arabic or Persian word like Chiun, is not sufficiently strong to enable us to lay any stress upon the agreement. In hieroglyphics the sign for a star is one of the two composing the word Seb, “to adore,” and is undoubtedly there used in a symbolical as well as a phonetic sense, indicating that the ancient Egyptian religion was partly derived from a system of star-worship; and there are representations on the monuments of mythical creatures or men adoring stars (*Ancient Egyptians*, pl. 30 a). We have, however, no positive indication of any figure of a star being used as an idolatrous object of worship. From the manner in which it is mentioned, we may conjecture that the star of Remphan was of the same character as the tabernacle of Moloch, an object connected with false worship rather than an image of a false god. According to the Sept. reading of the last clause, it might be thought that these objects were actually images of Moloch and Remphan; but it must be remembered that we cannot suppose an image to have had the form of a tent, and that the version of the passage in the Acts, as well as the Masoretic text; if in the latter case we may change the order of the words, gives a clear sense. As to the meaning of the last clause, it need only be remarked that it does not oblige us to infer that the Israelites made the images of the false gods, though they may have done so, as in the case of the golden calf; it may mean no more than that they adopted these gods.

It is to be observed that the whole passage does not indicate that distinct Egyptian idolatry was practiced by the Israelites. It is very remarkable that the only false gods mentioned as worshipped by them in the desert should be probably Moloch and Chiun and Remphan, of which the latter two were foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt. From this we may reasonably infer that while the Israelites sojourned in Egypt there was also a great stranger-population in the Lower Country, and therefore that it is probable that then the Shepherds still occupied the land. See Schroder, *De Tabernac. Alolochi et Stella Dei Remph.* (Marb. 1745); Maius, *Dissert. de Kium et Remphan* (1763); *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1852, p. 1039; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 669, 670. **SEE CHIUN.**

Renaissance

Picture for Renaissance

(Fr. *new birth*), a term used alike in architecture, sculpture, and ornamental art, to designate a revival period or style after the Middle Ages. The Renaissance had its origin in Italy, where, at best, Gothic architecture secured but a precarious hold. The discovery (early in the 15th century) of the productions of the ancients in statuary and painting, and the bringing to light of long-hidden stores of Greek and Latin MSS. (as, for instance, Vitruvius on the architecture of the ancients), could not fail to bring Roman buildings into prominent notice, and to predispose the public mind in favor of the classic style. A new system was consequently developed, during the first stages of which (namely, the Transition period) the elements of Roman architecture came again into use, although the forms which belong to the Later-Romanesque period — as, for instance, the division of the window-arches by mullions — were not entirely abandoned. Starting in Italy, this new style reached its zenith in that country in the course of the same century. Although derived from that of Italy, each country had its peculiar Renaissance, described accordingly as French, German, and English Renaissance, preserving a general likeness, but each exhibiting traits exclusively its own.

1. Italian. — At the early epoch of its existence, the new style of architecture displays not so much an alteration in the arrangement of the spaces and of the main features of the buildings as in the system of ornamentation and in the aspect of the profiles. During the early period the endeavor was maintained to adapt classical forms with more or less freedom to modern buildings while later (in the 16th century) a scheme

based on ancient architecture was universally prescriptive. Two distinct styles belong to this first period, viz. the Early Florentine and the Early Venetian. In the Roman Renaissance, the system of the second period, which confines itself more closely to classical elements, is more prevalent. The decoration of the interiors of the buildings of the Renaissance is copied from ancient Roman architecture. The rooms are either vaulted or have flat ceilings; but in both cases they are adorned with paintings, after the manner of those discovered in the Baths of Titus. Ornamented panels were employed in large palaces for horizontal ceilings, as also in churches, though in the latter case they were more often applied to cupola vaultings, as notably in St. Peter's. *SEE ROME.*

2. French. — France was the first to introduce the new style north of the Alps, Fra Giocondo, an Italian artist, having been summoned thither by Louis XII. Giocondo erected for cardinal D'Amboise, the minister of that monarch, the celebrated Chateau Gaillon. At this time the Flamboyant (q.v.) style was still in its vigor, and the consequence was that a blending of the two styles temporarily prevailed. After the period of Philibert Delorme, who completed the chapel of the Chateau d'Anet in the Renaissance style (1552), the Gothic style was, as a rule, abandoned. At the same time, the general arrangement of the Gothic churches was retained, and it was only the Renaissance system of decoration which was substituted for the Gothic. The ground-plan, the proportions, and the whole structure, with its flying buttresses, pinnacles, clustered columns, and deeply recessed portals, are borrowed from the pointed style. It was only in the details and in the ornamentation that the Renaissance was followed. The Tuileries, as built for Catherine de Medicis, is a great example of French Renaissance when at its best. In its elevation richness is perceptible without excess, and symmetry is attained without stiffness: in fact, it presents a design in which aesthetic laws are fully considered, and the details harmoniously, if not magnificently, executed.

3. German. — The Renaissance style was not employed in Germany before the middle of the 16th century, and the most noteworthy instances of it are the Belvedere of Ferdinand I on the Hradschin at Prague, and the so-called Otto Henry buildings at Heidelberg Castle. In Germany, as in other countries, the elements of the preceding style are intermingled with those of the Renaissance during the early period of its prevalence. The fault of the German Renaissance style is a certain heaviness—an exuberance, not to say extravagance, in its constructive character and decorative details.

4. Spanish. — In Spain an Early Renaissance style appears, a kind of transitional Renaissance, belonging to the first half of the 16th century. It consists of the application of Moorish and pointed-arch forms in conjunction with those of classical antiquity. In this way a conformation was produced which was peculiar to Spain, and the style is characterized by bold lightness, by luxuriance in decoration, and by a spirit of romance. In the reign of Charles V, this ornate Early Renaissance style gave place to a later one, which, in reality, belongs to the Rococo style. Among the Renaissance edifices of Spain may be mentioned the upper gallery of the cloister of the Convent of Huerta, the townhall of Saragossa and of Seville, and the Alcazar at Toledo.

5. English. — The Italian Renaissance style was introduced into England about the middle of the 16th century by John of Padua, the architect of Henry VIII. English buildings of this style are distinguished by capricious treatment of forms, and generally exhibit a deficiency of that grace and dignity, both in details and ensemble, which lend a peculiar charm to Italian structures in the same style. Longleat House, Wiltshire, and Wollaton Hall are specimens of this style. See *English Cylop.* s.v.; Rosengarten, *Architectural Styles*. **SEE ROCOCO; SEE ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE.**

Renanah

SEE PEACOCK.

Renaudot, Eusebe

a French savant, was born at Paris, July 20, 1646. His early studies were carried on among the Jesuits, and in the College of Harcourt. On their completion he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, but without taking orders. Though he remained but a short time in this institution, the whole of his life was passed in similar ones, and was devoted to his favorite studies of theology and Oriental literature. His knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs caused him to be employed in many negotiations with foreign countries, and his talent made him a favorite at court. In 1700 abbe Renaudot went to Rome, and received from Clement XI the priory of Frossay, in Brittany. During his whole career he endeavored to re-establish the printing of the Oriental classics, and interested the duke of Orleans in the subject, but it was never accomplished. He died at Paris, Sept. 1, 1720. Renaudot's writings were numerous, though he published nothing until a

few years before his death. We mention, *Defense de la Perpetuite de la Foi*, etc. (Paris, 1708): — *Gennadii Patriarchce Homiloë de Eucharistia*, etc. (ibid. 1709): — *La Penpetuite de la iFoide l'Eglise sur les Sacrements*, etc. (ibid. 1713): — *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*, etc. (ibid. 1713). This is the most complete work ever written upon the history of Egyptian Christianity. It is based upon the *Arabic* narrative of bishop Severus, and contains a complete list of the Jacobite patriarchs from Cyril to John Touki, who lived early in the 18th century: — *Liturgium Orientalium Collectio* (ibid. 1715-16): — *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*, etc. (ibid. 1718). Besides these, he left works on purely literary subjects, and several valuable *MSS.*: — *Histoire de Saladin*: — *Histoire des Patriarches Syniens et de la Secte iNestorienne*, and *Traite de l'Eglise d'Ethiopie*. See *De Beri, Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscript. v*; Niceron, *Memoires*, 12 and 20. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rend

is the translation of several Heb. and Gr. words in the Bible. The following only are of special significance.

1. The rending ($\text{[רָצַף; רָצַף; רָצַף]}$) of one's clothes, is an expression frequently used in Scripture as the token of the highest grief. Reuben, to denote his sorrow for Joseph, rent his clothes (⁴¹³⁷Genesis 37:29); Jacob did the like (ver. 34), and Ezra, to express the concern and uneasiness of his mind, and the apprehensions he entertained of the divine displeasure on account of the people's unlawful marriages, is said to have rent his garments and mantle (⁴¹⁰⁸Ezra 9:3), that is, both his inner and upper garment. This action was also an expression of indignation and holy zeal; the high-priest rent his clothes, pretending that our Saviour had spoken blasphemy (⁴¹⁶⁶Matthew 26:65), and so did the apostles when the people intended to pay them divine honors (⁴¹⁴⁴Acts 14:14). **SEE CLOTHING.**

To rend the garments was in Eastern countries and among ancient nations a symbolical action, expressive of sorrow, fear, or contrition. (See the monographs on the subject in Latin by Grunewold [Hafn. 1708]; Hilliger [Wittenb. 1716]; Rohrensee [ibid. 1668]; Schroder, [Jen. 1716]; and Wickmannshausen [Wittenb. 1716].) The passage in ⁴¹¹³Joel 2:13, "Rend your hearts, and not your garments," is in allusion to this practice. But the phrase here is a Hebraism, meaning "Rend your hearts *rather than* your

garments,” or “Rend your hearts, and not your garments only;” for the prophet does not forbid the external appearances of mourning, but he cautions them against a merely hypocritical show of sorrow, and exhorts them to cherish that contrite and broken spirit which is acceptable in the sight of God. *SEE BURIAL; SEE MOURNING.*

2. In the prophet ⁽²⁴⁹⁾Jeremiah 4:30, when he denounces the divine judgments upon the people, it is said, “Though thou rentest ([r̄q̄) thy face with painting;” the Hebrew has, instead of face, “eyes,” and the expression is an allusion to the Eastern practice of painting the eyes, which we have explained under the words EYE and PAINT.

Rendu, Louis

a French prelate, was born at Meyrin, Dec. 19, 1789. He entered the priesthood and spent his life in teaching and scientific research. In 1833 he published a work entitled *De l'Influence des Lois sur les Moeurs et des Moeurs sur les Lois*. This gained for the author a wide reputation. He was afterwards made bishop of Annecy. His works were entirely scientific on geology, meteorology, chemistry. He died Aug. 18, 1859. See *Mgr. Louis Rendu*, by the abbe G. Mermillod. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Renee d'Este

duchess of Ferrara and princess of France, whose career was closely interwoven with the history of the Reformation, was the second daughter of king Louis XII and Anne of Brittany, and was born at Blois, Oct. 29, 1510 (according to some authorities, Oct. 10 or 25; we follow Bonnet [J.], *Lettres de J. Calvin*, i, 43). She was married July 30, 1527, to duke Hercules of Ferrara, and became the mother of five children; and in the exercise of her tastes for literature and art she made the court of Ferrara a centre of culture which emulated that of Florence and the Medici. Her sympathies, directed no less by personal conviction than by the traditions of her family and her early education, were with the Reformation. She encouraged Brucchioli to prepare an Italian version of the Bible, and allowed him to dedicate to her the first edition (1541), and she afforded a refuge to fugitive Protestants. Calvin availed himself of this asylum in 1535, and thus began a relation which was of great value to the duchess while he lived. He was allowed to pray and expound the Scriptures in a chapel which is still shown, until remonstrances from Rome induced the duke to banish him, and with him all the Protestant friends of his consort,

down to the servants brought with her from France. The same influence led to the persecution of Renee in person. The relations of Ferrara with France had been broken off, and political added to religious prejudices aggravated the situation; but beyond restraints and disrespect she suffered little, until in 1545 the Inquisition was established in Ferrara and the reconquest of the land to Romanism began. The co-operation of Henry II of France was secured; Renee was compelled to listen to sermons in denunciation of her principles; her husband caused her to be imprisoned with two of her women, and placed her daughters Leonora and Lucretia in a convent. These measures broke her spirit and brought her to confession and attendance on the mass. She was restored to liberty Dec. 1, 1554, after an imprisonment of two and a half months. She had enjoyed the counsel of Protestant friends during much of her period of trial: Calvin had written frequent letters, and had sent Francis Morel (of Collanges) to act as her spiritual adviser; and her former secretary, Leon Jamez, had also sustained her faithfully; but, in the heat of a persecution in which but few stood firm, her resolution gave way. The unfaltering fidelity of the whole of her subsequent life atoned for that single and temporary lapse. The experience of Renee was sufficiently trying in other respects as well. Her daughter Anna was married, against the earnest protest of her mother, to the chief opponent of the Protestant cause, duke Francis of Guise (Sept. 29, 1548). Her eldest son, Alphonso, quarrelled with his father and fled the country in 1552. Her husband died Oct. 3, 1559, after exacting from her an oath that she would no longer correspond with Calvin, from which she was, however, absolved by Calvin. Alphonso succeeded his father, and, influenced by pope Pius IV, at once compelled his mother to renounce his country or her faith. She chose the former alternative, and returned to France in September, 1560, leaving her children in Ferrara. France was at this period troubled with the disputes of Navarre and Conde with the Guises, and Conde lay in prison awaiting death. Renee did not hesitate to censure the disloyal cruelty of the Guises; and when their power was broken, on the death of Francis II, she became the open promoter of the Reformation. She invited Protestant clergymen into the country and caused Protestant worship to be held at her seat of Montargis and wherever she might make a temporary home in other places; but she was none the less earnestly engaged in promoting peace between the contending parties. At Montargis she so compromised their disputes that they were definitively laid aside. Her charities and her counsels were expended upon applicants of every class. When her son-in-law, the duke of Guise, began the war which

during thirty years drenched France with blood, she determined that Montargis should be a refuge to all Protestant fugitives. Francis of Guise died Feb. 24, 1563, and the peace of Amboise was declared in March of the same year; and, as she was thereafter forbidden to celebrate the worship of her Church in Paris, even in her own house, she retired permanently to Montargis, though she subsequently accompanied Charles IX on his tour through the kingdom. She founded a school, enlarged and beautified the town, and took a lively interest in the translation of the New Test. into Spanish. At this time she received a last letter from Calvin, written (April 4, 1564) while he was on his death-bed, by the hand of his brother. From this period the records of her life become rare. The second religious war (Sept., 1567, to March, 1568) did not disturb her. She was at the H/tel de Laon in Paris during St. Bartholomew's Night, but was exempted from the general massacre, and succeeded in rescuing several of her coreligionists, whom she carried to Montargis and aided to effect their ultimate escape. She ended her noble life June 12, 1575. An eloquent testimony to her faith was included in her will. Her remains were interred in the church at Montargis. See Munch [Ernst], *Renata von Este und ihre Tochter* (1831-33, 2 vols.), not important and not always trustworthy; Catteau-Calleville, *Vie de Renee de France* (Berl. 1781-83). Brief biographies are given in M'Crie, *Hist. of the Ref. in Italy*; and Gerdes, *Specimen Italioe Reformatoe*; and a more detailed life in Young, *Life and Times of Aonio Paleario* (Lond. 1860, 2 vols.); Bayle, *La France Protestante*, viii; Bonnet [Jules], *La Vie d'Olympe Morate*; and *Lettres de Jean Calvin*. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Renesse, Ludwig Gerard Van

a Dutch ascetic author, was born at Breda, May 11, 1599. As an evangelical minister he preached at Maerssen, in the province of Utrecht. In 1638 he was called to Breda, where he founded a college, of which he was the first director and professor of theology. The University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of doctor of theology. He was a fine linguist, and corresponded with the most celebrated theologians of his time. His principal works are, *Painted Jezebel* (1654): — *Treatises on the Care, Authority, and Duty of Elders in the Church* (1659-64): — and *Meditations* on religious subjects. These are all written in Flemish. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Rennell, Thomas

(1), D.D., an English clergyman, was born in 1754, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became curate of Barnack, and prebendary of Winchester (resigned 1797) rector of St. Magnus's, London Bridge, in 1792; master of the Temple from 1797 to 1827; dean of Winchester in 1805; rector of Alton, Hants, in 1809; vicar of Barton Stacey, Hants, in 1814. He died in 1840. He published, single *Sermons* (Lond. 1793-98), and a volume of *Discourses* (ibid. 1801). Mr. Pitt styled him "the Demosthenes of the pulpit." See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.

Rennell, Thomas

(2), D.D., a learned English divine, son of the above, was born at Winchester in 1787, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became Christian advocate at Cambridge and vicar of Kensington in 1816; and master of St. Nicholas's Hospital and prebendary of Salisbury in 1823. He died in 1824. Mr. Rennell was one of the editors of and contributors to the (Eton) *Miniature* and the *British Critic*, and a contributor to the *Museum Criticum*. He published, *Palentes Morbi: — Animadversions on the Unitarian Version of the New Test.* (1811, 8vo): — *Remarks on Scepticism* (1819, 12mo; 6th ed. 1824): — *Proofs of Inspiration*, etc. (1822, 8vo): — *Sermons* (3d ed. Lond. 1831, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.

Renniger, Or Rhanger, Michael

was born in Hampshire, 1529, and was educated at, and a fellow of, Magdalen College, Oxford. He embraced the principles of the Reformation, resided chiefly at Strasburg during the reign of Mary, and was made chaplain to Elizabeth on her accession. He became prebendary of Winchester in 1560, precentor and prebendary of Lincoln in 1567, archdeacon of Winchester in 1575, and prebendary of St. Paul's, in 1583. He died Aug. 26, 1609, and was buried in the church of Crawley. He wrote: *Carmina in Mortem Duorum Fratrum* (Lond. 1552, 4to): *De Pii Vet Gregorii XIII Furoribus contra Elizabetham Reginam Anglie* (1582, 8vo): — *Exhortation to True Love, Loyalty, and Fidelity to Her Majesty* (1587, 8vo): — *Syntagma Hortationum ad Jacobum Regem Anylice* (1604, 8vo):

— *Translation from Latin of Bishop Poynt's Apology or Defence of Priests' Marriage.* See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Renou, Jean Baptiste,

a French Orientalist, was born at Aigers. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory, and was superior of the convent of the order at Laon, where he died Dec. 26, 1701. Two of his posthumous works may be mentioned: *Meitode pour apprendre facilement les Langues Hebraique et Chaldaique* (Paris, 1708): — and a *Dictionnaire Hebraique* (ibid. 1709). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Renoult, Jean Baptiste

a French controversialist, was born about 1664. After passing four years in the order of the Cordeliers, he laid aside his habit, embraced Protestantism, and in 1695 went to London, where he openly taught Calvinism. He served the parish of Hungerford (1706), then that of the Pyramid (1710), and was finally called to Ireland. The date of his death is unknown. His works are, *Le Vrai Tableau du Papisme* (Lond. 1698): — *Taxe de la Chancellerie Romaine* (ibid. 1701): — *Les Aventures de la Madonna et de Francois d'Assise* (Amst. 1701): — *L'Antiquite et la Pespetuite de la Religion Protestante* (ibid. 1703; Geneva, 1737; Neufchatel, 1821): — *Histoire des Variations de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Amst. 1703). See Haag Brothers, *La France Protestante.* — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Renovation

Those who hold to baptismal regeneration make a distinction between renovation and regeneration. "Regeneration," says Dr. Hook, "comes only once in or through baptism; renovation exists before, in, and after baptism, and may be often repeated." Renovation takes up the work of regeneration, daily renewing the person in God's grace. Another difference between regeneration and renovation is usually made by Calvinistic theologians, that regeneration once given can never be totally lost any more than baptism, and so can never need to be repeated in the whole; whereas renovation may be totally lost. **SEE REGENERATION.**

Renshaw, Richard

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 1, 1776. He received a fair education, which was improved by foreign travels, an account of which was published in Manchester in 1804. He entered the ministry as a Weslevan, and began preaching in 1808 among the New Connection Methodists, but afterwards became an Independent. He emigrated to America in 1856, and in 1858 was admitted as a member of the Iowa Valley Presbytery. His extreme age prevented him from taking a Church, though he was willing to preach whenever opportunity offered. He died Sept. 5, 1859. Mr. Renshaw was a man of great decision of character and of undoubted piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 163. (J. L. S.)

Rensselaer, Van

SEE VAN RENSSELAER.

Renunciantes

(*renouncers*), a name applied to monks, from their formal renunciation of the world and all secular employments. Many of them kept their estates in their own hands, but had no more use of them than if they had been transferred to others.

Renunciation

a form which constitutes a characteristic portion of the baptismal ceremonial. The person about to be baptized (or his sponsors, if an infant) renounces the works of the devil and of darkness, especially idolatry and the vices and follies of the world. This renunciation is of very great antiquity, and it was probably of apostolic origin. In the Roman Catholic Church the question is, "Hast thou renounced Satan, and all his works and all his pomps?" The candidate is expected to answer in the affirmative, turning to the west as the place of darkness. In the baptismal service of the Church of England and of the Methodist Episcopal Church the question is asked, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" The answer is, "I renounce them all."

Renunciatores

SEE APOTACTICI.

Renwick, James

a noted Nonconformist divine, was born at Dumfriesshire, Scotland, Feb. 15, 1662. He was an uncompromising Covenanter, and was executed Feb. 17, 1688, for “denying the king’s authority, owning the covenants,” etc. He wrote, with Alexander Shields, *An Informatory Vindication of the Covenanters* (Edinb. 1744, small 8vo): — *A Choice Collection of Prefaces, Lectures, and Sermons*, etc. (Glasgow, 1777, 8vo).

Reordination

the repetition of the sacramental ordinance of ordination, has ever been held to be contrary to the true theory of sacraments, and has been forbidden by the Church under pain of severe penalties. The ground of this prohibition is well expressed by Morinus, quoting the Council of Trent (Sess. 23 c. 4): “In the sacrament of orders, as in baptism and confirmation, a character is conferred which cannot be effaced or taken away.” The historical evidence as to both the doctrine and practice of the Church is full and complete. The 68th apostolical canon condemned it, and pronounced sentence of deposition on the ordainer and the ordained. The third Council of Carthage (canon 52) forbade it along with rebaptism. Whether the ordinations of heretics and schismatics are to be held valid, and whether those who have received them are on their reconciliation to be received in their several orders, is a question in respect to which the practice of the Church has varied considerably. The Council of Nice decreed that those who had: been ordained by Meletius should be admitted to serve the Church by reordination. The 68th apostolical canon, while condemning the reordination of those once ordained in the Church, allows that of those who had only received heretical ordination. The second Council of Saragossa (A.D. 592) ratifies the baptism of the Arians, but condemns their ordinations. In later times the practice of the Roman Catholic Church has also been very contradictory. Thus the ordinations of Formosus were declared null by Stephen VI, considered valid by John IX, and again declared invalid by Sergius III. The modern Roman practice of reordaining those ordained in the Church of England is not based on any decree of the Church, and has not been invariable. The custom of the Church of England forbids reordination in the case of those ordained within

the Church, and asserts the indelibility of the ordination character. See Aquinas, *Summ.* pars 3 qu. 38 art. ii; Augustine, *Cont. Parmen.* lib. ii, c. 13; *Ep. 50 ad Bonifac.* ii, 661 (ed. Bened.); Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. i, ch. 7; Courayer, *Valid. Angl. Ord.* (Oxf. 1844); Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. 6 ch. 6. *SEE ORDINATION.*

Repairs Of Churches.

Canon 85 of the Church of England enacts, “The church-wardens or questman shall take care and provide that the churches be well and sufficiently repaired, and so from time to time kept and maintained,” etc., specifying the work upon windows, floor, churchyard, walls, and fences. They are also to “see that at every meeting of the congregation peace be well kept, and that all persons excommunicated, and so denounced, be kept out of the church.” Canon 86 adds, “Every dean, dean and chapter, archdeacon, and others which have authority to hold ecclesiastical visitations by composition, law, or prescription, shall survey the churches of his or their jurisdiction once in every three years in his own person, or cause the same to be done,” etc. Usually the repair of the church belongs to the rector, and that of the nave to the parishioners,

The repairing of the Established churches in Scotland belongs to the heritors, who, if they resolve to build a new church, must build it so large as to accommodate two thirds of the examinable permanent population, or persons above twelve years of age. The presbytery can ordain the heritors to make the necessary repairs, can appoint a visitation to a decayed church, receive the report of the tradesmen, and come to a decision. Unendowed congregations build and repair their own places of worship.

Repentance

(*μετάνοια*) signifies a *change of the mind* from a rebellious and disaffected state to that submission and thorough separation from iniquity by which converted sinners are distinguished (⁴⁰⁰Matthew 3:2-8).

Repentance is sometimes used generally for a mere change of sentiment, and an earnest wishing that something were undone that has been done. In a sense analogous to this, God himself is said to repent; but this can only be understood of his altering his conduct towards his creatures, either in the bestowing of good or infliction of evil — which change in the divine conduct is founded on a change in his creatures; and thus speaking after the manner of men, God is said to repent. In this generic sense also Esau

“found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears;” that is, he could not move his father Isaac to repent of what he had done, or to recall the blessing from Jacob and confer it on himself (^{<8127>}Hebrews 12:17; ^{<6129>}Romans 11:29; ^{<4070>}2 Corinthians 7:10). There are various kinds of repentance, as

- (1) a *natural* repentance, or what is merely the effect of natural conscience;
- (2) a *national* repentance, such as the Jews in Babylon were called unto, to which temporal blessings were promised (^{<2680>}Ezekiel 18:30);
- (3) an *external* repentance, or an outward humiliation for sin, as in the case of Ahab;
- (4) a *hypocritical* repentance, as represented in Ephraim (^{<2076>}Hosea 7:16);
- (5) a *legal* repentance, which is a mere work of the law and the effect of convictions of sin by it, which in time wear off and come to nothing;
- (6) an *evangelical* repentance, which consists in conviction of sin, accompanied by sorrow for it, confession of it, hatred to it, and renunciation of it.

A legal and an evangelical repentance are distinguished thus:

1. A legal repentance flows only from a sense of danger and fear of wrath, but an evangelical repentance produces a true mourning for sin and an earnest desire of deliverance from it.
2. A legal repentance flows from unbelief, but evangelical is always the fruit and consequence of a saving faith.
3. A legal repentance consists of an aversion to God and to his holy law, but an evangelical flows from love to both.
4. A legal repentance ordinarily flows from discouragement and despondency, but evangelical from encouraging hope.
5. A legal repentance is temporary, but evangelical is the daily exercise of the true Christian.

6. A legal repentance does at most produce only a partial and external reformation, but an evangelical is a total change of heart and life.

The author as well as object of true repentance is God (^{<445>}Acts 5:31). The subjects of it are sinners, since none but those who have sinned can repent. The means of repentance is the Word and the ministers of it; yet sometimes private consideration, sanctified afflictions, conversation, etc., have been the instruments of repentance. The blessings connected with repentance are pardon, peace, and everlasting life (11:18). The time of repentance is the present life (^{<2816>}Isaiah 55:6; ^{<2105>}Ecclesiastes 9:50). The evidences of repentance are faith, humility, prayer, and obedience (^{<3820>}Zechariah 12:10). The necessity of repentance appears evident from the evil of sin; the misery it involves us in here; the commands given us to repent in God's Word; the promises made to the penitent; and the absolute incapability of enjoying God here or hereafter without it. See Dickinson, *Letters*, let. 9; Owen, *On the 130th Psalm*; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, s.v. "Repentance;" Ridgley, *Body of Divinity*, quest. 76; Davies, *Sermons*, vol. 3:serm. 44; Case, *Sermons*, serm. 4; Whitefield, *Sermons*; Saurin, *Sermons* (Robinson's transl.), vol. iii; Scott, *Treatise on Repentance*. *SEE PENANCE; SEE PENITENCE*.

Repentinae

a term for *State holidays*.

Repetition

Our Lord in his sermon on the Mount (^{<4007>}Matthew 6:7) cautions his followers against *using vain repetitions* ($\beta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$) in prayer. *SEE PRAYER, FORMS OF*. It is well to distinguish that this is not directed against simple repetitions, which may often arise in the fervor and urgency of earnest supplication, but against the *vain* repetitions of such as think, whether in theory or practice, "that they shall be heard for their *much* speaking." The idea that a prevailing merit was attached to much speaking in prayer with multitudinous repetitions has been, and is, found in most of the false systems of religion. Perhaps we find it among Baal's worshippers, who "called upon the name of Baal from morning to noon, saying, O Baal, hear us!" (^{<4183>}1 Kings 18:26). The practice was certainly common among the classical heathen, and is noticed by some of their more serious writers with disapprobation and laughed at by their satirists. If we may judge by the hymns of Homer, Orpheus, and Callimachus, we may suppose that the pagan prayers were so stuffed up with synonymous epithets and

prerogatives of the Deity as to be justly liable to the censure of “vain repetitions.” The Jews adopted this and other bad practices, insomuch that it was one of their maxims, “He that multiplies prayer shall be heard.” The same idea was inculcated with much earnestness by Mohammed, and is at this day exhibited in full force among his followers. Witness the following from the *Mishat-ul-Masabih*: “The prophet said, Shall I not teach you an act by which you may attain the greatness of those who have gone before you, and by which you shall precede your posterity, excepting those who do as you do? Then they said, Instruct us, O prophet of God. He said, Repeat after every prayer *Subhan Allah!* [O most pure *God!*] eleven times, and *Allaho acber* [God is very great] eleven times, and *Alhamdo lilldhi* [praise to God! eleven times.” Compare this puerility with the sublime instructions of our Saviour. But again: “Whoever says *Subhan Alldh* and *Bihamdihi* a hundred times *in a day*, his faults shall be silenced, though they be as great as the waves of the sea. Whoever says, morning and evening, *Subhan Allah* and *Bihamdihi* a hundred times, no one will bring a better deed than his on the day of resurrection, except one who should have said like him, or *added* anything thereto.” To these instructions the Mohammedans have been most attentive. There are those among Christians, especially Roman Catholics, who repeat the Lord’s Prayer and other forms a great number of times, and vainly think that the oftener the prayer is repeated the more efficacious it is, i.e. if repeated two hundred times it will be twice as good as if repeated only one hundred times. (See the literature in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 33; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 229.) **SEE AVE MARIA; SEE PATERNOSTER; SEE ROSARY.**

Repetitions In The Liturgy.

An objection has been made to the Liturgy of the English Church that it involves vain repetitions and a useless prolixity. It is replied, repetition is one thing, but a *vain repetition* quite another. The repetitions in the Liturgy are principally in the cry “Have mercy upon us,” and in the use of the Lord’s Prayer twice, or at most thrice, in the longest services, and in the responses in the Litany and the Decalogue. Reference is also made to the example of our Saviour who prayed thrice in Gethsemane, “saying the *same words*” (⁴¹⁶⁴ Matthew 26:44). Further, the petitions which we address to Heaven must, for the most part, have the sane general drift; and there can be no advantage in arranging them in a perpetually changing dress, nor will they be the better received because of their novelty.,

Re'phael

(Heb. *Rephael*', **l aṣṣr**] *healed of God*; Sept. **ῚΡαφαήλ**), a son of Shemaiah the Levite, of the house of Obed-edom. an able-bodied porter in the service of the house of God in David's reign (**<1347>**1 Chronicles 26:7). B.C. cir. 1015.

Re'phah

(Heb. *Reophach*, **j ṣr**, *riches*; Sept. **ῚΡαφή**), a son of Beriah, of the tribe of Ephraim, ancestor of Joshua (**<1375>**1 Chronicles 7:25). B.C. post 1618.

Rephai'ah

(Heb. *Rephayah*', **hyṣr**] *healed of Jehovah*; Sept. **ῚΡαφαῖα** v. r. **ῚΡαφαῖα**, etc.), the name of five Israelites.

- 1.** The second named of six sons of Tola, head of a family in Issachar (**<1376>**1 Chronicles 7:2). B.C. ante 1658.
- 2.** Son of Binea, and eighth in lineal descent from Saul's son Jonathan (**<1394>**1 Chronicles 9:43). B.C. long post 1000. He is also called RAPHA (**<1387>**1 Chronicles 8:37).
- 3.** Son of Ishi, and one of the chieftains of the tribe of Simeon, in the reign of Hezekiah, who headed the expedition of five hundred men against the Amalekites of Mt. Seir and drove them out (**<1342>**1 Chronicles 4:42). B.C. cir. 725.
- 4.** Son of Hur, and ruler of "the half" of Jernsalem. He aided in rebuilding the wall (**<1404>**Nehemiah 3:9). B.C. 445.
- 5.** Son of Hananiah and father of Arnan, among the descendants of Zerubbabel (**<1392>**1 Chronicles 3:21); the same with RHESA (q.v.) of the genealogy of Christ (**<1407>**Luke 3:27).

Repha'im

[many *Reph'aim*] (Heb. usually with the art. *ha-Rephaim*', **ṣyṣṣr ḥ**:[see below]), a name which frequently occurs, and in some remarkable passages, as that of a race of unusual stature, who originally dwelt in the country east of the Jordan. The earliest mention of them is the record of their defeat by Chedorlsaomer and some allied kings at Ashteroth Karnaim;

<1145>Genesis 14:5). They are again mentioned (15:20); their dispersion recorded (<1820>Deuteronomy 2:10, 20), and Og the giant king of Bashan said to be “the only remnant of them” (3:11; <1624>Joshua 12:4; 13:12; 17:15). Extirpated, however, from the east of Palestine, they long found a home in the West; and in connection with the Philistines, under whose protection the small remnant of them may have lived, they still employed their arms against the Hebrews (<1018>2 Samuel 21:18 sq.; <1304>1 Chronicles 20:4). In the latter passage there seems, however, to be some confusion between the Rephaim and the sons of a particular giant of Gath, named Rapha. Such a name may have been conjectured as that of a founder of the race, like the names Ion, Dorus, Teut, etc. (Bottcher, *De Inferis*, p. 96, note); Rapha occurs also as a proper name (<1375>1 Chronicles 7:25; 8:2,37). It is probable that they had possessed districts west of the Jordan in early times, since the “valley of Rephaim” (κοιλὰς τῶν Τιτάνων, <1058>2 Samuel 5:18; <1315>1 Chronicles 11:15; <2376>Isaiah 17:5; κ. τῶν γιγάντων, Joseph. *Ant.* 7:4, 1), a rich valley south-west of Jerusalem, derived its name from them. That they were not Canaanites is clear from there being no allusion to them in <1105>Genesis 10:15-19. They were probably one of those aboriginal peoples to whose existence the traditions of many nations testify, and of whose genealogy the Bible gives us no information. The few names recorded have, as Ewald remarks, a Shemitic aspect (*Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* i, 311); but from the hatred existing between them and both the Canaanites and Hebrews, some suppose them to be Japhethites, “who comprised especially the inhabitants of the coasts and islands” (Kalisch, *on Genesis* p. 351). *SEE CANAANITE.*

μυαῖρ] is rendered by the Greek versions very variously (Sept. ῤαφαίμ, γίγαντες, γηγενεῖς, θεόμαχοι, Τιτάνες, and ἰατροί [*<1870>*Psalm 87:10; <2334>Isaiah 26:14, where it is confused with μυαῖρ] comp. Genesis 1, 2], and sometimes νεκροί, τεθνηκότες, especially in the *later* versions). In the A.V. the words used for it are “Rephaim,” “giants,” and “the dead.” That it has the latter meaning in many passages is certain (<1880>Psalm 88:10; <1028>Proverbs 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; <2334>Isaiah 26:14,19). The question arises, how are these meanings to be reconciled? Gesenius gives no derivation for the national name, and derives *r* = *mortui*, from *apr*; *sanavit*, and the proper name Rapha from an Arabic root signifying “tall,” thus seeming to sever *all* connection between the meanings of the word, which is surely most unlikely. Masius, Simon, etc., suppose the second meaning to come from the fact that both spectres and giants strike terror (accepting the

derivation from **hpr**; *remisit*, “unstrung with fear,” R. Bechai, *on Deuteronomy 2*); Vitringa and Hiller from the notion of *length* involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Hiller, *Syntagn. Hermen.* p. 205; Virg. *AEn.* ii, 772, etc.). J. D. Michaelis (*ad Lowth S. Poes.* p. 466) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, etc., were troglodytes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Bottcher sees in **apr**; and **hpr**; a double root, and thinks that the giants were called **μυαῖ** (*languefacti*) by a euphemism; and that the dead were so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek **καμόντες, κεκμηκότες** (comp. Buttmann, *Lexil.* ii, 237 sq.). An attentive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Gesenius also hints) from some notion of Sheol being the residence of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are ^{<2116>}Proverbs 21:16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all), ^{<2394>}Isaiah 26:14,19, which are difficult to explain without some such supposition, ^{<2349>}Isaiah 14:9, where the word **μυδῖ** [i (Sept. **οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς**), if taken in its literal meaning of *goats*, may mean evil spirits represented in that form (comp. ^{<8177>}Leviticus 17:7), and especially ^{<8315>}Job 26:5, 6. “Behold the gyantes (A.V. “dead things”) grown under the waters” (Douay version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaqueous prison of rebellious spirits like that in which (according to the Hindui legend) Vishnu the water-god confines a race of giants (comp. **πυλάρχος**, as a title of Neptune, Hesiod, *Theog.* 732; Nork, *Brammin. und Rabb.* p. 319 sq.). **SEE GIANT**. Branches of this great unknown people were the following

1. EMIM (**μυμῶε** Septt. **Ὀμμίν, Ἰμμαῖοι**), smitten by Chedorlaomer at Shaveh Kiriathaim (^{<0145>}Genesis 14:5), and occupying the country afterwards held by the Moabites (^{<8210>}Deuteronomy 2:10), who gave them the name **μυμῶε** “terrors.” The word rendered “tall” may perhaps be merely “haughty” (**ἰσχύοντες**). **SEE EMIM**.
2. ANAKIM (**μυαῖ**). The imbecile terror of the spies exaggerated their proportions into something superhuman (^{<0133>}Numbers 13:28, 33), and their name became proverbial (^{<8210>}Deuteronomy 2:10; 9:2). **SEE ANAKIM**.
3. ZUZIM (**μυζῖε**), whose principal town was Ham (^{<0145>}Genesis 14:5), and who lived between the Arnon and the Jabbok, being a northern tribe of

Rephaim. The Ammonites who defeated them called them *Zamzunzim*, $\mu\gamma\text{M}\alpha\text{z}\alpha\text{i}$ (^{<0120>}Deuteronomy 2:20 sq., which is, however, probably an early gloss). — See *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 151 sq.; Jan. 1852, p. 363 sq.; April, 1852, p. 55 sq.; July, 1852, p. 302 sq.; Oct. 1852, p. 87 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 279 sq. *SEE ZUZIM*.

Rephaim, Valley Of

(Heb. *E'mek Rephaim'*, $\alpha\text{m}[\mu\gamma\alpha\text{p}\alpha\text{i}]$ Sept. ἡ κοιλάς τῶν Τιτάνων or Γιγάντων in Joshua γῆ or Ἐμέκ ῚΡαφαῖν; in Isaiah φάραγξ στερεά; Vulg. *vallis Raphaim* or *gigantun*; A.V. “valley of the giants” in ^{<0158>}Joshua 15:8; 18:16), a valley beginning adjacent to the valley of Hinnom, south-west of Jerusalem, and stretching away south-west on the right of the road to Bethlehem (^{<0158>}Joshua 15:8; 17:5; 18:6; ^{<0058>}2 Samuel 5:18, 22). The valley appears to derive its name from the ancient nation of the Rephaim. It may be a trace of an early settlement of theirs, possibly after they were driven from their original seats east of the Jordan by Chedorlaomer (^{<0145>}Genesis 14:5), and before they again migrated northward to the more secure wooded districts in which we find them at the date of the partition of the country among the tribes (^{<0175>}Joshua 17:15; A.V. “giants”). In this case it is a parallel to the “mount of the Amalekites” in the centre of Palestine, and to the towns bearing the name of the Zemaraim, the Avim, the Ophnites, etc., which occur so frequently in Benjamin.

The valley of Rephaim is first mentioned in the description given by Joshua of the northern border of Judah. The passage is important: “The border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom unto the south side of the Jebusite: the same is Jerusalem; and the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward” (^{<0158>}Joshua 15:8). The last clause in the Hebrew is not quite clear ($\text{h}\alpha\text{q}\text{b}\ \text{h}\eta\text{w}\text{p}\alpha\ \mu\gamma\alpha\text{p}\alpha\text{q}\alpha\text{m}[\]$). It may mean that the boundaryline was north of the valley, or that the valley was north of the boundary. The latter construction is possible; but the former is unquestionably the more natural, and is supported by the Sept. and the Vulgate, and also by most commentators. If this interpretation be admitted, the situation of the valley is certain: it lay on the south of the hill which enclosed Hinnom on the west. This; view is further strengthened by the notice in ^{<0186>}Joshua 18:16. When David was hiding from Saul in the cave of Adullam, we are told that the Philistines, no doubt taking advantage of

intestine troubles, invaded the mountain fastnesses of Israel. A band of them pitched in the valley of Rephaim, and at the same time seized and garrisoned Bethlehem, David's native place (^{<1013>}2 Samuel 23:13, 14). It was then that three of his warriors, to gratify a wish of their chief, broke through the enemies' lines and drew water from the well by the gate of Bethlehem. The narrative shows clearly that the valley of Rephaim could not have been far distant from Bethlehem (^{<1311>}1 Chronicles 11:15-19). The "hold" (ver. 14) in which David found himself seems (though it is not clear) to have been the cave of Adullam, the scene of the commencement of his freebooting life; but, wherever situated, we need not doubt that it was the same fastness as that mentioned in ^{<1017>}2 Samuel 5:17, since in both cases the same word (**hdWxMj** with the definite article), and that not a usual one, is employed. The story shows very clearly the predatory nature of these incursions of the Philistines. It was in "harvest time" (ver. 13). They had come to carry off the ripe crops, for which the valley was proverbial (^{<217>}Isaiah 17:5), just as at Pas-dammum (^{<1311>}1 Chronicles 11:13) we find them in the parcel of ground full of barley, at Lehi in the field of lentiles (^{<1021>}2 Samuel 23:11), or at Keilah in the threshing-floors (^{<1021>}1 Samuel 23:1). Their animals (**hvj**) were scattered among the ripe corn receiving their load of plunder. The "garrison," or the officer in charge of the expedition, was on the watch in the village of Bethlehem. On two other occasions, soon after David was proclaimed king, the Philistines invaded the mountains and drew up their armies on the same plain; they were at once attacked by David's veterans and routed with great slaughter (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 5:18, 22; ^{<1349>}1 Chronicles 14:9-13). The destruction inflicted on them and on their idols was so signal that it gave the place a new name, and impressed itself on the popular mind of Israel with such distinctness that the prophet Isaiah could employ it, centuries after, as a symbol of a tremendous impending judgment of God — nothing less than the desolation and destruction of the whole earth (^{<2391>}Isaiah 28:21, 22). **SEE PERAZIM, MOUNT.**

But from none of these notices do we learn anything of the position of the valley. Josephus in one place (*Ant.* 7:4, 1) says that the *valley of the giants* was near Jerusalem; and in another place (7:12, 4), when narrating the story of the drawing of water from the well at Bethlehem, in which he makes a strange blunder, he says the valley extended from Jerusalem "to the city of Bethlehem." Eusebius and Jerome, on the other hand, place it on the *north* of Jerusalem (*Onomast.* s.v. "Raphaim"), and in the territory of

Benjamin (*ibid.* s.v. “Emec Raphaim”). Their notices, however, are brief and unsatisfactory (see *Onomast.* s.v. “Coelas Titanorum,” and the excellent note by Bonfrere). A position north-west of the city is adopted by Furst (*Handw.* ii, 383 b), apparently on the ground of the terms of ^{657B}Joshua 15:8, and 18:16, which certainly do leave it doubtful whether the valley is on the north of the boundary or the boundary on the north of the valley; and Tobler, in his last investigations (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 202), conclusively adopts the *Wady-Der Jasin* (*W. Makhrior*, on Van de Velde’s map), one of the side valleys of the great Wady Beit Hanina, as the valley of Rephaim. This position is open to the obvious objection of too great distance from both Bethlehem and the cave of Adullam (according to any position assignable to the latter) to meet the requirements of ^{1023B}2 Samuel 23:13. Since the latter part of the 16th century the name has been attached to the upland plain which stretches south of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Bethlehem the *Buik’ah* of the modern Arabs (Tobler, *Jerusalem*, ii, 401). Dr. Robinson says, “As we advanced (towards the holy city) we had on the right low hills, and on the left the cultivated valley or plain of Rephaim, or the ‘giants,’ with gentle hills beyond. This plain is broad, and descends gradually towards the south-west until it contracts in that direction into a deeper and narrower valley, called *Wady el- Werd*, which unites farther on with Wady Ahmed, and finds its way to the Mediterranean. The plain of Rephaim extends nearly to the city, which, as seen from it, appears to be almost on the same level. As we advanced, the plain was terminated by a slight rocky ridge, forming the brow of the valley of Hinnom” (*Researches*, i, 219). It is true that this tract has more of the nature of a plateau or plain considerably elevated than a valley in the ordinary sense. But on the south-west it does partake more of this character (see Bonar, *Land of Promise*, p. 177), and possibly in designating so wide and open a tract by the name of the Rephaim valley there was a sort of play on the giant race with which it was associated, as if it, like them, must set at naught ordinary dimensions. South of Mount Zion — the most southern part of the valley of Gihon — is called *Wady Rafaath* by the Arabs, which corresponds to *Rephaim* in Hebrew. Hence Schwarz infers that this is the true valley of Rephaim, though usually taken for that of the son of Hinnom (*Palest.* p. 240). **SEE JERUSALEM.**

Repha’ims

so the Hebrew plural Rephaim (q.v.) is incorrectly pluralized again in English in the A.V. (^{0145B}Genesis 14:5; 15:20).

Reph'idim

(Heb. *Rephidim*’, רֵפִידִים *supports*, i.e., perhaps, *resting-places*; Sept. and Josephus, Ῥαφιδίμ), a station of the Israelites on their journey through the Arabian desert, to which they passed from the Desert of Sin (Ἔξοδος Exodus 17:1), situated, according to Ἔξοδος Numbers 33:14 sq., between Alush and the wilderness of Sinai. Here the Amalekites attacked Israel, but were repulsed (Ἔξοδος Exodus 17:8 sq.). Here also Moses struck the rock, from which the fountain of water leaped forth; to which the later Jewish traditions added many other wonders, as that the rock itself followed the people in their journey, supplying water always (see Wettstein and Schottgen, on Ἔξοδος 1 Corinthians 10:4; *Buxtorf, Exercit.* p. 391 sq.). The knowledge of this miraculous gift of water reached the Romans. Tacitus alludes to it (*Hist.* v, 3), and supposes that Moses was guided by wild asses, and then by the green pasture, to the exact spot where water was concealed (comp., in the Grecian mythology, especially Pausan. 4:36, 5; but the legend of Hippocrene [Ovid, *Met.* v, 256 sq.] has scarcely any points of resemblance). The most definite indication as to the situation of Rephidim is incidentally supplied in the Scripture account of the above miracle. While encamped at Rephidim, “there was no water for the people to drink,” and they murmured against Moses. He was therefore commanded to “go on (Ῥαφιδίμ) pass, i.e. cross the desert shore) before the people,” and with his rod to smite “the rock in Horeb,” upon which (Ῥαφιδίμ | [*i*] the towering cliff bounding the range et-Tih) Jehovah stood. (This admirably suits the entrance of Wady Hibran, but is utterly vague and inapt if spoken of the interior.) In consequence of this, Rephidim was called *Massah* (“temptation”) and, *Meribah* (“chiding”). As the Israelites, though encamped in Rephidim, were able to draw their needful supply of water from “the rock in Horeb,” the two places must have been adjacent. Assuming Jebel Muisa to be Sinai (or Horeb), and that the Israelites approached it by Wady es-Sheik; which is the: only practicable route for such a multitude coming from Egypt, it follows that Rephidim was not more than one march — and apparently a short one — distant from the mountain. Notwithstanding this indication, however, the position of Rephidim has created much discussion among travellers and sacred geographers. Josephus appears to locate it very near to Sinai, and states that the place was entirely destitute of water, while in their preceding marches the people had met with fountains (*Ant.* 3:1, 7, and 5, 1). Eusebius

and Jerome say it was near Mount Horeb (*Onomast.* s.v. “*Raphidim*”). Cosmas places it at the distance of six miles, which agrees pretty nearly with that of Nebi Saleh (*Topographia Christiana*, v, 207 sq.). Robinson removes it some miles farther down Wady es-Sheik to a narrow gorge which forms a kind of door to the central group of mountains. He gets over the difficulty in regard to the proximity of Horeb by affirming that that name was given, not to a single mountain, but to the whole group (*Bib. Res.* i, 120). **SEE HOREB.** Mr. Sandie places Raphidim at the extreme end of Wady er-Rahah, and identifies it with a *Wady Rudhwan*. He supposes that the Israelites marched from the coast plain of el-KIaa by Wady Daghadah (*Horeb and Jerusalem*, p. 159). This route, however, would scarcely be practicable for such a multitude. Lepsius (ed. Bohn, p. 310 sq.), Stewart (*Tent and Khan*), Ritter (*Pal. und Syr.* i, 738 sq.), Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 40 sq.), and others, locate Raphidim in Wady Feiran, near the base of Mount Serbal, especially at the oasis of *el-Hesmeh* or the rock *Hesy el-Khatatin* (Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 135). The great distance from Sinai — twelve hours’ march — and the abundance of water at Feiran appear to be fatal to this theory. No spot in the whole peninsula has such a supply of water, and Feiran is on this account called “the paradise of the Bedawin.” The position of Raphidim, it is thus seen, largely depends upon the route which the Israelites may be supposed to have taken from the Desert of Sin to Mount Sinai. Murphy (*Comment. on Exodus* p. 174 sq.) regards that by way of Wady Hibran as being out of the question, partly on account of its length (whereas it is really little, if any, farther than either of the two other practicable ones, especially the northern one by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh, which he prefers), and partly on account of the narrow and difficult passes (especially Nagb Ajameh) along it, which, however, are no worse than many others in different parts of their identified route (see Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* [Amer. ed.], p. 228). Keil, who likewise prefers the same northern route for reaching Sinai, observes (*Comment. on Pent.* [Clarke’s ed.] 2, 75) that Raphidim lay at only one day’s distance from Sinai (⁽¹²⁰²⁾Exodus 19:2). He therefore locates Raphidim at the point where the Wady es-Sheik opens into the plain er-Rahah, although this would be almost at the foot of Sinai, and past several fountains which would have relieved their thirst without the need of a miracle. If, on the other hand, we should place Raphidim at the other end of the Wady es-Sheik, this, according to Keil’s own showing, would be about as far from Sinai as the mouth of Wady Hibran, which last is, after all, only twenty miles, following the windings of the valleys. The great

objection to the access by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh is that although this (as the name signifies) is in the main a sandy plain, yet there are not wanting springs at various points along its course — one especially, Ain el-Akdar (i.e. “the green”), being situated just at its junction with Wady es-Sheik (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 125). By the way of the plain el-Kaa and Wady Hibran, on the contrary, there is total drought, so that the Israelites, as the narrative requires, would have exhausted the stock brought probably from Elim, without having been meanwhile in a region where their scouts could have procured water within any reaching distance. For the same reason, the most natural route of all — by way of Wady Feiran — must be suspected, which, as already said, is the best watered and most fertile of all in that vicinity (*ibid.* i, 126). There is still another route from the Red Sea at Ras Abu-Zenimah (where the Israelites evidently encamped) to Sinai — namely, by way of Sarabet el-Khadim. This, although not so smooth as by wadies Feiran and es-Sheik, is nevertheless quite practicable, and is often taken by modern travellers. This route is advocated by Knobel, Keil, Cook (in his *Specker’s Commentary*), and others, who find the Desert of Sin in Debbet er-Ramleh, Dophkah in Wady Tih, and perhaps Alush in Wady el-Esh. The water supply on this route is good, but the presence of a military force of Egyptians at the mines in Sarabet el-Khadim is a grave objection to its having been followed by the Israelites. There are two traditional spots fixed upon as the scene of Moses’ smiting of the rock, and hence called *Hajr Mosa*, or “Moses’s Rock.” One is pointed out by the Arabs in Wady Feiran, and the other by the monks in Wady Lejah. The former is too distant and the latter too near for the Biblical account. **SEE MERIBAH.** If the Israelites approached Sinai by way of Wady Hibran, we should look for Rephidim at the entrance of that valley from the plain along the Red Sea, as suggested under the article EXODE **SEE EXODE**; but if they reached Mount Sinai by way of Wady Feiran, as most writers suppose or by way of Sarabet el-Khadim, then we must probably look for Rephidim somewhere near the entrance from Wady es-Sheik to the plain er-Rahah, perhaps at the pass of *el-Watiyeh*, indicated above by Robinson. This defile was visited and described by Burckhardt (Syria, etc., p. 488) as at about five hours’ distance from where it issues from the plain er-Rahah, narrowing between abrupt cliffs of blackened granite to about forty feet in width. Here is also the traditional “seat of Moses.” Within the pass the valley expands, affording ample space for a large camp. The nearest water is in Wady Sheb, two miles distant to the south-west (Porter, *Hand-book*, p. 65). See Ridgeway, *The Lord’s Land*, p. 57 sq. The arguments in favor

of the location of Rephidim at el-Watlyeh are forcibly presented by Mr. Holland in *Jerusalem Recovered*, p. 420 sq. *SEE SINAI*.

Reposoir

1. A receptacle for the tabernacle in, the procession of Corpus Christi.
2. A chapel and shelter for travellers on the wayside, common in Italy: one of the 13th century is near Fismes. A pilgrim's chapel remains on Lansdown, near Bath.

Repousse

a French artistic term signifying *hammered work*.

Representation

The theological use of this word by English writers of the 16th and 17th centuries was, in the strict sense of its Latin original, that of "presenting over again" in reality; the subordinate idea of "portrayal" as in a picture, being little, if at all, in use by them. Thus when bishop Pearson writes, "by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, 'he destroyeth him that hath the power of death,'" the word refers to our Lord's continual pleading of the sacrifice once offered. It is of importance to remember this use of the term "representation," as it is not unfrequently used with reference to the eucharistic sacrifice; and by losing sight of the sense in which the word was understood by former writers, modern readers have understood "representation" to mean a dramatic or pictorial imitation rather than a real and actual making present, and offering over again, of that which is present by virtue of the once only offered sacrifice.

Representation, Lay.

SEE LAY REPRESENTATION.

Representers

or MARROW MEN. *SEE MARROW CONTROVERSY*.

Reproach

(usually ἠπρῆ , ὄνειδος), the act of finding fault in opprobrious terms, or attempting to expose to infamy and disgrace. In whatever cause we

engage. however disinterested our motives, however laudable our designs, reproach is what we must expect. But it becomes us not to retaliate, but to bear it patiently; and so to live that every charge brought against us be groundless. If we be reproached for righteousness' sake, we have no reason to be ashamed, nor to be afraid. All good men have thus suffered, Jesus Christ himself especially. We have the greatest promises of support. Besides, it has a tendency to humble us, detach us from the world, and excite in us a desire for that state of blessedness where all reproach shall be done away.

Reprobation

is equivalent to *rejection*; and by it is usually understood the Calvinistic doctrine, that a portion of mankind, by the eternal counsel or decree of God, has been predestined to eternal death. Conditional reprobation, or rejecting men from the divine mercy, because of their impenitence or refusal of salvation, is a scriptural doctrine. Against the unconditional, absolute reprobation taught by rigid Calvinists, the following objections may be urged:

- 1.** It cannot be reconciled to the love of God. "God is love." "He is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works."
- 2.** Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures.
- 3.** Nor to the grace of God, so often magnified in the Scriptures. For it does not, certainly, argue superabounding richness of grace, when ten thousand have equally offended, to pardon one or two of them.
- 4.** Nor to those passages of Scripture which represent God as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst of his creatures. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth;" "The Lord is long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish."
- 5.** Nor to his justice. We may affirm that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if men everywhere would consider it as contrary to justice that a sovereign should condemn to death one. or more of his subjects for not obeying laws which it was utterly

impossible for them to obey, it is manifestly unjust to charge God with acting in precisely the same manner. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the person so punished, or, as we may rather say, destroyed, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding which this act shuts out. Every received notion of justice is thus violated.

6. Nor to the sincerity of God in offering salvation by Christ to all who hear the Gospel, of whom this scheme supposes the majority, or at least great numbers, to be among the reprobate. That God offers salvation to those who he knows will never receive it, is true; but there is here no insincerity, for the atonement has been made for their sins.

7. Nor with the scriptural declaration, that “God is no respecter of persons.” To have respect of persons is a phrase in Scripture which sometimes refers to judicial proceedings, and signifies to judge from partiality and affection, and not upon the merits of the question. “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him” (^{<418B>}Acts 10:34, 35). But if the doctrine of reprobation be true, then it necessarily follows that there is precisely this kind of respect of persons with God.

8. This doctrine brings with it the repulsive and shocking opinion of the eternal punishment of infants. The escape from this is either by annihilation of those dying in infancy, or by assuming that they are among the elect.

9. This doctrine destroys the end of punitive justice. That end can only be to deter men from offence, and to add strength to the law of God. But if the whole body of the reprobate are left to the influence of their fallen nature without remedy, they cannot be deterred from sin by threats of inevitable punishment; nor can they ever submit to the dominion of the law of God: their doom is fixed, and threats and examples can avail nothing.

SEE ELECTION.

Reproof

(*hr̄[ġ]tj kīp̄ō̄lēγxos*), blame or reprehension spoken to a person’s face. It is distinguished from a reprimand thus: he who reproves another, points out his fault, and blames him; he who reprimands affects to punish, and mortifies the offender. In giving reproof, the following rules may be observed:

1. We should not be forward in reproving our elders or superiors, but rather to remonstrate and supplicate for redress. What the ministers of God do in this kind, they do by special commission as those that must give an account (~~5:10~~ 1 Timothy 5:1; ~~5:17~~ Hebrews 13:17).
2. We must not reprove rashly; there should be proof before reproof.
3. We should not reprove for slight matters, for such faults or defects as proceed from natural frailty, from inadvertency, or mistake in matters of small consequence.
4. We should never reprove unseasonably, as to the time, the place, or the circumstances.
5. We should reprove mildly and sweetly, in the calm, est manner, in the gentlest terms.
6. We should not affect to be reprehensive; perhaps there is no one considered more troublesome than he who delights in finding fault with others.

In receiving reproof, it may be observed,

1. That we should not reject it merely because it may come from those who are not exactly on a level with ourselves.
2. We should consider whether the reproof given be not actually deserved; and whether, if the reprover knew all, the reproof would not be sharper than it is.
3. Whether, if taken humbly and patiently, it will not be of great advantage to us.
4. That it is nothing but pride to suppose that we are never to be the subjects of reproof, since it is human to err.

Reptile

Picture for Reptile

a word not used in the A.V., which designates this class of animals by the term “creeping thing” (q.v.), but covers thereby a much wider range of creatures. The following are the true *reptilia* mentioned in Scripture. They

almost exclusively consist of various unknown species of serpents and lizards. Of course both these classes were unclean to the Hebrews.

Requiem

a musical mass for the dead in the Church of Rome. so called from the words of the Introit, "Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine," Give them eternal rest, O Lord, etc. (2 Esdras 2:34, 35); and the antiphon for the psalms in place of the *Gloria Patri*

Reredos

Picture for Reredos

(written also *lardos*, from Fr. *l'arrieredos*), the wall or screen at the back of an altar, seat, etc. It was usually ornamented with panelling, etc., especially behind an altar, and sometimes was enriched with a profusion of niches, buttresses, pinnacles, statues, and other decorations, which were often painted with brilliant colors. Reredoses of this kind not unfrequently extended across the whole breadth of the church, and were sometimes carried up nearly to the ceiling, as at St. Alban's Abbey, Durham Cathedral, Gloucester Cathedral, St. Saviour's Church, Southwark; Christ Church, Hampshire, etc. In village churches they were generally simple, and appear very frequently to have had no ornaments formed in the wall, though sometimes corbels or niches — were provided to carry images, and sometimes that part of the wall immediately over the altar was panelled. Remains of these, more or less injured, are to be found in many churches, particularly at the east ends of aisles, as at St. Michael's, Oxford; Hanwell and Enstone, Oxfordshire; Solihull, Warwickshire, etc.; and against the east wall of the transept, as in St. Cuthbert's, Wells. It was not unusual to decorate the wall at the back of an altar with panellings, etc., in wood, or with embroidered hangings of tapestry-work, to which the name of reredos was given: it was also applied to the screen between the nave and choir of a church. The open fire-hearth, frequently used in ancient domestic halls, was likewise called a reredos. *SEE ALTAR.*

Rescissory Act

an act of the Scottish Parliament passed on the restoration of Charles II, annulling all acts passed between 1638 and 1650 for religion and the Reformation; denouncing the Solemn League and Covenant and the

Glasgow Assembly of 1638, and declaring that the government of the Church, as an essential royal prerogative, belongs alone to the crown.

Rescript

or CODEX RESCRIPTUS, a manuscript, the original writing of which had been virtually wiped out, and the works of some saint or father written over it. A codex of this class is that called *Codex Ephraemi* in the Imperial Library of Paris. Several works of the Syrian father were written on portions both of the Old and New Testaments. It has been published by Tischendorf, with a curious facsimile of the older and newer handwriting. By the application of a chemical tincture, the original writing of a rescript can now be well deciphered. *SEE EPHRAIM MANUSCRIPT*; *SEE PALIMPSEST*.

Resemblance To God.

SEE IMAGE OF GOD.

Res'en

(Heb. *id.*) $\hat{s}r$, a halter, as in ^{<330>}Isaiah 30:20; Sept. $\Delta\alpha\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\mu$ v. r. $\Delta\alpha\sigma\acute{\eta}$), an ancient town of Assyria, described as a great city lying between Nineveh and Calah (^{<100>}Genesis 10:12). Many writers have been inclined to identify it with the *Rhesina* or *Rhescena* of the Byzantine authors (Amm. Marc. 23:5; Procop. *Bell. Pers.* ii, 19; Steph. Byz. s.v. $\text{Ῥ}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\nu\alpha$), and of Ptolemy (*Geograph.* v, 18), which was near the true source of the western Khabour, and which is most probably the modern *Ras el-Ain*. There are no grounds, however, for this identification except the similarity of name (which similarity is perhaps fallacious, since the Sept. evidently reads $\hat{s}d$ for $\hat{s}r$, but not the Samar.), while it is a fatal objection to the theory that Resaena or Resina was not in Assyria at all, but in Western Mesopotamia, 200 miles to the west of both the cities between which it is said to have lain. Biblical geographers have generally been disposed to follow Bochart (*Phaleg*, 4:23) in finding a trace of the Hebrew name in *La-issa*, which is mentioned by Xenophon (*Anab.* 3:4, 9) as a desolate city on the Tigris, several miles north of the Lycus. The resemblance of the names is too faint to support the inference of identity; but the situation is not irreconcilable with the scriptural intimation. Ephrem Syrus (*Comment.* ad loc.) says that *Rassa*, which he substitutes for Resen (the Peshito has *Ressin*), was the

same as *Rish-Ain* (fountain-head); by which Assemani understands him to mean, not the place in Mesopotamia so called, but another Rish-Ain in Assyria, near Saphsaphre, in the province of Marga, which he finds noticed in a Syrian monastic history of the Middle Ages (Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* 3:2, p. 709). It is, however, still uncertain if Rassa be the same with Rish-Ain; and, whether it be so or not, a name so exceedingly uncommon (corresponding to the Arabic Ras el-Ain) affords a precarious basis for the identification of a site so ancient. The Larissa of Xenophon is most certainly the modern Nimrud. Resen, or Dasen — whichever may be the true form of the word — must assuredly have been in this neighborhood. As, however, the Nimrud ruins seem really to represent Calah, while those opposite Mosul are the remains of Nineveh, we must look for Resen in the tract lying between these two sites. Assyrian remains of some considerable extent are found in this situation, near the modern village of *Selamiyeh*, and it is perhaps the most probable conjecture that these represent the Resen of Genesis (see Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, i, 204). No doubt it may be said that a “great city,” such as Resen is declared to have been (^{אור}Genesis 10:12), could scarcely have intervened between two other large cities which are not twenty miles apart; and the ruins at Selamiyeh, it must be admitted, are not very extensive. But perhaps we ought to understand the phrase “a great city” relatively — i.e. great, as cities went in early times, or great, considering its proximity to two other larger towns. If this explanation seem unsatisfactory, we might perhaps conjecture that originally Asshur (Kileh-Sherghat) was called Calah, and Nimrud Resen; but that, when the seat of empire was removed northwards from the former place to the latter, the name Calah was transferred to the new capital. Instances of such transfers of name are not unfrequent. The later Jews appear to have identified Resen with the Kileh-Sherghat ruins. At least the Targums of Jonathan and of Jerusalem explain Resen by Tel-Asar (**rsl t** or **rsal t**), “the mound of Asshur.” *SEE ASSYRIA.*

Resentment

generally used in an ill sense, implying a determination to return an injury. Dr. Johnson observes that resentment is a union of sorrow with malignity; a combination of a passion which all endeavor to avoid with a passion which all concur to detest. The man who retires to meditate mischief and to exasperate his own rage; whose thoughts are employed only on means of distress and contrivances of ruin; whose mind never pauses from the

renewance of his own sufferings but to indulge some hope of enjoying the calamities of another, may justly be numbered among the most miserable of human beings — among those who are guilty, who have neither the gladness of prosperity nor the calm of innocence.

Reservation, Or Restriction

in ethics, is the keeping back in the mind; equivocation, by a phrase which means one thing to the users and another to those who hear it. It may be distinguished as *real* and *mental*.

1. *Real restriction* takes place when the words used are not true if strictly interpreted, but there is no deviation from truth if the circumstances be considered. One man asks another, Have you dined? and the answer given is, No. The party giving this answer has dined, times without number; but his answer is restricted by the circumstances, as *to-day*, and in that sense is true.

2. *Mental restriction* consists in saying so far what is true and to be believed, but adding mentally some qualification which makes it not to be true. A debtor, asked by his creditor for payment of his debt, says, “I will certainly pay you to-morrow,” adding to himself, “in part;” whereas the words audibly uttered referred to the whole amount. See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocabulary of Philosophical Science*, s.v.

Reserve In Teaching.

This is the *suppression*, in the instruction of the great mass of Christians, of a portion of those Gospel doctrines which are most earnestly set forth in Scripture, as if they were a sort of esoteric mystery of which ordinary believers are unworthy, and which should be reserved as a reward for a long course of pious submission. The maintainers of this system of teaching affect great mystery about the highest and most sacred doctrines of Christianity (such as the atonement, the divinity of our Lord, etc.); they regard them as too solemn and divine to be *vulgarized* by being explicitly and prominently put before the Christian world at large. They would therefore “economize” the knowledge of such deep doctrines. *reserving* them for communication to those worthy of being initiated, meanwhile asserting that the ordinary Christian is put in possession of these truths, and to a certain degree derives virtue out of them, by partaking of the sacraments, etc. It is on the authority of the fathers.that the advocates of

“reserve” chiefly dwell as most fully and expressly supporting the principle; but they adduce also, in justification of the system, the reverence it has a tendency to beget for sacred things (as if it were reverence, and not superstition, in those who know not what they are reverencing), and allege that doing thus they are acting a merciful part in keeping those in ignorance who would not make a profitable use of knowledge (just as if they had the power of discerning spirits). They contend that they are imitating the most perfect Pattern of wisdom and mercy, who thus economizes light and knowledge (e.g. concealing the Gospel at first under the veil of the Mosaic ritual), as if it were a system of philosophy of their own they undertook to teach, or as if they were imitating the Deity in concealing what he had revealed. The example of our Lord is appealed to, who, they say, taught openly by parables, but privately explained the mysteries of his kingdom to his disciples; a case quite inapplicable, as our Lord used *reserve*, not to his disciples, but towards wilful unbelievers. The system is also vindicated by studiously confounding it with the *gradual* initiation of Christians in the knowledge of their religion, and the necessity of *gradual* teaching; and the care requisite to avoid teaching anything which, though true in itself, would be falsely understood by the hearers is confounded with the system of withholding a portion of Gospel truths from those able and willing to receive it. It is almost needless to add that the entire system is opposed to the Word of God, which commands ministers not to shun to declare to the people “*all* the counsel of God,” and that it is calculated to throw doubt and uncertainty upon the whole Christian religion; for, as in this system of “reserve” there may be an indefinite number of degrees, none can ever be sure that he has fathomed the system and ascertained what is the real inmost doctrine of its advocates. See the Rev. Dr. West’s *Sermon on Reserve in Teaching*.

Reserved Cases

among Roman Catholic casuists, are certain sins which are to be dealt with by higher ecclesiastics than the mere priest, who may, however, bestow absolution if the penitent be at the point of death. To this class of sins belong heresy, simony, sacrilege, and certain offences against the priesthood.

Re'sheph

(Heb. *id.* פּוּר, *flame*, as often; Sept. Ῥασέφ *v.r.* Σαράφ), one of the descendants of Ephraim, a “son” of Beriah (q.v.) (~~1~~1 Chronicles 7:25). B.C. post 1658.

Residence

In the early Church there were laws regulating the residence of the clergy, and their design was to bind them to constant attendance upon their duty. The Council of Sardica had several canons relating to this matter. The seventh decreed that no bishop should go εἰς στρατόπεδον, to the emperor's court, unless the emperor by letter called him thither; but if any petition was to be preferred to the emperor relating to any civil contest, the bishop should depute his *apocrisarius*, or resident at court, to act for him, or send his *veconomus*, or some other of his clergy, to solicit the cause in his name, that the Church might neither receive damage by his absence nor be put to unnecessary expenses. Another canon of the Council of Sardica limited the absence of a bishop from his church to three weeks, unless it were upon some very weighty and urgent occasion. Another allowed the same time for a bishop to collect the revenues of his estate, provided he there celebrated divine service every Lord's day. By two other canons, presbyters and deacons were similarly tied. The Council of Agde made the like order for the French churches, decreeing that a presbyter or deacon who was absent from his church for three weeks should be three years suspended from the communion. By a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage, every bishop's house was to be near the church. The fifth council prescribed that every bishop should have his residence near his principal or cathedral church, which he should not leave, to the neglect of his cure.

In Great Britain, at the present time, residence is now regulated by 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106. The penalties for it, without a license from the bishop, are, one third of the annual value of the benefice when the absence exceeds three but does not exceed six months; one half of the annual value when the absence exceeds six but does not exceed eight months; and when it has been for the whole year, three fourths of the annual income are forfeited. Certain persons are exempted from the penalties of nonresidence, as the heads of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, the warden of Durham University, and the headmasters of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster schools. Privileges for temporary non-residence are granted to a great

number of persons who hold offices in cathedrals and at the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. 6 ch. 4 p. 7; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v.

Resignation

a patient, unresisting submission to the will of God, acknowledging both his power and right to afflict. The obligations to this duty arise from: 1. The perfections of God (^{<1604>}Deuteronomy 32:4). 2. The purpose of God (^{<4011>}Ephesians 1:11). 3. The commands of God (^{<8019>}Hebrews 12:9). 4. The promises of God (^{<4107>}1 Peter 5:7). 5. Our own interest (^{<8014>}Hosea 2:14, 15). 6. The prospect of eternal felicity (^{<3009>}Hebrews 4:9). *SEE PATIENCE.*

Resignation, Ecclesiastical.

The ancient Church was very strict in the matter of resignations, and yet there were cases in which they were allowed:

1. When a bishop, through the obstinacy, hatred, or disgust of any people, found himself incapable of doing them any service, and that the burden was an intolerable oppression to him; in that case, if he desired to resign, his resignation was accepted. Thus Gregory Nazianzen renounced the see of Constantinople because the people murmured at him as a stranger.
2. When in charity a bishop resigned, or showed himself willing to resign, to cure some inveterate schism. Thus Chrysostom announced his willingness to resign if the people had any suspicion that he was a usurper. In such cases canonical pensions were sometimes granted. The following are the rules that prevail in the Church of England: It can be made only to a superior, and it must be to such superior as the one from whom it was *immediately* obtained; for example, where institution was required, the party having the right to institute is the same to whom resignation is to be made; and in the case of donatives, resignation is to be made to the patron. Resignation must be made personally, and not by proxy: that is, it must be made either by personal appearance before the ordinary, or by an instrument properly attested and presented to him. It must be made without any condition annexed; in the words of the instrument, it must be made "absolute et simpliciter," and it must further be, in the words of the same instrument, "sponte et pure." It must also be made voluntarily, and it must not proceed from any corrupt inducement. If an incumbent take any pension, sum of money, or other benefit, directly or indirectly, for or in

respect of the resigning of a benefice having cure of souls, such a transaction is criminal in the view of the law, and both the giver and receiver in it are liable to legal penalties. No resignation can be valid till accepted by the proper ordinary, but the law has provided no remedy if the ordinary should refuse to accept. In as far as legal decisions have hitherto gone, the ordinary is no more compellable to accept a resignation than he is to admit persons into holy orders. When a resignation has been accepted, notice is to be given to the patron, if different from the ordinary; and lapse does not begin to run, as against the patron, until notice of the vacancy has been properly given to him. A Presbyterian minister resigns to the presbytery in whose bounds his charge is. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. 6 ch. 4 p. 2; Eden. *Theol. Dict.* s.v.

Resolutioners, Or Resolutionists

were those who approved of the answer given by the commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (which met at Perth in the time of Charles II) to the question proposed to them by the Parliament, viz. what persons were to be admitted to rise in arms against Cromwell. The resolution was, that all persons capable of bearing arms were to be admitted, except those of bad character, or obstinate enemies to the Covenant. Those who supported it were called *Resolutioners*, while those who opposed it were designated *Protesters* or *Anti-Resolutioners*.

Respect Of Persons

(προσωποληψία, ^{<821>}Romans 2:11; ^{<818>}Ephesians 6:9; ^{<825>}Colossians 3:25; ^{<818>}James 2:1; a later Greek word, found only in the New Test., and modelled after the use of ἡ [ν; with μνησθῆ, *partiality* for individuals. God appointed that the judges should pronounce sentence without respect of persons (^{<895>}Leviticus 19:15; ^{<867>}Deuteronomy 16:17, 19). That they should consider neither the poor nor the rich, the weak nor the powerful, but should attend only to truth and justice. God has no respect of persons. The Jews complimented our Saviour that he told the truth, without respect of persons, without fear (^{<126>}Matthew 22:16; ^{<311>}Isaiah 32:1-16). Jude (ver. 16), instead of the phrase “to have respect of persons,” has “to admire persons.”

Our English term *respect* seems to imply some kind of deference or submission to a party; but this is not always the proper meaning to be annexed to it in Scripture. When we read (^{<825>}Exodus 2:25) “God had

respect to the children of Israel," it can only express his compassion and sympathy for them; when God had respect to the offering of Abel (~~<0004>~~Genesis 4:4), it imports *to accept favorably*, to notice with satisfaction. (Comp. ~~<1088>~~1 Kings 8:28; ~~<0465>~~Numbers 16:15.)

Respond

Picture for Respond

before the Reformation, was a short anthem interrupting the middle of a chapter; when two or three verses had been read, the respond was sung, after which the chapter proceeded.

Respond

a half-pillar or pier, in Middle-age architecture, attached to a wall to support an arch, etc. Responds are very frequently used by themselves, as at the sides of the entrances of chancels, etc., and are also generally employed at the terminations of ranges of pillars, such as those between the body and aisles of churches. In these last-mentioned situations they usually correspond in form with the pillars, but are sometimes different. The name frequently occurs in mediaeval contracts, and may have its origin in the notion of the two pilasters responding to, i.e. corresponding with, each other. Thus the breadth of the nave of Eton College chapel "between the *responders*" was directed by the will of king Henry VI to be thirty-two feet. *SEE ARCH.*

Responsales

were a sort of residents in the imperial city in the name of foreign churches and bishops, whose office was to negotiate as proctors at the emperor's court in all ecclesiastical causes wherein their principals might be concerned. The institution of the office seems to have been in the time of Constantine, or not long after, when, the emperors having become Christians, foreign churches had more occasion to promote their suits at the imperial court than formerly. However, we find it established by law in the time of Justinian. It does not appear from that law that *responsales* were clergymen, but from other writings we may easily collect it. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. 3:ch. 13:p. 6.

Response

Among the Hebrews the usual response by the people to prayer was by the utterance of the word *Amen* at the close; and this practice was naturally adopted, or rather continued, by Christians likewise. This word ($\text{^}ma$), literally “firm, true,” was used as a substantive, “that which is true,” “truth” ($\text{^}28516$ Isaiah 65:16). It was employed in strong asseverations, fixing, as it were, the stamp of truth upon the assertion which it accompanied, and making it binding as an oath (comp. $\text{^}0462$ Numbers 5:22). In the Sept. of $\text{^}3166$ 1 Chronicles 16:36; $\text{^}4653$ Nehemiah 5:13; 8:6, the word appears in the form $\text{Am\`{e}n}$, which is used throughout the New Test. In other passages the Hebrew is rendered by $\text{^}4653$ $\text{^}4653$, except in $\text{^}28516$ Isaiah 65:16. The Vulgate adopts the Hebrew word in all cases except in the Psalms, where it is translated *fiat*. In $\text{^}6275$ Deuteronomy 27:15-26, the people were to say “Amen” as the Levites pronounced each of the curses upon Mount Ebal, signifying by this their assent to the conditions under which the curses would be inflicted. In accordance with this usage we find that among the rabbins “Amen” involves the ideas of swearing, acceptance, and truthfulness. The first two are illustrated by the passages already quoted, the last by $\text{^}1036$ 1 Kings 1:36; $\text{^}4653$ John 3:3, 5, 11 (A.V. “verily”), in which the assertions are made with the solemnity of an oath and then strengthened by the repetition of “Amen.” “Amen” was the proper response of the person to whom an oath was administered ($\text{^}4653$ Nehemiah 5:13; 8:6; $\text{^}3166$ 1 Chronicles 16:36; $\text{^}2416$ Jeremiah 11:5, marg.); and the Deity, to whom appeal is made on such occasions, is called “the God of *Amen*” ($\text{^}28516$ Isaiah 65:16), as being a witness to the sincerity of the implied compact. With a similar significance Christ is called “the *Amen*, the faithful and true witness” ($\text{^}6184$ Revelation 3:14; comp. $\text{^}6014$ John 1:14; 16:6; $\text{^}4012$ 2 Corinthians 1:20). It is matter of tradition that in the Temple the “Amen” was not uttered by the people, but that instead, at the conclusion of the priest’s prayers, they responded. “Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever.” Of this a trace is supposed to remain in the concluding sentence of the Lord’s Prayer (comp. $\text{^}5116$ Romans 11:36). But in the synagogues and private houses it was customary for the people or members of the family who were present to say “Amen” to the prayers which were offered by the minister or the master of the house, and the custom remained in the early Christian Church ($\text{^}4653$ Matthew 6:13; $\text{^}6446$ 1 Corinthians 14:16). And not only public prayers, but those offered in private, and doxologies were appropriately concluded with “Amen”

(~~4515~~ Romans 9:5; 11:36; 15:33; 16:27; ~~47313~~ 2 Corinthians 13:13, etc.). *SEE AMEN.*

Responses

Short sentences, so called from their being the *answers* of the people to the officiating minister. The design of responses is, by giving to the people a part in the service, to quicken this devotion and engage their attention. It is much to be regretted that congregations do not in general join in the parts of the service allotted to them, as such neglect is the means of making our worship appear to many both cold and formal. Anciently all the people were allowed to join in psalmody and prayers, and make their proper responses. Of the latter there were several.

- (1.) Amen. This, in the phraseology of the Church, is denominated *orationis signaculum*, or *devotee concionis responsio*, and intimates that the prayer of the speaker is heard, and approved by him who gives this response.
- (2.) Hallelujah. This was adopted from the Jewish psalmody, particularly from those psalms (113-118) which were sung at the Passover, called the Great Hallel, or Hallel. The use of this phrase was first adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by the other churches, and was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whit-Sunday. In the Greek Church it was expressive of grief, sorrow, and penitence, while in the Latin it denoted a joyful spirit.
- (3.) Hosanna. The Church, both ancient and modern, has ascribed to this word a meaning similar to that of hallelujah. The true signification is "Lord save" (~~4825~~ Psalm 118:25).
- (4.) "O Lord have mercy" — κύριε ἐλέησον. The Council of Vaison, A.D. 492, canon 3, ordained that this response should be introduced into the morning and evening worship, and into the public religious service. Gregory the Great introduced a threefold form, "O Lord," "Lord have mercy," "Christ have mercy."
- (5.) "Glory, glory in the highest," in use on festive occasions in the 5th century, and in general use in the 7th century.
- (6.) "The Lord be with you;" "Peace be with you," ordained by the Council of Braga, A.D. 561, to be the uniform salutation of bishops and presbyters

when addressing the people. The last-mentioned salutation alone was in use in the Greek Church. See Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.*; Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.

Responsorii, Psalmi

mean either the repetition of the verses by the people, or the repetition of the last words of the psalm, with the addition of the “amen” or the doxology; or that the psalms were so selected as to correspond to the subject of the lessons which had been read. — Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v. “Psalmody.”

Ressaunt

Picture for Ressaunt

(probably Fr. *ressentir*), an old English term for an ogee moulding. It was also applied to other architectural members that had the inflected outline of this moulding.

Rest, Or Repose

was enjoined upon the Israelites on the Sabbath day for the glory of God, in that he rested after the six days of creation. **SEE SABBATH.**

Rest also signifies a fixed and secure habitation. “Ye shall go before your brethren until the Lord shall give rest to your brethren, as well as to you, and until ye are come into the land whither ye are going to possess it” (^{<0680>}Deuteronomy 3:20). So also ^{<0519>}Deuteronomy 12:9: For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you,” i.e. you are not as yet settled in that land which you are to possess. Naomi says to Ruth, “My daughter, shall I not seek rest for thee, that it may be well with thee?” (^{<0801>}Ruth 3:1) — i.e. I shall endeavor to procure you a settlement. David, speaking of the ark of the covenant, which till his time had no fixed place of settlement, says, “Arise, O Lord, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength” (^{<0428>}Psalms 132:8). Likewise Ecclesiastes 36:15: “O be merciful unto Jerusalem, thy holy city, the place of thy rest.”

Rest has the following figurative meanings: to *lean*, or *trust in* (^{<4418>}2 Chronicles 32:8); to *continue fixed* (^{<2504>}Isaiah 51:4); to *come to an end* (^{<2362>}Ezekiel 16:42; 21:17); *cease from war* (^{<0345>}Joshua 14:15).

Rest, like sleep, is in the Scriptures sometimes used as the symbol of *death*. Thus the patriarch exclaims, “For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth” (^{<K813>}Job 3:13); and thus a charge is given to Daniel: “Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days” (^{<7213>}Daniel 12:13). This phrase also occurs in I Samuel 28:15; ^{<8118>}Job 11:18; ^{<4125>}Acts 2:26; ^{<6161>}Revelation 6:9; and is common on Jewish monuments for the dead, as “May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with the other just men of the world.” “May his soul rest in peace till the Comforter come.” “May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with other just men. Amen, amen, amen, Selah.”

In a moral and spiritual sense, rest denotes a cessation from carnal trouble and sin (^{<4128>}Matthew 11:28, 29). Finally, it is used to represent the fixed and permanent state of repose enjoyed by the blessed in heaven; and to this Paul makes an application of what is said of the settlement of the Israelites in the Land of Promise: “I swear to them in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest,” i.e. into the land of Canaan (^{<3951>}Psalms 95:11). “Therefore,” says Paul (^{<3817>}Hebrews 3:17-19; 4:1-3), “as they could not enter therein by reason of their unbelief, let us be afraid of imitating their example: for we cannot enter but by faith,” etc. *SEE SABBATISM*.

Restitution

a term applied in the A.V. in two very different senses.

1. Penal (^{<114>}μῖν; *to repay*, ^{<2101>}Exodus 20:1-14, etc.; elsewhere “requite,” etc.; but in ^{<8118>}Job 20:18, ^{<hrWmT>}exchange, as elsewhere rendered), that act of justice by which we restore to our neighbor whatever we have unjustly deprived him of; a point insisted on under both the old and the new covenant (^{<1271>}Exodus 22:1; ^{<2198>}Luke 19:8). Justice requires that those things which have been stolen or unlawfully taken from another should be restored to the party aggrieved, and that compensation should be made to him by the aggressor. Accordingly various fines or pecuniary payments were exacted by the Mosaic law: as,

(**1.**) Fines, ^{<311>}צנ], *onesh*, strictly so called, went commonly to the injured party, and were of two kinds: fixed, i.e. those of which the amount was determined by some statute as, for instance, that of ^{<6219>}Deuteronomy

22:19, or 22:29; and undetermined, or where the amount was left to the decision of the judges (⁽¹²¹²⁾Exodus 21:22).

(2.) Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly retained, with twenty per cent. over and above. He who, by ignorance, should omit to give to the Temple what was appointed by the law — for example, in the tithes or first-fruits — was obliged to restore it to the priests and to add a fifth part besides, over and above which he was bound to offer a ram for his expiation. Nehemiah prevailed with all those Israelites to make restitution who had taken interest of their brethren (⁽⁴¹⁵⁰⁾Nehemiah 5:10, 11), and Zacchaeus (⁽²⁹⁰⁸⁾Luke 19:8) promises a Fourfold restitution to ail from whom he had extorted in his office as a publican. The Roman laws condemned to a fourfold restitution all who were convicted of extortion or fraud. Zacchaeus here imposes that penalty on himself, to which he adds the half of his goods, which was what the law did not require.

(3.) If a man killed a beast, he was to make it good, beast for beast (⁽⁸²⁴⁸⁾Leviticus 24:18). If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant thirty shekels of silver (⁽¹²¹³⁾Exodus 21:32). In the case of one man's ox pushing the ox of another man to death, as it would be very difficult to ascertain which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel, the two owners were obliged to bear the loss between them; the living ox was to be sold, and its price, together with the dead beast, was to be equally divided by them. If, however, one of the oxen had previously been notorious for goring, and the owner had not taken care to confine him, in such case he was to give the loser another and to take the dead ox himself (ver. 36).

(4.) If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit remain open and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of such pit was obliged to pay for the beast and had it for the payment (vers. 33, 34).

(5.) When a fire was kindled in the fields and did any damage, he who kindled it was to make the damage good (22:6). *SEE DAMAGES.*

Moralists observe respecting restitution:

(1.) That where it can be made in kind, or the injury can be certainly valued, we are to restore the thing or the value.

(2.) We are bound to restore the thing with the natural increase of it, i.e. to satisfy for the loss sustained in the meantime and the gain hindered.

(3.) Where the thing cannot be restored and the value of it is not certain, we are to give reasonable satisfaction according to a middle estimation.

(4.) We are at least to give by way of restitution what the law would give, for that is a generally equal and in most cases rather favorable than rigorous.

(5.) A man is not only bound to restitution for the injury he did, but for all that directly follows from the injurious act; for the first injury being wilful, we are supposed to will all that which follows upon it.

2. *Apocatastasis*, a term which, in its Greek form, occurs but once in the New Test. in the phrase “restitution of all things,” ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (^{<418>}Acts 3:21). As an event, it is in that passage connected with the “refreshing (ἀνάψυξις) from the presence of the Lord” (ver. 19). The grammatical construction as well as exegetical interpretation of the whole passage has been greatly disputed by commentators (see Meyer, *Commentar. ad loc.*); but Alford (*Greek Test. ad loc.*) regards both these as being decisively settled by the parallel expression of our Saviour — that Elijah “will restore all things,” ἀποκαταστάσει πάντα (^{<471>}Matthew 17:11). The principal opinions of interpreters are thus summed up by Kuinol (*Comment. ad loc.*):

(a) De Dieu, Limbach, Wolf, and others understand by the times of “refreshing” and “restitution” (i.e. the predicted period when the due position will be assigned each one), the days of the *last judgment*, the times of affliction to the impious and contumacious, but of relief, quiet, and safety to the saints. In support of this view they adduce the frequent argument of the sacred writers to induce Christians to diligence and hope drawn from the prospect of the last day (^{<473>}Acts 17:30 sq.; ^{<607>}2 Peter 3:7; 11:13 sq.; comp. especially the similar language of ^{<500>}2 Thessalonians 1:7; 2:16), and the fact that Jewish writers were accustomed so to speak of it (*Pirke Aboth*, 4:17).

(b) Schulz (in his *Dissert. de Temporibus τῆς ἀναψύξεως*, in the *Biblioth. Hagan.* v, 119 sq.) understands the *time of death*, the terminus fixed to each man’s life, the future rest of the dead in the Lord; a view which Barkey (*ibid.* p. 411) justly opposes by this, among other considerations,

that if this had been Peter's meaning it is strange he had not used clearer and more customary phraseology.

(c) Kraft (*Obs. Sacr.* fascic. 9:271 sq.) remarks that Peter on this passage derives his argument not merely from the hope of pardon, but also from the benefits already bestowed by God, and therefore considers this "refreshing" to be the *liberation afforded by Jesus from the ceremonial yoke of bondage* of the Jewish law, an exposition which is well refuted by Barkey (*Bibl. Hag.* 3:119 sq.), who pertinently remarks that Peter at this very time was not himself free from legal prejudices.

(d) Barkey (*ibid.* v, 397 sq.) thinks these "times of refreshing" are the period of *the delay of the divine judgment upon the Jews*, the time of the divine longsuffering, in which the zeal of the Almighty's vengeance was remitted or relaxed. He regards the expression "Jesus Christ" here as put for "the word of Jesus Christ," and so refers the words "he shall send," etc., to the preaching of the doctrine of Jesus.

(e) In the opinion of Grotius, Hammond, and Bolten, the "times of refreshing" are the time of the freedom of Christians from Jewish persecution and the calamities impending over the wicked and refractory Jews (^{<4243>}Matthew 24:33; ^{<4213>}Luke 21:28); while the "times of restitution" are the time of the fulfilment of the predictions concerning the overthrow of the capital and polity of the Jews (comp. ^{<4245>}Matthew 24:15, 30).

(f) Ernesti (in his *Opusc. Theol.* p. 477), who finds a follower in Dbderlein (*Institutio Theol. Christ.* ii, § 223, obs. 6), interprets the term *apocatasis* as meaning a new, greater, and truer *perfection of religion*, the doctrine of the Gospel clear and free from all shadows of figures and rites; first announced by John, then promulgated by Jesus among the Jews, and finally propagated by the apostle everywhere. This view he fortifies by the observation that "times of restitution" is equivalent to "time of reformation" (**διδόθησιν**, ^{<3990>}Hebrews 9:10).

(g) Also Eckermann (*Theologische Beiträge*, 1, ii, 112 sq.) interprets the "apocatasis of all things" to mean the universal emendation of religion by the doctrine of Christ, and the "times of refreshing" to be the *day of renewal*, the times of the Messiah. The same writer, however, afterwards (*ibid.* II, i, 188 sq.) rejects this exposition on the ground that the parallel passages (^{<4017>}Matthew 11:17; ^{<4092>}Mark 9:12) speak of *Elijah* as to precede and rectify Jewish faith and morals. He therefore concludes that Peter was

referring to a restoration of the Jewish polity in its original splendor. Yet finally (in his *Erkalrung aller dunkeln Stellen des N.T.* ii, 184) he returns to his original opinion. (h) Rosenmuller, following Morus, understands the “times of refreshing” to denote *happy times*, not merely the day of the resurrection of the dead, but also spiritual benefits of every kind which Christians enjoy in this and the future life (Morus: the Messianic times), and refers the “times of restitution” (full and perfect fulfilment of prophecy) to the consummation of that auspicious period when all enemies shall be subdued (1 Corinthians 20:25 sq.; ^{<802>}Hebrews 10:12, 15; comp. ^{<801>}Psalm 110:1), and every influence opposing true religion removed. Many of these interpretations are obviously fanciful, and most of them too vague, although some contain an element of truth. The word ἀποκατάστασις signifies *emendation, restoration to a pristine condition, change to a better state*. (So Josephus, *Ant.* 11:3, 8; 4:6; Philo, *De Decal.* p. 767 b; *De Rer. Div. Her.* p. 522 c. Hesychius and Phanorinus likewise explain it by τελείωσις; but the scholiast in the Cod. Nosq. *ad loc.* renders συμπλήρωσις, ἔκβασις. In like manner ἀποκαθιστάνειν signifies to *complete, bring to a conclusion*; see the Sept. at ^{<806>}Job 8:6, where it corresponds with μλωσο in ^{<0413>}Genesis 41:13; ^{<208>}Jeremiah 22:8; comp. Polyb. 4, 23, 1; Diod. Sic. 20:34.) By the expression “until the times of the *apocatastasis* of all things which God hath spoken,” etc., Peter means the time when all affairs shall be consummated, all the prophetic announcements shall be accomplished, including the inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah and its attendant events, the full extension of the Gospel, the resurrection, judgment, etc. — in short, the end of the world (see Olshausen, De Wette, Hackett, and most others, *ad loc.*). **SEE ESCHATOLOGY.**

Restoration

THE, a name generally given to the return of the Church of England to the previously appointed ecclesiastical polity, and to their allegiance to the regular prince, Charles II, which took place in 1660. It has been appointed, by authority, that May 29 in every year shall be kept with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God for this event.

Restoration Of The Jews.

This term is applied to two very different classes of prophecies relating to the Hebrew race.

1. Their Return from Captivity. — It is maintained by Von Bohlen (*Genesis*, p. 116) that the ten tribes intermarried so freely with the surrounding population as to have become completely absorbed; and it appears to be a universal opinion that no one now knows where their descendants are. But it is a harsh assumption that such intermarriages were commoner with the ten tribes than with the two; and certainly, in the apostolic days, the *twelve* tribes are referred to as a well-known people, sharply defined from the heathen (^{<4947>}Acts 24:7; ^{<5000>}James 1:1). Not a trace appears that any repulsive principle existed at that time between the Ten and the Two. “Ephraim no longer envied Judah, nor Judah vexed Ephraim;” but they had become “one nation;” though only partially “on the mountains of Israel” (^{<28113>}Isaiah 11:13; ^{<26572>}Ezekiel 37:22). It would seem, therefore, that one result of the captivity was to blend all the tribes together, and produce a national union which had never been effected in their own land. If ever there was a difference between them as to the books counted sacred, that difference entirely vanished; at least, no evidence appears of the contrary fact. When, moreover, the laws of landed inheritance no longer enforced the maintenance of separate tribes and put a difficulty in the way of their intermarriage, an almost inevitable result in course of time was the entire obliteration of this distinction; and, as a fact, no modern Jews know to what tribe they belong, although vanity always makes them choose to say that they are of the two or three, and not of the ten tribes. That all Jews now living have in them the blood of all the twelve tribes ought (it seems) to be believed, until some better reason than mere assertion is advanced against it.

When Cyrus gave permission to the Israelites to return to their own country, and restored their sacred vessels, it is not wonderful that few persons of the ten tribes were eager to take advantage of it. In two centuries they had become thoroughly naturalized in their Eastern settlements; nor had Jerusalem ever been the centre of proud aspirations to them. It is perhaps remarkable that in ^{<4500>}Ezra 2:2, 36 (see also 10:18, 25), the word *Israel* is used to signify what we might call the laity as opposed to the priests and Levites, which might seem as if the writer were anxious to avoid asserting that all the families belonged to the two tribes. (If this is not the meaning, it at least shows that all discriminating force in the words *Israel* and *Judah* was already lost. So, too, in the book of Esther, the twelve tribes through all parts of the Persian empire are called Jews.) Nevertheless, it was to be expected that only those would return to

Jerusalem whose expatriation was very recent, and principally those whose parents had dwelt in the holy city or its immediate neighborhood. The remigrants, doubtless, consisted chiefly of the pious and the poor; and as the latter proved docile to their teachers, a totally new spirit reigned in the restored nation. Whatever want of zeal the anxious Ezra might discern in his comrades, it is no slight matter that he could induce them to divorce their heathen wives — a measure of harshness which Paul would scarcely have sanctioned (^{<487D>}1 Corinthians 7:12); and the century which followed was, on the whole, one of great religious activity and important permanent results on the moral character of the nation. Even the prophetic spirit by no means disappeared for a century and a half; although at length both the true and the false prophet were supplanted among them by the learned and diligent scribe, the anxious commentator, and the over-literal or over-figurative critic. In place of a people prone to go astray after sensible objects of adoration, and readily admitting heathen customs; attached to monarchical power, but inattentive to a hierarchy; careless of a written law, and movable by alternate impulses of apostasy and repentance, we henceforth find in them a deep and permanent reverence for Moses and the prophets, an aversion to foreigners and foreign customs, a profound hatred of idolatry, a great devotion to priestly and Levitical rank, and to all who had an exterior of piety; in short, a slavish obedience both to the law and to its authorized expositors. Now first, so far as can be ascertained (observe the particularity of detail in ^{<468D>}Nehemiah 8:4, etc.), were the synagogues and houses of prayer instituted and the law periodically read aloud. Now began the close observance of the Passover, the Sabbath, and the sabbatical year. Such was the change wrought in the guardians of the sacred books that, whereas the pious king Josiah had sat eighteen years on the throne without knowing of the existence of “the book of the law” (^{<422B>}2 Kings 22:3, 8), in the later period, on the contrary, the text was watched over with a scrupulous and fantastic punctiliousness. From this era the civil power was absorbed in that of the priesthood, and the Jewish people affords the singular spectacle of a nation in which the priestly rule came later in time than that of hereditary kings. Something analogous may, perhaps, be seen in the priestly authority at Comana, in Cappadocia, under the Roman sway (Cicero, *Ep. ad Div.* 15:4, etc.).

In their habits of life, also, the Jewish nation was permanently affected by the first captivity. The love of agriculture, which the institutions of Moses had so vigorously inspired, had necessarily declined in a foreign land; and

they returned with a taste for commerce, banking, and retail trade, which was probably kept up by constant intercourse with their brethren who remained in dispersion. The same intercourse in turn propagated towards the rest the moral spirit which reigned at Jerusalem. The Egyptian Jews, it would seem, had gained little good from the contact of idolatry (Jeremiah xliv, 8); but those who had fallen in with the Persian religion, probably about the time of its great reform by Zoroaster, had been preserved from such temptations, and returned purer than they went. Thenceforward it was the honorable function of Jerusalem to act as a religious metropolis to the whole dispersed nation; and it cannot be doubted that the ten tribes, as well as the two, learned to be proud of the holy city, as the great and free centre of their name and their faith. The same religious influences thus diffused themselves through all the twelve tribes of Israel. *SEE DISPERSED.*

2. *Their Future Return to Palestine.* — It is a favorite view with many that the Israelitish race, now scattered over the face of the earth, will eventually be brought back to their own land. To this is generally added the belief that they will yet return in a converted, i.e. Christian, state. The final ingathering of the Jews, no less than of all Gentiles, is certainly taught, not only in the Old Test., but likewise in the New (see ^{<small>SIII>}Romans 11:11-25). But it appears to be an error to infer that, therefore, they will generally be restored to their original home. See Swaine, *Objections to the Restoration of the Jews* (3d ed. Lond. 1861); Browne, *Restoration of the Jews* (Edinb. 1861); Clarke, *Restoration of the Jews* (Lond. 1861). *SEE MILLENNIUM.*

Restorationists

the name assumed by a body of professing Christians who are to a very great extent identical with the Unitarians, on the one hand, and the Universalists, on the other. Their peculiar doctrine is, that all men will ultimately become holy and happy. They maintain that God created men only to bless them, and that he sent his Son to “be for salvation to the ends of the earth.” They further teach that man’s probation is not confined to this life, but extends throughout the mediatorial reign of Christ; and that, as he died for all, all will eventually be saved. They consider that punishment is reformatory in its character, and has for its object the conversion of the sinner. Although the Restorationists, as a separate body, have only existed for a few years, their sentiments are by no means new. Some of the early fathers — Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory Nyssen, and others — believed and advocated the restoration of

all fallen intelligences. A branch of the German Baptists, before the Reformation, held and propagated the doctrine. In Europe many prominent names may be cited as its advocates. It was introduced into America about the middle of the 18th century, but not much taught until about 1775 or 1780, when John Murray and Elhanan Winchester became its advocates. Afterwards we find Dr. Chauncey, of Boston; Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; Dr. Smith, of New York; and Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, as advocates, although most of them continued in the ranks of the various sects. In 1785 a convention was organized at Oxford, Mass., under the auspices of Messrs. Winchester and Murray; and as all who believed in universal salvation believed that the effects of sin and the means of grace extended into a future life, the terms *Restorationist* and *Universalist* were synonymous, and the convention adopted the latter as their distinctive name. In 1818 the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, advanced the doctrine that all retribution is confined to this world; to which was added by others the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, that the whole man died a temporal death, and that the resurrection would introduce all men into everlasting happiness. As a result a distinct sect, by the name of *Universal Restorationists*, was formed at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 17, 1831; but it soon became extinct. The Restorationists maintain that a just retribution does not take place in time; that men are invited to act with reference to a future life; that there are grades of reward and punishment; that it is not death or the resurrection that introduces men into heaven. The Restorationists have never been numerous; they are found more extensively in Massachusetts, although they have a few societies in other states. At one time they published a weekly newspaper, and had from twenty to thirty ministers, with from two to three thousand members. Very many, however, are found in the other sects who entertain the peculiar views of the Restorationists. See Ballou, *Ancient History of Universalism*; Belcher, *Religious Denominations*; Foster, *Examination of Strong*; Hudson, *Letter and Reply*; Chauncey, *Salvation of all Men*; Hartley, *On Man*; Stonehouse, *Universal Retribution*; Smith, *On Divine Government*. **SEE UNIVERSALISM.**

Resurrection

(ἀνάστασις) OF THE BODY, the revivification of the human body after it has been forsaken by the soul, or the reunion of the soul hereafter to the body which it had occupied in the present world. This is one of the essential points in the creed of Christendom.

I. History of the Doctrine. — It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew Scripture. It is not to be found in the Pentateuch, in the historical books, or in the Psalms; for ^{<19115>}Psalm 49:15 does not relate to this subject; neither does ^{<19123>}Psalm 104:29, 30, although so cited by Theodoret and others. The celebrated passage of ^{<18125>}Job 19:25 sq. has indeed been strongly insisted upon in proof of the early belief in this doctrine; but the most learned commentators are agreed, and scarcely any one at the present day disputes, that such a view of the text arises either from mistranslation or misapprehension, and that Job means no more than to express a confident conviction that his then diseased and dreadfully corrupted body should be restored to its former soundness; that he should rise from the depressed state in which he lay to his former prosperity; and that God would manifestly appear (as was the case) to vindicate his uprightness. That no meaning more recondite is to be found in the text is agreed by Calvin, Mercier, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Durell, Heath, Kennicott, Doderlein, Dathe, Eichhorn, Jahn, De Wette, and a host of others. That it alludes to a resurrection is disproved thus:

- 1.** The supposition is inconsistent with the design of the poem and the course of the argument, since the belief which it has been supposed to express, as connected with a future state of retribution, would in a great degree have solved the difficulty on which the whole dispute turns, and could not but have been often alluded to by the speakers.
- 2.** It is inconsistent with the connection of the discourse; the reply of Zophar agreeing, not with the popular interpretation, but with the other.
- 3.** It is inconsistent with many passages in which the same person (Job) longs for death as the end of his miseries, and not as the introduction to a better life (Job 3; 7:7, 8; 10:20-22; ch. 19; 17:11-16).
- 4.** It is not proposed as a topic of consolation by any of the friends of Job; nor by Elihu, who acts as a sort of umpire; nor by the Almighty himself in the decision of the controversy.
- 5.** The later Jews, who eagerly sought for every intimation bearing on a future life which their Scriptures might contain, never regarded this as such; nor is it once referred to by Christ or his apostles.

6. The language, when exactly rendered, contains no warrant for such an interpretation; especially the phrase “yet *in* my flesh shall I see God,” which should rather be rendered “*out of* my flesh.” *SEE JOB, BOOK OF.*

Isaiah may be regarded as the first Scripture writer in whom such an allusion can be traced. He compares the restoration of the Jewish people and state to a resurrection from the dead (^{<2339>}Isaiah 26:19, 20); and in this he is followed by Ezekiel at the time of the exile (ch. 37). From these passages, which are, however, not very clear in their intimations, it may seem that in this, as in other matters, the twilight of spiritual manifestations brightened as the day-spring from on high approached; and in ^{<2711>}Daniel 12:2 we at length arrive at a clear and unequivocal declaration that those who lie sleeping under the earth shall awake, some to eternal life, and others to everlasting shame and contempt.

In the time of Christ, the belief of a resurrection, in connection with a state of future retribution, was held by the Pharisees and the great body of the Jewish people, and was only disputed by the Sadducees. Indeed, they seem to have regarded the future life as incomplete without the body; and so intimately were the two things—the future existence of the soul and the resurrection of the body—connected in their minds that any argument which proved the former they considered as proving the latter also (see ^{<4123>}Matthew 22:31; ^{<4152>}1 Corinthians 15:32). This belief, however, led their coarse minds into gross and sensuous conceptions of the future state, although there were many among the Pharisees who taught that the future body would be so refined as not to need the indulgences which were necessary in the present life; and they assented to our Lord’s assertion that the risen saints would not marry, but would be as the angels of God (^{<4121>}Matthew 22:30; comp. ^{<4119>}Luke 20:39). So Paul, in ^{<4163>}1 Corinthians 6:13, is conceived to intimate that the necessity of food for subsistence will be abolished in the world to come.

In further proof of the commonness of a belief in the resurrection among the Jews of the time of Christ, see ^{<4121>}Matthew 22; ^{<4210>}Luke 20; ^{<4112>}John 11:24; ^{<4216>}Acts 23:6-8. Josephus is not to be relied upon in the account which he gives of the belief of his countrymen (*Ant.* 18:2; *War.* ii, 7), as he appears to use terms which might suggest one thing to his Jewish readers and another to the Greeks and Romans, who scouted the idea of a resurrection. It is clearly taught in the Apocryphal books of the Old Test. (*Wisdom of Solomon* 3:1, etc.; 4:15; *2 Maccabees* 7:14, 23, 29, etc.). —

Many Jews believed that the wicked would not be raised from the dead; but the contrary was the more prevailing opinion, in which Paul once took occasion to express his concurrence with the Pharisees (~~4045~~ Acts 24:15).

But although the doctrine of the resurrection was thus prevalent among the Jews in the time of Christ, it might still have been doubtful and obscure to us had not Christ given to it the sanction of his authority, and declared it a constituent part of his religion (e.g. Matthew 22; John 5, 8, 11). He and his apostles also, were careful to correct the erroneous notions which the Jews entertained on this head, and to make the subject more obvious and intelligible than it had ever been before. A special interest is also imparted to the subject from the manner in which the New Test. represents Christ as the person to whom we are indebted for this benefit, which, by every variety of argument and illustration, the apostles connect with him, and make to rest upon him (~~4042~~ Acts 4:2; 26:3; 1 Corinthians 15; ~~5044~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:14, etc.).

II. Scripture Details. — The principal points which can be collected from the New Test. on this subject are the following:

- 1.** The raising of the dead is everywhere ascribed to Christ, and is represented as the last work to be undertaken by him for the salvation of man (~~4042~~ John 5:21; 11:25; ~~4152~~ 1 Corinthians 15:22 sq.; ~~5045~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:15; ~~6018~~ Revelation 1:18).
- 2.** All the dead will be raised, without respect to age, rank, or character in this world (~~4048~~ John 5:28, 29; ~~4045~~ Acts 24:15; ~~4152~~ 1 Corinthians 15:22).
- 3.** This event is to take place not before the end of the world, or the general judgment (~~4042~~ John 5:21; 6:39, 40; 11:24; ~~4152~~ 1 Corinthians 15:22-28; ~~5045~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:15; ~~6011~~ Revelation 20:11).
- 4.** The manner in which this marvellous change shall be accomplished is necessarily beyond our present comprehension, and therefore the Scripture is content to illustrate it by figurative representations, or by proving the possibility and intelligibility of the leading facts. Some of the figurative descriptions occur in Matthew 24; John 5; ~~4152~~ 1 Corinthians 15:52; ~~5046~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:16; ~~5042~~ Philippians 3:21. The image of a trumpet-call, which is repeated in some of these texts, is derived from the Jewish custom of convening assemblies by sound of trumpet.

- 5.** The possibility of a resurrection is powerfully argued by Paul in ^{<465D>}1 Corinthians 15:32 sq., by comparing it with events of common occurrence in the natural world. (See also ver. 12-14; and comp. ^{<440D>}Acts 4:2.) — Kitto.
- 6.** The numerous instances of an actual raising of individuals to life by our Lord and his apostles, not to speak of a few similar acts by the Old Test. prophets, and especially the crowning fact of our Lord's resurrection from the grave, afford some light on these particulars. (See below.):
- 7.** The fact of the general judgment (q.v.) is conclusive as to the literal truth of this great doctrine.

But although this body shall be so raised as to preserve its *identity*, it must yet undergo certain purifying changes to fit it for the kingdom of heaven, and to render it capable of immortality (^{<465S>}1 Corinthians 15:35 sq.), so that it shall become a glorified body like that of Christ (ver. 49; ^{<460D>}Romans 6:9; ^{<400D>}Philippians 3:21); and the bodies of those whom the last day finds alive will undergo a similar change without tasting death (^{<465S>}1 Corinthians 15:51, 53; ^{<400D>}2 Corinthians 5:4; ^{<404S>}1 Thessalonians 4:15 sq.; ^{<400D>}Philippians 3:21).

III. Theories on the Subject, — Whether the soul, between the death and the resurrection of the present body, exists independent of any envelope, we know not. Though it may be that a union of spirit with body is the general law of all created spiritual life, still this view gives no countenance to the notions of those who have attempted to prove, from certain physiological opinions respecting the renewal — every few years — of the human frame during life, and the final transmission of its decomposed elements into other forms of being, that the resurrection of the body is impossible. The apostle asserts the fact that the “dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (^{<465S>}1 Corinthians 15:35-53). While this passage affirms the identity of the body before and after the resurrection, it by no means affirms the identity of the constituent particles of which the body is, at different periods, supposed to be made up. The particles of a man's body may change several times between infancy and old age; and yet, according to our ideas of bodily identity, the man has had all the time “the same body.” So also all the particles may be changed again between the process of death and the resurrection, and the

body yet retain its identity (see the *Bibliothec Sacra*, 2, 613 sq.). Doubtless the future body will be incorruptible, infrangible, and capable of being moved at will to any part of the universe. The highest and most lengthened exercises of thought and feeling will doubtless not occasion exhaustion or languor so as to divert in any way the intellect and the affections from the engagements suited to their strength and perfection (see the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* April, 1862). But that there is *no* analogy — that the new body will have no connection with, and no relation to, the old; and that, in fact, the resurrection of the *body* is not a doctrine of Scripture — does not appear to us to have been satisfactorily proved by the latest writer on the subject (Bush, *Annistasis*, N. Y. 1845); and we think so highly of his ingenuity and talent as to believe that no one else is likely to succeed in an argument in which he has failed.

Among the speculations propounded as a solution of the problem of the resurrection, the most ingenious, perhaps, as well as fascinating, is the *germ* theory, which assumes that the soul at death retains a certain ethereal investiture, and that this has, by virtue of the vital force, the power of accreting to itself a new body for the celestial life. This is substantially the Swedenborgian view as advocated by the late Prof. Bush, and has recently received the powerful support of Mr. Joseph Cook in his popular lectures. It is thought to be countenanced especially by Paul's language (1 Cor. 15) concerning the "spiritual body" of the future state (ver. 4), and his figure of the renewed grain (ver. 37). This explanation, however, is beset with many insuperable difficulties.

(a.) The apostle's distinction between the *psychical* (ψυχικόν, "natural") and the *pneumatical* (πνευματικόν, "spiritual") in that passage is not of *material* (φυσικόν, physical) as opposed to immaterial or disembodied; for both are equally called *body* (σῶμα, actual and tangible substance), such as we know our Lord's resurrection body was composed of (Luke 24:39). It is merely, as the whole context shows ("corruptible-incorruptible," "mortal-immortal," etc.), the difference between the feeble, decaying body of this life in its present *normal* state, and the glorious, fadeless frame of the future world in its *transcendent* condition hereafter; in short, its aspect as known to us here from *natural* phenomena, and its prospect as *revealed* to us in Scripture. This appears from the contrasted use of these terms in another part of the same epistle (1 Cor. 2:14, 15) to denote the unregenerate as opposed to the regenerate heart,

the former being its usual or depraved, and the latter its transformed or gracious, state.

(b.) In like manner the apostle's figure of grain as sown, while it admirably illustrates, in a general way, the possibility of changes in the natural world as great as that which will take place in the resurrection body, yet — like all other metaphors — was never intended to teach the precise *mode* of that transformation, and accordingly it fails in several essential particulars to correspond to the revival of the body from the grave. 1. The seed never actually *dies*, nor any part of it. It is the *germ* alone that possesses vitality, and this simply expands and develops, gathering to itself the material of the rest of the seed, which undergoes chemical and vital changes fitting it for nutriment until the young plant attains roots and leaves wherewith to imbibe nourishment from the outer world. This whole process is as truly a *growth* as that anywhere found in nature; it is, in fact, essentially the same as takes place in the hatching of an egg or the gestation of an animal. 2. The real *identity* of the original plant or seed and its successor or the crop is lost in this transmutation, as the apostle himself intimates (ver. 37). It is, in fact, the reproduction of another but similar thing rather than the continuation or renewal of the: same. The old plant, indeed, perishes, but it never revives. The seed is its offspring, and thus only represents its parent. Nor is the new plant anything more than a lineal descendant of the old one. We must not confound the resurrection with mere propagation. The young plant may, we admit, in one sense be said to be identical with the germ sown, notwithstanding the great change which it takes on in the process of growth; and this is the precise point of the apostle's simile. But we must not press his figure into a literal strictness when comparing things so radically different as the burial of a corpse and the planting of grain. The principle of life is continuous in the latter; but this is not a distinct substance, like the soul; it is merely a property of matter, and in the case of the body must cease with physical dissolution.

(c.) We would ask those who maintain this theory a simple question: Is the so-called germ or “enswathement” which is supposed to survive, escape, or be eliminated from the body at death is it matter or is it spirit? We presume all will admit that there are but these two essential kinds of substance. Which of these, then, is it? It must, of course, belong to the former category. Then the body does not actually and entirely die! But this contradicts all the known phenomena in the case. The whole theory under discussion is not only a pure begging of the question really at issue, but it is

improbable and inconsistent. There is absolutely not the slightest particle of scientific or historical evidence that the body leaves a vital residuum in dissolution, or evolves at death an ethereal frame that survives it in any physical sense whatever as a representation. We remand all such hypotheses to the realm of ghostland and “spiritualism.”

(d.) In the case of the resurrection of the body of Jesus, which is the type of the general resurrection, and the only definite instance on record, it is certain that this theory will not apply. Not only is no countenance given to it by the language of Holy Scripture concerning the agency which effected that resuscitation, viz. the direct and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, but the circumstances obviously exclude such a process. There, was the defunct person, entire except that the spark of life had fled. If it be said that there still lingered about it some vital germ that was the nucleus around which reanimation gathered, what is this but to deny that Jesus was truly and effectually dead? Then this whole doctrine of the atonement is endangered. In plain English, he was merely in a swoon, as the Rationalists assert. It may be replied, indeed, that the revivification of our Lord’s body, which had not yet decomposed, of course differed in some important respects from that of the bodies of the saints whose elements will have dissolved to dust. But on the ordinary view the two agree in the essential point, viz. an actual and full return to life after total and absolute extinction of it; whereas under the theory in question one main element of this position is denied. It matters little how long the body has been dead, or to what extent disorganization has taken place — whether but a few hours, as in the case of the son of the widow of Nain; or four days, as in that of Lazarus; or thousands of years, as in that of the saints at the final judgment. It is equally a resurrection if life have utterly left the physical organism, and not otherwise. We conclude, therefore, that there is no scriptural, consistent, or intelligible view except the one commonly entertained by Christians on this subject, viz. that the pure and immaterial soul alone survives the dissolution of the body, and that at the last day almighty power will clothe this afresh with a corporeal frame suitable to its enlarged and completely developed faculties, and that the identity of the latter will consist, not so much, if at all, in the reassemblage of the individual particles of which its old partner was composed, much less of some subtle and continuous *tertium quid* that emerged from the decaying substance and reconstructs a new physical home for itself, but in the similar combination of similar matter, similarly united with the same immortal spirit, and with it

glorified by some such inscrutable change as took place in our Saviour's body at the transfiguration, and as still characterized it when preternaturally beheld by Saul on his way to Damascus.

IV. Literature. — This is very copious (see a list of works on the subject in the appendix to Alger's *Doctrine of a Future Life*, Nos. 2929-3181). We here mention only a few of the most important: Knapp, *Christian Theology*, translated by Leonard Woods, D.D., § 151-153; Hody, *On the Resurrection*; Drew, *Essay on the Resurrection of the Human Body*; Burnet, *State of the Dead*; Schott, *Dissert. de Resurrect. Corporis, adv. S. Burnetum* (1763); Teller, *Fides Dogmat. de Resurr. Carnis* (1766); Mosheim, *De Christ. Resurr. Mort.*, etc., in *Dissertatt.* ii, 526 sq.; Dassov, *Diatr. gua Judceor. de Resurr. Mort. Sentent. ex Plur. Rabbinis* (1675); Neander, *All. Geschichte*, etc., I, 3:1088,1096; II, 3:1404-1410; Zehrt, *Ueber d. Auferstehung d. Todten* (1835); Hodgson, *Res. of Hum. Body* (Lond. 1853). **SEE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.**

Resurrection Of Christ.

This great fact, by which "he was declared to be the Son of God with power," stands out everywhere prominently on the pages of the New Test. as the foundation of the Christian faith (^{<400D>}Romans 1:2; ^{<413D>}Acts 13:32, 33; ^{<617B>}1 Corinthians 15:3-15). According to the Scriptures the disciples were assured, by the testimony of their senses, that the body of Christ, after his resurrection, was the same identical body of human flesh and bones which had been crucified and laid in the sepulchre (^{<406D>}Matthew 16:21; 27:63; 28:5-18; ^{<416B>}Mark 16:6-19; ^{<245>}Luke 24:5-51; ^{<430D>}John 20:9-26; ^{<400E>}Acts 1:1-11). Our Lord himself took special pains to make the impression upon the minds of his disciples that in his crucified body he was actually raised to life. He appealed to the testimony of their own senses "Behold," says he, "my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me here." He showed them his hands and his feet, which the nail-prints attested to be the same which had hung upon the cross. Our Lord also invited Thomas to thrust his hand into his wounded side; and, to remove the last remaining shadow of doubt from the minds of his disciples that it was he himself in the same human body, "he called for food, and he took and did eat before them" (^{<23B>}Luke 24:39-43; ^{<437>}John 20:27). The fact also that our Lord continued forty days upon earth after his resurrection, in the same human body in which he was crucified, shows plainly that he did not rise from the tomb in a glorified

body. And the evidence is equally strong that he now dwells in heaven in a glorified body (^{<302>}Philippians 3:21; ^{<303>}Colossians 3:4).

Since this event, however, independently of its importance in respect to the internal connection of the Christian doctrine, was manifestly a miraculous occurrence, the credibility of the narrative has from the earliest times been brought into question (Celsus, apud Origen. *cont. Cels.* i, 2; Woolston, *Discourses on the Miracles*, disc. vi; Chubb, *Posth. Works*, i, 330; Morgan, *The Resurrection Considered* [1744]). Others who have admitted the facts as recorded to be beyond dispute, yet have attempted to show that Christ was not really dead, but that, being stunned and palsied, he wore for a time the appearance of death, and was afterwards restored to consciousness by the cool grave and the spices. The refutation of these views may be seen in detail in such works as Less, *Ueber die Religion*, ii, 372; id. *Auferstehungsgeschichte, nebst Anhang* (1799); Doderlein, *Fragmente und Antifragmente* (1782). The chief advocates of these views are Paulus (*list. Resurrect. Jes.* [1795]), and, more recently, Henneberg (*Philol. histor. krit. Commentar fib. d. Gesch. d. Begrabbn., d. Auferstehung u. Himmelfahrt Jesu* [1826]). "If the body of Jesus Christ," says Saurin, "were not raised from the dead, it must have been stolen away. But this theft is incredible. Who committed it? The enemies of Jesus Christ? Would they have contributed to his glory by countenancing a report of his resurrection? Would his disciples? It is probable they would not, and it is next to certain they could not. How could they have undertaken to remove the body — frail and timorous creatures, people who fled as soon as they saw him taken into custody? Even Peter, the most courageous, trembled at the voice of a servant-girl, and three times denied that he knew him. Would people of this character have dared to resist the authority of the governor? Would they have undertaken to oppose the determination of the Sanhedrim, to force a guard, and to elude, or overcome soldiers armed and aware of danger? If Jesus Christ was not risen again (I speak the language of unbelievers), he had deceived his disciples with vain hopes of his resurrection. How came the disciples not to discover the imposture? Would they have hazarded themselves by undertaking an enterprise so perilous in favor of a man who had so cruelly imposed on their credulity? But were we to grant that they formed the design of removing the body, how could they have executed it? How could soldiers, armed and on guard, suffer themselves to be overreached by a few timorous people? Either (says St. Augustine) they were asleep or awake; if they were awake, why should

they suffer the body to be taken away? If asleep, how could they know that the disciples took it away? How dare they then depose that it was stolen?"

The testimony of the apostles furnishes us with arguements, and there are eight considerations which give the evidence sufficient weight.'

1. The nature of these witnesses. They were not men of power, riches, eloquence, credit, to impose upon the world; they were poor and mean.
2. The number of these witnesses. (See Corinthians 15; ~~<1264>~~ Luke 24:34; ~~<1164>~~ Mark 16:14; ~~<1330>~~ Matthew 28:10.) It is not likely that a collusion should have been held among so many to support a lie, which would be of no utility to them.
3. The facts themselves which they avow: not suppositions, distant events, or events related by others, but real facts which they saw with their own eyes (1 John 1).
4. The agreement of their evidence: they all deposed the same thing.
5. Observe the tribunals before which they gave evidence: Jews and heathens, philosophers and rabbins, courtiers and lawyers. If they had been impostors, the fraud certainly would have been discovered.
6. The place in which they bore their testimony. Not at a distance, where they might not easily have been detected, if false, but at Jerusalem, in the synagogues, in the praetorium.
7. the time of this testimony: not years after, but three days after, they declared he was risen; yea, before the rage of the Jews was quelled, while Calvary was yet dyede with the blood they had spilled. If it had been a fralud, it is not likely they would have come forward in such broad daylight, amid so much opposition.
8. Lastly, the motives which induced them to publish the resurrection: not to gain fame, riches, glory, profit; no, they exposed themselves to suffering and death, and proclaimed the truth from conviction of its importance and certainty.

Objections have also been raised upon the apparent discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of the event. These discrepancies were early perceived; and a view of what the fathers have done in the attempt to reconcile them has been given by Niemeyer (*De Evangelistarum in Narrando Christi in*

Vitam Reditu Dissensione [1824]). They were first collocated with much acuteness by Morgan in the work already cited, and at a later date by an anonymous writer, whose fragments were edited and supported by Lessing, the object of which seems to have been to throw uncertainty and doubt over the whole of this portion of Gospel history. A numerous host of theologians, however, rose to combat and refute this writer's positions, among whom we find the names of Doderlein, Less, Semler, Teller, Maschius, Michaelis, Plessing, Eichhorn, Herder, and others. Among those who have more recently attempted to reconcile the different accounts is Griesbach. who, in his excellent *Prolusio de Fontibus uide Evangelistoe suas de Resurrectione Donini Narrationes hauserint* (1793), remarks that all the discrepancies are trifling, and not of such moment as to render the narrative uncertain and suspected, or to destroy or even diminish the credibility of the evangelists, but serve rather to show how extremely studious they were of truth "and how closely and even scrupulously they followed their documents." Griesbach then attempts to shew how these discrepancies may have arisen, and admits that, although unimportant, they are hard to reconcile, as is indeed evinced by the amount of controversy they have excited. The principal one of these discrepancies has been discussed under APPEARANCE *SEE APPEARANCE* .

For works on the general subject, besides those referred to under the preceding article, see Malcolm, *Theological Index*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* (see Index); and for monographs on the various points connected with our Lord's resurrection, see those cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 67 sq.; and by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 160, 221, 225, 227, 230; also the following: Clausewitz, *De AMortuorum Tempore Resurrect. et Chr. Resurrectione* (Hal. 1741); Kunadius, *De Sanctis Redivivis* (Viteb. 1665); Hobichhont, *De Sanctis Resurgente Christo Resurgentibus* (Ros. 1696); Schtirzmann, *De Anastasi Atheniensibus pro Dea Habita* (Lips. 1708). Numerous articles on the subject are to be found in religious periodicals, among which, as the latest, we name *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1853, Oct. 1854; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1870, i; *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1863; *Theol. and Lit. Journal*, Oct. 1857, Oct. 1858; *Lond. Bib. Rev.* April, 1849; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* April, 1862; *Bibl. Sacra*, June, 1852. Oct. 1860, Oct. 1869; *New-Englander*, May, 1857; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1873, Oct. 1877; *Christian Quar.* Amril, 1876; *Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev.* July and Oct. 1867; *South. Presb. Rev.* Oct.

1860; *Mercersb. Rev.* April, 1861; *Danville Rev.* March, 1863; *Universalist Quar.* April and Oct. 1861. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.*

Reticulated Work

(Lat. *opus reticulatum*=network), masonry constructed with diamond-shaped stones, or square stones placed diagonally. In the city of Rome this mode of decorating the surface of a wall is generally characteristic of the period of the early empire; it was frequently imitated in Romanesque work in the tympanum of a door-way, especially in Norman work.

Retribution, Future.

That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. The denial of *all* punishment in a future state, rests chiefly upon the two unscriptural and contradictory dogmas — the *immaculate spirituality* and the *mortal materialism* of the human soul. The position believed to be taught in the Scriptures is this, that all sinners who do not repent and take refuge in the Saviour in the present life shall in the future state suffer everlasting punishment, as the necessary and just retribution of their sins. This doctrine, however awful it must be acknowledged by all to be, appears to be taught in the Scriptures, and has been held by very large portions of the Church in all ages. We shall not, however, depend upon this fact as a *proof*, though it affords what logicians call a *violent presumption*, that it was an original part of Christianity. We present the following as Scripture proof, and urge,

1. Those passages which declare that certain sinners shall not enter the kingdom of heaven (^{<4151>}Matthew 5:20; 7:13, 21-23; 18:3; ^{<4102>}Mark 10:23-27; ^{<2124>}Luke 13:24, 26 ^{<4113>}John 3:3-5; ^{<4109>}1 Corinthians 6:9, 10; Galations 5:19-21; ^{<4115>}Ephesians 5:5; ^{<3119>}Hebrews 3:19; 4:1, 13). If some men, according to the language of these Scriptures, are to be excluded from heaven, they must necessarily sink to hell; for the Scriptures give us no intimation of a middle state.

2. Those passages of Scripture which describe the future and final state of men in contrast (^{<3174>}Psalm 17:14, 15 ^{<3103>}Proverbs 10:28; 14:35, ^{<2112>}Daniel 12:2; ^{<4112>}Matthew 3:12; 7:13, 14, 21; 8:11, 12; 13:30-43, 47-50; 24:46-51 25:23-46; ^{<4166>}Mark 16:16; ^{<4123>}Luke 6:23, 24, 47-49; ^{<4116>}John 3:16; 5:29; ^{<4121>}Romans 6:21-23; 9:21-23; Galations 6:7, 8 ^{<3117>}Philippians 3:17-21;

<3005>2 Thessalonians 1:5-12; <5129>2 Timothy 2:19, 20; <5008> Hebrews 6:8, 9; <6048>1 Peter 4:18). These passages are believed to refer to the final state of man because —

- (1) in several of them the state is expressly called their *end*.
- (2) The state of the righteous and that of the wicked are put in exact opposition to each other; and if one is not final, neither is the other.
- (3) There is a dead silence about any succeeding state; and
- (4) the phraseology of some of the passages will admit of no other interpretation.

3. Those passages of Scripture which apply the terms “everlasting” “eternal,” “forever,” and “for ever and ever” to this future state (<2722> Daniel 12:2; <4088> Matthew 18:8 25:41-46; <4029> Mark 3:29; <6048> 2 Corinthians 4:18; <3005> 2 Thessalonians 1:9 <6027> 2 Peter 2:17; <6006> Jude 1:6, 7, 13; <6640> Revelation 14:10-13; 19:3 20:10).

4. Those passages which express future punishment by phrases which imply its everlasting duration (<4008> Matthew 10:28; 12:31, 32; <4088> Mark 3:39; 9:43-48; <4025> Luke 9:25; 14:26; <4085> John 3:36; 8:21; 17:9; <5080> Philippians 3:10; <3005> Hebrews 6:2; 10:26, 27; <5013> James 2:13; <6156> 1 John 5:16).

5. Those passages which intimate that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life (<3024> Proverbs 1:24-28; <2816> Isaiah 55:6, 7; <4025> Matthew 25:5-13; <4034> Luke 13:24-29; <6126> John 12:36; <4005> 2 Corinthians 6:1, 2; <3005> Hebrews 3:1-10; 13:15-22; <6221> Revelation 22:11). **6.** Those passages which foretell the consequences of rejecting the Gospel (<4012> Psalm 2:12; <1005> Proverbs 29:1; <4430> Acts 13:40-46; 20:26; 28:26, 27; <5002> Romans 10:12; <4018> 1 Corinthians 1:18; <4025> 2 Corinthians 2:15, 16; 4:3; <5188> 1 Thessalonians 5:3; <3008> 2 Thessalonians 1:8; 2:10-12; <3005> Hebrews 2:1-3; 4:1-11; 10:26-31, 38, 39; 22:25-29; <5024> James 2:14; <6047> 1 Peter 4:17, 18; <6001> 2 Peter 2:1-21; 3:7). The Gospel being the only way of salvation for man (<4042> Acts 4:12), its rejection is that of the only method of salvation. *SEE PUNISHMENT, EVER LASTING; SEE UNIVERSALISM.*

Rettberg, Friedrich Wilhelm

a German theologian, was born at Cello, Aug. 21, 1805. After teaching in several small institutions, he became professor of theology at Marburg, where he died, April 7, 1849. His works are, *De Parabolis Jesu Christi*

(Göttingen, 1827): — *Cyprianus nach seinem Leben und Wirken* (ibid. 1831): — *Heilslehren des Christenthums nach den Grundsätzen der lutherischen Kirche* (Leips. 1838): — *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Göttingen, 1846-48). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Retz, Henri de Gondi de

a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1572. He was canon of Notre Dame, and held many rich abbeys. In 1596 he became coadjutor of his uncle, cardinal Pierre de Gondi, bishop of Paris, with the promise of succeeding to his title. He received the cardinal's hat in 1618, and, as cardinal de Retz, took part in the affairs of State. He published one work, *Ordonnances Synodales*. He was the last bishop of Paris. His death occurred at Beziers, Aug. 2, 1622. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Retz, Jean Francois Paul de Gondi

Cardinal de, often written *Rais*, a French prelate, was born at Montmirail in Oct. 1614. By birth he was a Knight of Malta, and was destined by his father for the Church, in the hope that he might succeed his uncle as archbishop of Paris. The ecclesiastical life was wholly distasteful to him, and his earlier years were spent in prodigality and excesses of all kinds; but, at the same time, he prosecuted his theological studies with great success, and received valuable benefices. He was made canon of Notre Dame in 1627, and adopted the title of abbe de Retz. His ambition and hardihood gained for him the friendship of the count de Soissons, and by the conspiracy planned by that nobleman he hoped to be released from his ecclesiastical life and enter upon a political one, which was more congenial to his intriguing nature. After the death of the count, he devoted himself with more regularity to his profession, and succeeded in gaining so great a popularity that Louis XIII, on his death-bed, appointed him coadjutor to his uncle, the bishop of Paris. In this position he gained the hearts of the people by his charities and great attention to all the outward requirements of religion. During the wars of the Fronde he rendered valuable assistance to the royal cause; but finding that he was distrustful, he finally became the secret leader of the popular party, and the greatest opponent of cardinal Mazarin. He was made cardinal in 1652, and received tempting offers of a position as ambassador of France to the Holy See; but before he had decided to accept this proposition, he was arrested by order of Louis XIV, and was kept closely confined at Vincennes. On the death of his uncle,

March 21, 1654, his friends took possession of the archbishopric in his name. By resigning his claims, he succeeded in gaining a change of residence, and was removed to the Chateau of Nantes. He escaped from his confinement Aug. 8, 1654, and after many adventures reached Spain. Philip IV offered him an escort, and he immediately hastened to Rome, where he declared himself archbishop of Paris, the pope having refused to acknowledge his resignation. Retz subsequently travelled through Europe; and having been prohibited by Louis XIV from occupying his archbishopric in person, he governed it by vicars and subordinates until 1662, when he formally resigned all claim to it in consideration of receiving other valuable benefices. He was reconciled to the king, and received permission to establish himself at Commercy, where he kept up a petty state, and occupied himself in study and works of charity. He died at Paris, Aug. 24, 1679. His writings are chiefly political, and as such are not of interest here. But his greatest work is his *Memoires*, composed during his years of retirement. They were first published in 1717, and have been translated into several foreign languages. See *Memoires du Cardinal de Retz; Lettres de Madame de Sevigne; Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Retz, Pierre de Gondi de

a French cardinal, was born at Lyons in 1533. After entering the ecclesiastical life, he received many favors from Catherine de' Medici, and advanced rapidly. He was made bishop of Langres in 1565, and was transferred to the see of Paris in 1570, and became grand-almoner, chancellor, and chief of the council of Charles IX. He was several times ambassador to the Holy See, and in 1587 was created cardinal. He refused to take the oath of allegiance, and explained his reasons in a letter, to which the writers of the League replied with passion. In 1592 he was sent by Henry IV on an embassy to the pope. He died Feb. 17, 1616. Retz was an honest but parsimonious man, and possessed little genuine talent. — *Biog. Universelle*, s.v.

Re'u

(Heb. *Reii'*, W[r]fri-end; Sept. ^ⲓΡαγαῦ v. r. ^ⲓΡαγαύ, ^{<1025>}1 Chronicles 1:25), the son of Peleg and father of Serug in the Abrahamic ancestry (^{<1018>}Genesis 11:18, 21; ^{<1025>}1 Chronicles 1:25). B.C. cir. 1950. He is called *Ragau* in ^{<1035>}Luke 3:35. He lived 239 years. "Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*) says Reu

is *Roha*, the Arabic name for Edessa, an assertion which, borrowed from Knobel, is utterly destitute of foundation, as will be seen at once on comparing the Hebrew and Arabic words. A closer resemblance might be found between Reu and *Rhagoe*, a large town of Media, especially if the Greek equivalents of the two names be taken”

Reu'ben

(Heb. *Reiben'*, ^{רֵבֵן} see a son [see below]; Sept. and New Test.

^Ὶ Ρουβήν), the name of one of the Jewish patriarchs and of the tribe descended from him. The following account is chiefly compiled from the Scriptural statements. *SEE JACOB*.

1. Reuben was Jacob's first-born child (^{רֵבֵן}Genesis 29:32), the son of Leah, apparently an unexpected fruit of the marriage (ver. 31; Josephus, *Ant.* i, 19, 8). B.C. 1919. This is perhaps denoted by the name itself, whether we adopt the obvious signification of its present form — *reu'bn*, i.e. “behold ye, a son!” (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1247 b) — or the explanation given in the text, which seems to imply that the original form was ^{רֵבֵן} *yWar*; *rau bMonyi*, “Jehovah hath seen my affliction,” or that of Josephus, who uniformly presents it as *Roubel* (^Ὶ Ρούβηλος, so also in *Ant.* ii, 3, 1), and explains it (*Ant.* i, 19, 8) as the “pity of God”- ^Ὶ ἔλεον τοῦ θεοῦ, as if from ^Ὶ *aBjWar*; (Furst, *Heb. Lex.* p. 1269). The Peshito (*Rabil*) and the Arabic version of Joshua agree with this last form. Redslob (*Die alttestamentl. Namen*, p. 86) maintains that Reubel is the original form of the name, which was corrupted into Reuben, as Bethel into the modern Beitin, and Jezreel into Zerin. He treats it as signifying the “flock of Bel,” a deity whose worship greatly flourished in the neighboring country of Moab, and who under the name of Nebo had a famous sanctuary in the very territory of Reuben. In this case it would be a parallel to the title, “people of Chemosh,” which is bestowed on Moab. The alteration of the obnoxious syllable in *Reubel* would, on this theory, find a parallel in the *Meribbaal* and *Eshbaal* of Saul's family, who became *Mephibosheth* and *Ishbosheth*. But all this is evidently fanciful and arbitrary.

The notices of the patriarch Reuben in the book of Genesis and the early Jewish traditional literature are unusually frequent, and on the whole give a favorable view of his disposition. To him, and him alone, the preservation of Joseph's life appears to have been due. B.C. 1895. His anguish at the disappearance of his brother, and the frustration of his kindly artifice for

delivering him (⁽⁰¹⁵⁷²²⁾Genesis 37:22); his recollection of the minute details of the painful scene many years afterwards (⁽⁰⁴⁴²²⁾Genesis 42:22); his offer to take the sole responsibility of the safety of the brother who had succeeded to Joseph's place in the family (ver. 37), all testify to a warm and (for those rough times) a kindly nature. We are, however, to remember that he, as the eldest son, was more responsible for the safety of Joseph than were the others, and it would seem that he eventually acquiesced in the deception practiced upon his father. Subsequently Reuben offered to make the lives of his own sons responsible for that of Benjamin, when it was necessary to prevail on Jacob to let him go down to Egypt (vers. 37, 38). The fine conduct of Judah in afterwards undertaking the same responsibility is in advantageous contrast with this coarse, although well-meant, proposal. For his adulterous and incestuous conduct in the matter of Bilhah, Jacob in his last blessing deprived him of the pre-eminence and double portion which belonged to his birthright, assigning the former to Judah and the latter to Joseph (^(0444B)Genesis 44:3, 4; comp. vers. 8-10; 48:5). Of this repulsive crime we know from the Scriptures only the fact (⁽⁰¹⁵²²⁾Genesis 35:22). In the post-Biblical traditions it is treated either as not having actually occurred (as in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan), or else as the result of a sudden temptation acting on a hot and vigorous nature (as in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs) — a parallel, in some of its circumstances, to the intrigue of David with Bathsheba. Some severe temptation there must surely have been to impel Reuben to an act which, regarded in its social rather than in its moral aspect, would be peculiarly abhorrent to a patriarchal society, and which is specially and repeatedly reprobated in the law of Moses. The Rabbinical version of the occurrence (as given in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan) is very characteristic, and well illustrates the difference between the spirit of early and of late Jewish history. "Reuben went and disordered the couch of Bilhah, his father's concubine, which was placed right opposite the couch of Leah, and it was counted unto him as if he had lain with her. And when Israel heard it, it displeased him, and he said, Lo! an unworthy person shall proceed from me, as Ishmael did from Abraham, and Esau from my father. And the Holy Spirit answered him and said, All are righteous, and there is not one unworthy among them." Reuben's anxiety to save Joseph is represented as arising from a desire to conciliate Jacob, and his absence while Joseph was sold, from his sitting alone on the mountains in penitent fasting. These traits, slight as they are, are those of an ardent, impetuous, unbalanced, but not ungenerous, nature; not crafty and cruel, as were Simeon and Levi, but rather, to use the

metaphor of the dying patriarch, bdiling up (zPPi; A.V. “unstable,” ^{<0449>}Genesis 44:4) like a vessel of water over the rapid wood-fire of the nomad tent, and as quickly subsiding into apathy when the fuel was withdrawn.

2. The Tribe of Reuben. — At the time of the migration into Egypt (or rather at the time of Jacob’s decease), Reuben’s sons were four (^{<0449>}Genesis 46:9; ^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 5:3). From them sprang the chief families of the tribe (^{<0435>}Numbers 26:5-11). One of these families — that of Pallu — became notorious as producing Eliab, whose sons or descendants, Dathan and Abiram, perished with their kinsman On in the divine retribution for their conspiracy against Moses (16:1; 26:8-11). The census at Mount Sinai (1:20, 21; 2:11) shows that at the Exodus the numbers of the tribe were 46,500 men above twenty years of age, and fit for active warlike service. In point of numerical strength, Reuben was then sixth on the list, Gad, with 45,650 men, being next below. On the borders of Canaan, after the plague which punished the idolatry of Baal-peor, the numbers had fallen slightly, and were 43,730; Gad was 40,500; and the position of the two in the list is lower than before, Ephraim and Simeon being the only two smaller tribes (26:7, etc.). During the journey through the wilderness the position of Reuben was on the south side of the Tabernacle. The “camp” which went under his name was formed of his own tribe, that of Simeon (Leah’s second son), and that of Gad (son of Zilpah, Leah’s slave). The standard of the camp was a deer with the inscription, “Hear, O Israel! the Lord thy God is one Lord!” and its place in the march was second (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan [^{<0420>}Numbers 2:10-16]).

The Reubenites, like their relatives and neighbors on the journey, the Gadites, had maintained through the march to Canaan the ancient calling of their forefathers. The patriarchs were “feeding their flocks” at Shechem when Joseph was sold into Egypt. It was as men whose “trade had been about cattle from their youth” that they were presented to Pharaoh (^{<0462>}Genesis 46:32, 34), and in the land of Goshen they settled “with their flocks and herds and all that they had” (ver. 32; 47:1). Their cattle accompanied them in their flight from Egypt (^{<0128>}Exodus 12:38); not a hoof was left behind; and there are frequent allusions to them on the journey (34:3; ^{<0412>}Numbers 11:22; ^{<0883>}Deuteronomy 8:13, etc.). But it would appear that the tribes who were destined to settle in the confined territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan had, during the journey

through the wilderness, fortunately relinquished that taste for the possession of cattle which they could not have maintained after their settlement at a distance from the wide pastures of the wilderness. Thus the cattle had come into the hands of Reuben, Gad, and the half of Manasseh (^{<0431>}Numbers 32:1), and it followed naturally that when the nation arrived on the open downs east of the Jordan, the three tribes just named should prefer a request to their leader to be allowed to remain in a place so perfectly suited to their requirements. The country east of Jordan does not appear to have been included in the original land promised to Abraham. That which the spies examined was comprised, on the east and west, between the “coast of Jordan” and “the sea.” But for the pusillanimity of the greater number of the tribes it would have been entered from the south (13:30), and in that case the east of Jordan might never have been peopled by Israel at all. Accordingly, when the Reubenites and their fellows approach Moses with their request, his main objection is that by what they propose they will discourage the hearts of the children of Israel from going over Jordan into the land which Jehovah had given them (^{<0437>}Genesis 32:7). It is only on their undertaking to fulfil their part in the conquest of the western country, the land of Canaan proper, and thus satisfying him that their proposal was grounded in no selfish desire to escape a full share of the difficulties of the conquest, that Moses will consent to their proposal.

The “blessing” of Reuben by the departing lawgiver is a passage which has severely exercised translators and commentators. Strictly translated as they stand in the received Hebrew text, the words are as follows:

“Let Reuben live, and not die,

And let his men be a [small] number.”

As to the first line there appears to be no doubt, but the second line has been interpreted in two exactly opposite ways.

1. By the Sept.,

“And let his men be many in number.”

This has the disadvantage that **rPsimas** never employed elsewhere for a large number, but always for a small one (e.g. ^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 16:19; ^{<1312>}Job 16:22; ^{<2309>}Isaiah 10:19; ^{<3126>}Ezekiel 12:16). 2. That of our own A.V.,

“And let not his men be few.”

Here the negative of the first line is presumed to convey its force to the second, though not there expressed. This is countenanced by the ancient Syriac version (Peshito) and the translations of Junius and Tremellius, and Schott and Winzer. It also has the important support of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 968 a, and *Pent. Samuel* p. 44). It is, however, a very violent rendering. 3. A third and very ingenious interpretation is that adopted by the Veneto-Greek version, and also by Michaelis (*Bibelfur Ungelehrten*, Text), which assumes that the vowel-points of the word **wytmj** “his men,” should be altered to **wytmē** “his dead” “And let his dead be few” — as if in allusion to some recent mortality in the tribe, such as that in Simeon after the plague of Baal-peor. These interpretations, unless the last should prove to be the original reading, originate in the fact that the words in their naked sense convey a curse, and not a blessing. Fortunately, though differing widely in detail, they agree in general meaning. The benediction of the great leader goes out over the tribe which was about to separate itself from its brethren, in a fervent aspiration for its welfare through all the risks of that remote and trying situation. Both in this and the earlier blessing of Jacob, Reuben retains his place at the head of the family, and it must not be overlooked that the tribe, together with the two who associated themselves with it, actually received its inheritance before either Judah or Ephraim, to whom the birthright which Reuben had forfeited was transferred (~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 5:1).

From this time it seems as if a bar, not only the material one of distance, and of the intervening river and mountain-wall, but also of difference in feeling and habits, gradually grew up more substantially between the Eastern and Western tribes. The first act of the former after the completion of the conquest, and after they had taken part in the solemn ceremonial in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, shows how wide a gap already existed between their ideas and those of the Western tribes. The pile of stones which they erected on the western bank of the Jordan to mark their boundary — to testify to after-ages that, though separated by the rushing river from their brethren and the country in which Jehovah had fixed the place where he would be worshipped, they had still a right to return to it for his worship — was erected in accordance with the unalterable habits of Bedouin tribes both before and since. It was an act identical with that in which Laban and Jacob engaged at parting, with that which is constantly performed by the Bedouin of the present day. But by the Israelites west of Jordan, who were fast relinquishing their nomad habits and feelings for

those of more settled permanent life, this act was completely misunderstood, and was construed into an attempt to set up a rival altar to that of the sacred tent. The incompatibility of the idea to the mind of the Western Israelites is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the disclaimer of the two and a half tribes, and notwithstanding that disclaimer having proved satisfactory even to Phinehas, the author of Joshua 22 retains the name *mizbeach* for the *pile*, a word which involves the idea of sacrifice — i.e. of *slaughter* (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 402)-instead of applying to it the term *gal*, as is done in the case (^{<01345>}Genesis 31:46) of the precisely similar “heap of witness.” Another Reubenitish erection, which long kept up the memory of the presence of the tribe on the west of Jordan, was the stone of Bohan ben-Reuben which formed a landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (^{<01316>}Joshua 15:6). This was a single stone (*Eben*), not a pile, and it appears to have stood somewhere on the road from Bethany to Jericho, not far from the ruined khan so well known to travellers.

The doom, “Thou shalt not excel,” was exactly fulfilled in the destinies of the tribe descended from Reuben, which makes no figure in the Hebrew history, and never produced any eminent person. No judge, no prophet, no hero of the tribe of Reuben is handed down to us, unless it be “Adina the Reubenite, a captain of the Reubenites, and thirty with him” (^{<13142>}1 Chronicles 11:42). In the dire extremity of their brethren in the north under Deborah and Barak, they contented themselves with debating the news among the streams (*gl P*) of the Mishor. The distant distress of his brethren could not move Reuben: he lingered among his sheepfolds, and preferred the shepherd’s pipe and the bleating of the flocks to the clamor of the trumpet and the turmoil of battle. His individuality fades more rapidly than Gad’s. The eleven valiant Gadites who swam the Jordan at its highest, to join the son of Jesse in his trouble (^{<13128>}1 Chronicles 12:8-15); Barzillai; Elijah the Gileadite; the siege of Ramoth-gilead, with its picturesque incidents — all give a substantial reality to the tribe and country of Gad. But no person, no incident, is recorded to place Reuben before us in any distincter form than as a member of the community (if community it can be called) of “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the halftribe of Manasseh” (ver. 37). The very towns of his inheritance — Heshbon, Aroer, Kirjathaim, Dibon, Baalmeon, Sibmah, Jazer — are familiar to us as Moabitish, and not as Israelitish, towns. The city life so characteristic of Moabitish civilization had no hold on the Reubenites. They are most in

their element when engaged in continual broils with the children of the desert, the Bedouin tribes of Hagar, Jetur, Nephish, Nodab; driving off their myriads of cattle, asses, camels; dwelling *in their tents*, as if to the manner born (5:10), gradually spreading over the vast wilderness which extends from Jordan to the Euphrates (ver. 9), and every day receding further and further from any community of feeling or of interest with the Western tribes. See MOAB. Thus remote from the central seat of the national government and of the national religion it is not to be wondered at that Reuben relinquished the faith of Jehovah. “They went after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them,” and we hear little more of them till the time of Hazael, king of Syria, who ravaged and for a time held possession of their country (^{<1208>}2 Kings 10:33). The last historical notice which we possess of them, while it records this fact, records also as its natural consequence that the Reubenites and Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh were carried off by Pul and Tiglath-pileser, and placed in the districts on and about the river Khabfir, in the upper part of Mesopotamia — “in Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and the river Gozan” (^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 5:26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe of Reuben, with their probable identifications. For the boundaries, *SEE TRIBE*.

Abarim.	Mountains.	<i>El-Belka.</i>
Almon-diblathaim.	Town.	[N. of Dhiban]?
Arnon.	River.	<i>Mojeb.</i>
Aroer.	Town.	<i>Arair.</i>
Ashdodth-pisgah.	Brooks.	<i>SEE PISGAH.</i>
Ataroth.	Town.	<i>Atarus.</i>
Baal-meon.	do.	<i>Main.</i>
Bajith.	do.	<i>SEE BAAL-MEON.</i>
Bamoth (-baal).	Hill (Misgab)	<i>Jebel Humeh?</i>
Beer (-elim).	Well.	[On Seil Hadan]?
Beon.	Town.	<i>SEE BAAL-MEON.</i>
Beth-baal-meon.	do.	<i>SEE BAAL-MEON.</i>
Beth-diblathaim.	do.	<i>SEE ALMON-NIBNLATHAIM.</i>
Beth-jeshimoth.	do.	<i>Beit-Jismuth?</i>
Beth-meon.	do.	<i>SEE BAAL-MEON.</i>
Beth-peor.	Temple.	[N. W. of Hesban]?

Bezer.	Town.	[<i>Burazin</i>]?
Dibon [or Dimon].	do.	<i>Dhiban</i> .
Ealaleh.	do.	<i>El-Al</i> .
Heshbon.	do.	<i>Hesban</i> .
Jahaz.	do.	[<i>Khan es-Shib</i>]?
Kedemoth.	do.	[<i>Ed-Duleilat</i>]?
Kijjathaim.	do.	<i>Kureyat</i> ?
Lasha.	do.	SEE CALLIRRHO.
Mattanah.	do.	[In plain Ard Ramadan]?
Medeba.	do.	<i>Medaba</i> .
Mephaath.	do.	[<i>Em el- Weled</i>]?
Miunith.	do.	<i>Minyah</i> .
Migab.	do.	SEE BAMOTH.
Nahaliel.	do.	[N. of Wady Maleh]?
Nebo.	Mount.	<i>Jebel Neba</i> .
Nophah.	Town.	[<i>El-Habeeis</i>]?
Pisgah.	Mount.	SEE NEBO.
Shebern, Shebman, or Sibmah.	Town.	<i>Es-Sameh</i>]?
Zareth-shahar.	do.	<i>Zara</i> ?
Zophim.	Field.	[Plain of Medeba]?

Picture for Reuben

The country allotted to the Reubenites extended on the south to the river Arnon, which divided it from the Moabites (^{<41318>}Joshua 13:8, 16); on the east it touched the desert of Arabia; on the west were the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The northern border was probably marked by a line running eastward from the Jordan, through Wady Hesban (vers. 17-21; ^{<41327>}Numbers 32:37, 38). This country had originally been conquered and occupied by the Moabites; but they were driven out a short time before the Exodus by Sihon, king of the Amorites, who in his turn was expelled by the Israelites (Deuteronomy 2; ^{<41322>}Numbers 21:22-31). Immediately after the captivity the Moabites again returned to their old country and occupied their old cities. This is the reason why, in the later prophets, many of the cities of Reuben are embraced in the curses pronounced upon Moab (Jeremiah 48). — The territory was divided into sections — the western declivities towards the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley, which were steep,

rugged, and bare, with the little section of the lower plain of Jordan (called in Scripture — “the plains of Moab” [⁻⁰²⁷¹Numbers 22:1]) at their base; and the high table-land stretching from the summit of the ridge away towards Arabia. The latter, from its even surface, as contrasted with the rocky soil of Western Palestine, received from the accurate sacred writers the appropriate name Mishor (q.v.). Under its modern name of the *Belka* it is still esteemed beyond all others by the Arab sheepmasters. It is well watered, covered with smooth, short turf, and losing itself gradually in those illimitable wastes which have always been, and always will be, the favorite resort of pastoral nomad tribes. The whole region is now deserted; there is not a single settled inhabitant within its borders. Its great cities, mostly bearing their ancient names, are heaps of ruins. The wild wandering tribes of the desert visit it periodically to feed their flocks and herds on its rich pastures, and to drink the waters of its fountains and cisterns. See Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 365 sq.; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 460 sq.; Porter, *Hand-book for Syria*, p. 298 sq.

Reu'benite

(Heb. with the art. *ha-Reubeny'*, **יְרֻבֵּנִי**; Sept. **ῚΡουβήν**, occasionally **οἱ υἱοὶ ῚΡουβήν** or **ῚΡουβηνί**), a descendant of Reuben (⁻⁰⁴³⁷Numbers 26:7, etc.).

Reuchlin, Johann Von

an eminent German scholar, who adopted the Graecized name of *Capnio*, was born at Pforzheim in 1454. After serving in different political finctions, he became, in 1520, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, whence he removed to Tubingen, thence to Stuttgart, where he died, Dec. 28, 1521. Besides his memorable services in connection with classical literature and general culture, he may be regarded as the principal promoter of the study of Hebrew in his day. He published a Hebrew grammar and lexicon under the title *Ad Dionysium Fratrem suum de Rudimentis Hebraicis Libri III* (s. 1506, 4to), of which an improved edition, by Seb. Munster, appeared in 1537 (Basel, fol.). Reuchlin wrote also *De Accentibus et Orthographia Ling. Heb.* (Hagenau, 1518, 4to).

Reu'el

(Heb. *Reiel'*, **יְרֵאֵל** [**r**] *friend of God*; Sept. **ῚΡαγουήλ**; A.V. *Raguel* [⁻⁰¹⁰⁹Numbers 10:29]), the name of three or four men.

1. A son of Esau by Bashemath (^{<1304>}Genesis 36:4,10; ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 1:35, 37); his four sons (^{<1303>}Genesis 36:13) were princes, i.e. chiefs of the Edomites (ver. 17). B.C. post 1963. *SEE ESAU*.

2. A Midianitish priest and nomadic herdsman in the wilderness, to whom Moses fled from Egypt, and whose daughter Zipporah he married (^{<1016>}Exodus 2:16 sq.); but in ^{<1001>}Exodus 3:1; 4:18, JETHRO is called father-in-law of Moses, and in 3:1 is made priest and herdsman. Various methods are suggested for meeting the difficulty:

(1.) Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 12,1) considers Reuel and Jethro as two names of one man. So Lengerke (*Kanaan*, i, 393) and Bertheau (*Isr. Gesch.* p. 242).

(2.) Aben-Ezra, followed by Rosenmüller, understands by *father* in ^{<1018>}Exodus 2:18, *grandfather*.

(3.) Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* ii, 14) thinks “Jethro son of” has fallen out of the text before Reuel in Exodus ii, 18.

(4.) Ranke (*Pentat.* ii, 8) understands the word *chothen*, *wtj̄o* rendered father-in-law, to mean brother-in-law, and compares the ambiguous use of the Greek *γαμβρός*. We must then suppose that Jethro had succeeded to the priesthood and flocks of his deceased father (^{<1001>}Exodus 3:1).

(5.) Others find a double genealogical tradition (Hartmann, *Pentat.* p. 223 sq.; comp. De Wette, *Einleit. ins A. T.* p. 196). On this supposition the “compiler” must have been very careless. The third explanation derives no support from the fact that the Sept., in ^{<1016>}Exodus 2:16, twice mentions Jethro as father of seven daughters. The translators might have considered Reuel as the grandfather, and this would support No. 2. The fourth supposition is forced. If we must decide for any particular view, it seems simplest to understand *grandfather* for father (^{<1018>}Exodus 2:18), since Reuel was the father of the house until Jethro acquired independence. *SEE HOBAB; SEE RAGUEL*.

3. Father of Eliasaph, the leader of the tribe of Gad at the time of the census at Sinai (^{<1014>}Numbers 2:14). In the parallel passages (1:14; 7:42, 47; 10:20) the name is given DEUEL *SEE DEUEL* (q.v.).

4. Son of Ibnijah, father of Shephatiah (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 9:8), of the tribe of Benjamin. B.C. ante 1618.

Reu'mah

(Heb. *Reiimah'*, *hmWar*] *elevated* [Gesén.], or *pearl* [Furst]; Sept.

ῥευμά), a concubine of Nahor, Abraham's brother; and by him mother of Tebah and others (⁴¹²²⁴Genesis 22:24). B.C. cir. 2040.

Reuss, Benigna Von

(*Countess*), a German hymnist, was born at Ebersdorf Dec. 15, 1695, where she also died, Aug. 1, 1751. She was a sister of count Henry XXIX of Reuss-Ebersdorf, and of the countess Erdmuth Dorothea, wife of count von Zinzendorf. She was a godly woman, and wrote some hymns, one of which has been translated into English: *Komm Segen aus der Hohe* (Engl. transl. in *Sacred Lyrics from the German*, p. 155, "Attend, Lord, my daily toil"). (B. P.)

Reuterdahl, Henrik

a Swedish Protestant divine, was born in 1795 at Malmo, in Sweden. He studied at Lund, and in 1817 commenced lecturing as "privat docent" of theology. In 1824 he was made adjunct to the theological faculty, in 1826 prefect of the seminary, in 1827 member of the chapter, in 1838 librarian, and in 1844 professor of theology at Lund. In 1852 he was appointed state-councillor and head of the department for religious matters, which position he occupied till 1855, when he was made bishop of Lund, and in 1856 archbishop of Upsala. He died in 1870. He wrote, *On the Study of Theology* (Lund, 1834): — *Introduction to Theology* (ibid. 1837): — *History of the Swedish Church* (ibid. 1838-63, 3 vols.). Besides, he also published since 1828 the *Theologisk Quartalskrift*, and continued the *Apparatus ad Historiam Suedo-Gothicam*, commenced by Celse. His *De Fontibus Historien Ecclesiastica Eusebianæ*, published in 1826, in 4 pts., is still of great value. See Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*, i, 833, 892, ii, 730; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1059 sq. (B. P.)

Reval-Esthonian Version Of The Scriptures.

This version, which is used by the inhabitants of the north of Livonia, including the three adjacent islands of Oesel, Dagden (or Dagoë), and Mohn, was first printed at Reval in 1739, and partly published at the expense of the celebrated count Zinzendorf. In 1815, through the zeal of Dr. Paterson, and the aid afforded by the British and Foreign Bible Society,

an edition of 10,000 copies of the New Test. was printed. Prior to 1824 the Russian Bible Society published 5100 copies of the Old Test., and some recent editions have been issued at Dorpat. Of late the American Bible Society has undertaken the publication of the whole Bible in the Reval-Esthonian, now printing at Berlin, which is probably now ready, having the previous year (1876) issued an edition of 20,000 copies of the New Test., with the Psalms, in 12mo. We subjoin the Lord's Prayer in that dialect, from Dalton's *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 65: "Meie iza, kes sa oled taewas, pihitsetud sagu slnu nimi, sinu rik tulgu, sine tahtmine sundigu kui taewas nenda ka ma peal; meie igapaewane leib anna meile tana-paeiw; ja anna andeks meile meie wolad, kui ka meie andeks anname oma wolglastele; ja ara sada meid mitte kiuzatuze sisse, waid peasta meid ara kurjast; sest sinu paralt on rik, ja wagi ja au igaweste. Amen." See *Bible of Every Land*, p. 330 sq.; Dalton, *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 25 sq., 65; *Annual Reports of the American Bible Society*, 1876, 1877. (B. P.)

Revelation

(ἀποκάλυψις), a disclosure of something that was before unknown; and divine revelation is the direct communication of truths before unknown from God to men. The disclosure may be made by dream, vision, oral communication, or otherwise (²⁷¹⁹Daniel 2:19; ⁴¹⁴⁶1 Corinthians 14:26; ⁴⁷¹¹2 Corinthians 12:1; Galations 1:12; ⁶⁰⁰¹Revelation 1:1). Revelation is not to be confounded with *inspiration*. The former refers to those things only of which the sacred writers were ignorant before they were divinely taught, while the latter has a more general meaning. Accordingly revelation may be defined that operation of the Holy Spirit by which truths before unknown are communicated to men; and inspiration, the operation of the Holy Spirit by which not only unknown truths are communicated, but by which also men are excited to publish truths for the instruction of others, and are guarded from all error in doing it. Thus it was revealed to the ancient prophets that the Messiah should appear, and they were inspired to publish the fact for the benefit of others. The affecting scenes at the cross of Christ were not revealed to John, for he saw them with his own eyes (⁴⁸⁸⁵John 19:35); but he was inspired to write a history of this event, and by supernatural guidance was kept from all error in his record. It is therefore true, as the apostle affirms, that every part of the Bible is given by inspiration of God (⁵⁹¹⁶2 Timothy 3:16), though every part of the Bible is not the result of immediate revelation. For convenience' sake, we call the

whole Bible a revelation from God, because most of the truths it contains were made known by direct communication from God, and could have been discovered in no other way; and generally it is only the incidental circumstances attending the communication of these truths that would be ascertained by the writers in the ordinary modes of obtaining information.

Concerning a divine revelation, we remark that,

- 1.** It is possible. God may, for aught we know, think proper to make known to his creatures what they before were ignorant of; and, as a Being of infinite power, he cannot be at a loss for means of communication.
- 2.** It is desirable; for while reason is necessary to examine the matter of revelation, it is incapable, unaided, of finding out God.
- 3.** It is necessary; for without it we can attain to no certain knowledge of God, of Christ, and of salvation.
- 4.** Revelation must, to answer its ends be sufficiently marked with internal and external evidences. These the Bible has.
- 5.** Its contents must be agreeable to reason. Not that everything revealed must be within the range of reason; but this may be true, and yet there be no contradiction. To calm, dispassionate reason there is nothing in doctrine, command, warning, promises, or threatenings which is opposed thereto.
- 6.** It must be credible; and we find the facts of Scripture supported by abundant evidence from friend and foe.
- 7.** Revelation also must necessarily bear the prevailing impress of the circumstances and tastes of the times and nations in which it was originally given. The Bible, however, though it bears the distinct impress of Asiatic manners, as it should do, is most remarkable for rising above all local and temporary peculiarities, and seizing on the great principles common to human nature under all circumstances; thus showing that as it is intended for universal benefit, so will it be made known to all mankind. The language of the Bible is the language of men, otherwise it would not be a divine revelation to men. It is to be understood by the same means and according to the same laws by which all other human language is understood. It is addressed to the common-sense of men, and common-sense is to be consulted in its interpretation.

In a narrower sense, “revelation” is used to express the manifestation of Jesus Christ to Jews and Gentiles (⁴⁰²³Luke 2:32); the manifestation of the glory with which God will glorify his elect and faithful servants at the last judgment (⁴⁰²⁹Romans 8:19), and the declaration of his just judgments in his conduct both towards the elect and towards the reprobate (2:5-16). There is a very noble application of the word revelation to the consummation of all things, or the revelation of Jesus Christ in his future glory — (1Corinthians 1:7; ⁴⁰¹³1 Peter 1:13). See Brown, *Compendium of Natural and Revealed Religion*; Archbp. Campbell, *On Revelation*; Delany, *Revelation Examined*; Ellis, *On Divine Things*; Fuller, *Works*; Horne, *Introduction*; Leland, *Necessity of Revelation*; *View of Deistical Writers*. *SEE INSPIRATION*; *SEE MIRACLES*; *SEE PROPHECY*.

Revelation, Book Of.

This, the last of the books of the New Test., according to their usual arrangement, is entitled in the A.V. “The Revelation (*Ἀποκάλυψις*, *Apocalypse*) of [St.] John the Divine (*τοῦ θεολόγου*),” but in Codices Alex., Sinait., and Ephr. Rescrip. it is simply *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου*; and in Cod. Vat. it takes the fuller and more explicit form of *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου θεολόγου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ*, thus clearly identifying the author with the writer of the fourth gospel. The true and authoritative title of the book, however, is that which it bears in its own commencing words, *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; which has been restored by Tregelles in his critical edition of 1844, and which has been adopted by most of the critical authorities and versions since.

I. Canonical Authority and Authorship. — These two points are intimately connected with each other. If it can be proved that a book, claiming so distinctly as this does the authority of divine inspiration, was actually written by John, then no doubt will be entertained as to its title to a place in the canon of Scripture. Was, then, John the apostle and evangelist the writer of the Revelation? This question was first mooted by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius. *H.E.* 7:25). The doubt which he modestly suggested has been confidently proclaimed in modern times by Luther (*Vorrede auf die Offenbarung*, 1522 and 1534), and widely diffused through his influence. Lucke (*Einleitung*, p. 802), the most learned and diligent of modern critics of the Revelation, agrees with a majority of the eminent scholars of Germany in denying that John was the author. But the general

belief of the mass of Christians in all ages has been in favor of John's authorship.

1. Evidence in Favor of the Apostolic Authorship. This consists of the assertions of the author and historical tradition.

(1.) The author's description of himself in the first and twenty-second chapters is certainly equivalent to an assertion that he is the apostle. (a) He names himself simply John, without prefix or addition — a name which at that period, and in Asia, must have been taken by every Christian as the designation, in the first instance, of the great apostle who dwelt at Ephesus. Doubtless there were other Johns among the Christians at that time, but only arrogance or an intention to deceive could account for the assumption of this simple style by any other writer. He is also described as (b) a servant of Christ, (c) one who had borne testimony as an eye-witness of the word of God and of the testimony of Christ — terms which were surely designed to identify him with the writer of the verses ^{<BIB>}John 19:35; 1:14: and 1 ^{<BIB>}John 1:2. He is (d) in Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ: it may be easy to suppose that other Christians of the same name were banished thither, but the apostle is the only John who is distinctly named in early history as an exile at Patmos. He is also (e) a fellow-sufferer with those whom he addresses, and (f) the authorized channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the seven churches of Asia, of which churches John the apostle was at that time the spiritual governor and teacher. Lastly (g), the writer was a fellowservant of angels and a brother of prophets — titles which are far more suitable to one of the chief apostles, and far more likely to have been assigned to him than to any other man of less distinction. All these marks are found united together in the apostle John, and in him alone of all historical persons. We must go out of the region of fact into the region of conjecture to find such another person. A candid reader of the Revelation, if previously acquainted with John's other writings and life, must inevitably conclude that the writer intended to be identified with John. It is strange to see so able a critic as Lucke (*Einleitung*, p. 514) meeting this conclusion with the conjecture that some Asiatic disciple and namesake of the apostle may have written the book in the course of some missionary labors or some time of sacred retirement in Patmos. Equally unavailing against this conclusion is the objection brought by Ewald, Credner, and others, from the fact that a promise of the future blessedness of the apostles is implied in 18:20 and 21:14: as if it were inconsistent with the true modesty and

humility of an apostle to record — as Daniel of old did in much plainer terms (²⁷²¹³Daniel 12:13) — a divine promise of salvation to himself personally. Rather those passages may be taken as instances of the writer quietly accepting as his just due such honorable mention as belongs to all the apostolic company. Unless we are prepared to give up the veracity and divine origin of the whole book, and to treat the writer's account of himself as a mere fiction of a poet trying to cover his own insignificance with an honored name, we must accept that description as a plain statement of fact, equally credible with the rest of the book, and in harmony with the simple, honest, truthful character which is stamped on the face of the whole narrative.

Besides this direct assertion of John's authorship, there is also an implication of it running through the book. Generally, the instinct of single-minded, patient faithful students has led them to discern a connection between the Revelation and John's gospel and epistles, and to recognise, not merely the same Spirit as the source of this and other books of Holy Scripture, but also the same peculiarly formed human instrument employed both in producing this book and the fourth gospel, and in speaking the characteristic words and performing the characteristic actions recorded of John. This evidence is set forth at great length and with much force and eloquence by J. P. Lange in his essay on the connection between the individuality of the apostle John and that of the Apocalypse, 1838 (*Vermischte Schriften*, ii, 173-231). After investigating the peculiar features of the apostle's character and position, and (in reply to Lucke) the personal traits shown by the writer of the Revelation, he concludes that the book is a mysterious but genuine effusion of prophecy under the New Test., imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, the product of a spiritual gift so peculiar, so great and noble, that it can be ascribed to the apostle John alone. The Revelation requires for its writer John, just as his peculiar genius requires for its utterance a revelation. This special character of the Apocalypse as an inspired production under remarkably vivid circumstances is the true key to its diction, which certainly exhibits many striking differences as compared with John's other well-accredited writings. At the same time, there are not a few marked coincidences in the phraseology. Both of these points have been developed at great length by the writers above named and by others in their commentaries and introductions, to which we must refer the reader for details. Arguments of this nature are always inconclusive as to authorship, and we therefore rest

the conclusion upon evidence of a more palpable character. (See § 3 below.)

(2.) The historical testimonies in favor of John's authorship are singularly distinct and numerous, and there is very little to weigh against them.

(a.) Justin Martyr (cir. A.D. 150) says: "A man among us whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation which was made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem" (*Tryph.* § 81, p. 179, ed. Ben.).

(b.) The author of the Muratorian Fragment (cir. A.D. 170) speaks of John as the writer of the Apocalypse, and describes him as a predecessor of Paul, i.e. as Credner and Luicke candidly interpret it, his predecessor in the office of apostle.

(c.) Melito of Sardis (cir. A.D. 170) wrote a treatise on the Revelation of John. Eusebius (*II. E.* 4:26) mentions this among the books of Melito which had come to his knowledge; and as he carefully records objections against the apostle's authorship, it may be fairly presumed, notwithstanding the doubts of Klenker and Lucke (*Einleitung*, p. 514), that Eusebius found no doubt as to John's authorship in the book of this ancient Asiatic bishop.

(d.) Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (cir. 180), in a controversy with Hermogenes, quotes passages out of the Revelation of John (Eusebius, *H.E.* 4:24).

(e.) Ireneus (cir. 195), apparently never having heard a suggestion of any other author than the apostle, often quotes the Revelation as the work of John. In 4:20, § 11, he describes John the writer of the Revelation as the same who was leaning on Jesus' bosom at supper, and asked him who should betray him. The testimony of Irenaeus as to the authorship of Revelation is, perhaps, more important than that of any other writer: it mounts up into the preceding generation, and is virtually that of a contemporary of the apostle. For in 5:30, § 1, where he vindicates the true reading (666) of the number of the Beast, he cites in support of it, not only the old correct copies of the book, but also the oral testimony of the very persons who themselves had seen John face to face. It is obvious that Ireneus's reference for information on such a point to those contemporaries of John implies his undoubting belief that they, in common with himself, viewed John as the Writer of the book. Licke (p. 574)

suggests that this view was possibly groundless because it was entertained before the learned fathers of Alexandria had set the example of historical criticism; but his suggestion scarcely weakens the force of the fact that such was the belief of Asia, and it appears a strange suggestion when we remember that the critical discernment of the Alexandrians, to whom he refers, led them to coincide with Irenaeus in his view.

(f.) Apollonius (cir. 200) of Ephesus (?), in controversy with the Montanists of Phrygia, quoted passages out of the Revelation of John, and narrated a miracle wrought by John at Ephesus (Euseb. *H.E.* v. 18).

(g.) Clement of Alexandria (cir.200) quotes the book as the Revelation of John (*Stromata*, 6:13, p. 667), and as the work of an apostle (*Poed.* ii, 12, p. 207).

(h.) Tertullian (A.D. 207), in at least one place, quotes by name “the apostle John in the Apocalypse” (*Adv. Marcion.* 3:14).

(i.) Hippolytus (cir. 230) is said, in the inscription on his statue at Rome, to have composed an apology for the Apocalypse and Gosple of St. John the apostle. He quotes it as the work of John (*De Antichristo*, § 36, p. 756, ed. Migne).

(j.) Origen (cir. 233), in his commentary on John, quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* 6:25), says of the apostle, “he wrote also the Revelation.” The testimonies of later writers, in the 3d and 4th centuries, in favor of John’s authorship of the Revelation are equally distinct and far more numerous. They may be seen quoted at length in Lucke, p. 628-638, or in dean Alford’s *Prolegomena* (*N.T.* vol. 4. pt. 2). It may suffice here to say that they include the names of Victorinus, Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory, Didymus, Ambrose, Augustine; and Jerome.

All the foregoing writers, testifying that the book came from an apostle, believed that it was a part of Holy Scripture. But many whose extant works cannot be quoted for testimony to the authorship of the book refer to it as possessing canonical authority. Thus

(a) Papias, who is described by Irenaeus as a hearer of John and friend of Polycarp, is cited, together with other writers, by Andreas of Cappadocia, in his commentary on the Revelation, as a guarantee to later ages of the divine inspiration of the book (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i, 15; Cramer, *Catena*

[Oxford, 1840], p. 176). The value of this testimony has not been impaired by the controversy to which it has given rise, in which Licke, Bleek, Hengstenberg, and Rettig have taken different parts.

(b) In the epistle from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177, inserted in Eusebius, *H.E.* v, 1-3, several passages (e.g. 1:5; 14:4; 22:11) are quoted or referred to in the same way as passages of books whose canonical authority is unquestioned.

(c) Cyprian (Epp. 10,12,14,19, ed. Fell) repeatedly quotes it as a part of canonical Scripture. Chrysostom makes no distinct allusion to it in any extant writing; but we are informed by Suidas that he received it as canonical. Although omitted (perhaps as not adapted for public reading in church) from the list of canonical books in the Council of Laodicea, it was admitted into the list of the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397.

2. Evidence against John's Authorship. — Marcion, who regarded all the apostles except Paul as corrupters of the truth, rejected the Apocalypse and all other books of the New Test. which were not written by Paul. The Alogi, an obscure sect, (cir. A.D. 180), in their zeal against Montanism, denied the existence of spiritual gifts in the Church, and rejected the Revelation, saving it was the work, not of John, but of Cerinthus (Epiphanius, *Adv. Heer.* 51). The Roman presbyter Caius (cir. A.D. 196), who also wrote against Montanism, is quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* 3:28) as ascribing certain revelations to Cerinthus; but it is doubted (see Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii, 138) whether the Revelation of John is the book to which Caius refers. But the testimony which is considered the most important of all in ancient times against the Revelation is contained in a fragment of Dionysius of Alexandria (cir. A.D. 240), the most influential, and perhaps the ablest, bishop in that age. The passage, taken from a book *On the Promises*, written in reply to Nepos, a learned Judaizing Chiliast, is quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* 7:25). The principal points in it are these: Dionysius testifies that some writers before him altogether repudiated the Revelation as a forgery of Cerinthus; many brethren, however, prized it very highly, and Dionysius would not venture to reject it, but received it in faith as containing things too deep and too sublime for his understanding. (In his *Epistle to Hermammon* [Euseb. *H.E.* 7:10] he quotes it as he would quote Holy Scripture.) He accepts as true what is stated in the book itself, that it was written by John, but he argues that the way in which that name is mentioned, and the general character of the language, are unlike what we

should expect from John the evangelist and apostle; that there were many Johns in that age. He would not say that John Mark was the writer, since it is not known that he was in Asia. He supposes that it must be the work of some John who lived in Asia; and he observes that there are said to be two tombs in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of John. He then points out at length the superiority of the style of the Gospel and the First Epistle of John to the style of the Apocalypse, and says, in conclusion, that whatever he may think of the language, he does not deny that the Writer of the Apocalypse actually saw what he describes, and was endowed with the divine gifts of knowledge and prophecy. To this extent, and no further, Dionysius is a witness against John's authorship. It is obvious that he keenly felt the difficulty arising from the use made of the contents of this book by certain unsound Christians under his jurisdiction; that he was acquainted with the doubt as to its canonical authority which some of his predecessors entertained as an inference from the nature of its contents; that he deliberately rejected their doubt and accepted the contents of the book as given by the inspiration of God; that, although he did not understand how John could write in the style in which the Revelation is written, he yet knew of no authority for attributing it, as he desired to attribute it, to some other of the numerous persons who bore the name of John.

A weightier difficulty arises from the fact that the Revelation is one of the books which are absent from the ancient Peshito version, and the only trustworthy evidence in favor of its reception by the ancient Syrian Church is a single quotation which is adduced from the Syriac works (ii, 332 c) of Ephrem Syrus. Eusebius is remarkably sparing in his quotations from the "Revelation of John," and the uncertainty of his opinion about it is best shown by his statement in *H.E.* 3:39, that "it is likely that the Revelation was seen by the second John (the Ephesian presbyter); if any one is unwilling to believe that it was seen by the apostle." **SEE JOHN THE PRESBYTER.** Jerome states (*Ep. ad Dardanum.* etc.) that the Greek churches felt, with respect to the Revelation, a similar doubt to that of the Latins respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. Neither he nor his equally influential contemporary Augustine shared such doubts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret abstained from making use of the book, sharing, it is possible, the doubts to which Jerome refers. But they have not gone so far as to express a distinct opinion against it. The silence of these writers is the latest evidence of any

importance that has been adduced against the overwhelming weight of the testimony in favor of the canonical authority and authorship of this book.
SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

II. Time and Place of Writing. — The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95-97. The weighty testimony of Ireneus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says (*Adv. Haer.* v. 30, § 3), “It [i.e. the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of Domitian’s reign.” Stuart’s attempt to interpret this of Nero’s reign (*Comment.* ad loc.) is evidently forced. Eusebius also records as a tradition which he does not question, that in the persecution under Domitian, John the apostle and evangelist, being yet alive, was banished to the island of Patmos for his testimony of the divine word. Allusions in Clement of Alexandria and Origen point in the same direction. There is no mention in any writer of the first three centuries of any other time or place. Epiphanius (51, 12), obviously by mistake, says that John prophesied in the reign of Claudius. Two or three obscure and later authorities say that John was banished under Nero.

Unsupported by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is simply their inference from the style and contents of the book. But it is difficult to see why John’s old age rendered it, as they allege, impossible for him to write his inspired message with force and vigor, or why his residence in Ephesus must have removed the Hebraistic peculiarities of his Greek. It is difficult to see in the passages ^{<6107>}Revelation 1:7; 2:9; 3:9; 6:12, 16; 11:1, anything which would lead necessarily to the conclusion that Jerusalem was in a prosperous condition, and that the predictions of its fall had not been fulfilled when those verses were written. A more weighty argument in favor of an early date might be urged from a modern interpretation of ^{<6170>}Revelation 17:10, if that interpretation could be established. Galba is alleged to be the sixth king, the one that “is.” In Nero these interpreters see the beast that was wounded (^{<6133>}Revelation 13:3), the beast that was and is not, the eighth king (^{<6171>}Revelation 17:11). For some time after Nero’s death the Roman populace believed that he was not dead, but had fled into the East, whence he would return and regain his throne; and these interpreters venture to suggest that the writer of the Revelation shared and meant to express the absurd popular delusion. Even the able and learned Reuss (*Theol. Chret.* i, 443), by way of supporting this

interpretation, advances his untenable claim to the first discovery of the name of Nero Caesar in the number of the beast, 666. The inconsistency of this interpretation with prophetic analogy, with the context of Revelation, and with the fact that the book is of divine origin, is pointed out by Hengstenberg at the end of his *Commentary on ch. 13* and by Elliott, *Horoe Apoc.* 4:547.

It has been inferred from 1:2, 9, 10, that the Revelation was written in Ephesus, immediately after the apostle's return from Patmos. But the text is scarcely sufficient to support this conclusion. The style in which the messages to the seven churches are delivered rather suggests the notion that the book was written in Patmos. — *SEE JOHN THE APOSTLE.*

III. Language. — The thought first suggested by Harenberg, that the Revelation was written in Aramaic, has met with little or no reception. The silence of all ancient writers as to any Aramaic original is alone a sufficient answer to the suggestion. Lucke (*Einleit.* p. 441) has collected internal evidence to show that the original is the Greek of a Jewish Christian.

Lucke has also (p. 448-464) examined in minute detail, after the preceding labors of Donker-Curtius, Vogel, Winer, Ewald, Kolthoff, and Hitzig, the peculiarities of language which obviously distinguish the Revelation from every other book of the New Test. In subsequent sections (p. 680-747) he urges with great force the difference between the Revelation, on one side, and the fourth Gospel and first Epistle on the other, in respect of their style and composition and the mental character and attainments of the writer of each. Hengstenberg, in a dissertation appended to his *Commentary*, maintains that they are by one writer. That the anomalies and peculiarities of the Revelation have been greatly exaggerated by some critics is sufficiently shown by Hitzig's plausible and ingenious, though unsuccessful, attempt to prove the identity of style and diction in the Revelation and the Gospel of Mark. It may be admitted that the Revelation has many surprising grammatical peculiarities. But much of this is accounted for by the fact that it was probably written down, as it was seen, "in the spirit," while the ideas, in all their novelty and vastness, filled the apostle's mind, and rendered him less capable of attending to forms of speech. His Gospel and Epistles, on the other hand, were composed equally under divine influence, but an influence of a gentler, more ordinary kind, with much care, after long deliberation, after frequent recollection

and recital of the facts, and deep pondering of the doctrinal truths which they involve.

Gebhardt has recently given the coincidences in language between the Gospel and the Revelation of John in a most convincing manner (*Doctrine of the Apocalypse*, etc.; transl. from the German, Edinb. 1878): “There are underlying identities of style which demonstrate identity of authorship. The subjects, of course, are stupendously different, and so require even of the same writer a stupendous difference of style. In the Apocalypse the pictorial imagination is perpetually on the utmost stretch; events and objects are crowding upon each other with intense rapidity. The scenery and pictorial material are generally borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures, with immense improvements. More than all, the mind of the writer, steeped in Hebraism, is in a preternatural state. He who was in his youth a son of thunder has all the thunder of his youth preternaturally renewed within him. Rightly, the extraordinary conditions demand an extraordinary change of style, both in thought and language. Yet, underlying all this change, the natural style and mind unmistakably disclose themselves. He who cannot see this was never born a critic, and can never be reconstructed into one” (*Meth. Quar.* 1878. p. 739). **SEE JOHN** (*Gospel and Epistles*).

IV. Contents. — A full analysis of the book would involve much that is disputed as to its interpretation. We therefore here content ourselves with a general outline, in which the main visions are specified.

The first three verses contain the title of the book, the description of the writer, and the blessing pronounced on the readers, which possibly, like the last two verses of the fourth gospel, may be an addition by the hand of inspired survivors of the writer. John begins (~~600~~ Revelation 1:4) with a salutation of the seven churches of Asia. This, coming before the announcement that he was in the spirit, looks like a dedication not merely of the first vision, but of all the book, to those churches. In the next five verses (~~605~~ Revelation 1:5-9) he touches the key-note of the whole following book, the great fundamental ideas on which all our notions of the government of the world and the Church are built — the person of Christ; the redemption wrought by him; his second coming to judge mankind; the painful, hopeful discipline, of Christians in the midst of this present world; thoughts which may well be supposed to have been uppermost in the mind of the persecuted and exiled apostle even before the divine inspiration came on him.

a. The first vision (~~6017~~ Revelation 1:7-3:22) shows the Son of Man with his injunction, or epistles to the seven churches. While the apostle is pondering those great truths and the critical condition of his Church which he had left, a Divine Person resembling those seen by Ezekiel and Daniel, and identified by name and by description as Jesus, appears to John, and, with the discriminating authority of a lord and judge, reviews the state of those churches, pronounces his decision upon their several characters, and takes occasion from them to speak to all Christians who may deserve similar encouragement or similar condemnation. Each of these sentences, spoken by the Son of Man, is described as said by the Spirit. Hitherto the apostle has been speaking primarily, though not exclusively, to some of his own contemporaries concerning the present events and circumstances. Henceforth he ceases to address them particularly. His words are for the ear of the universal Church in all ages, and show the significance of things which are present in hope or fear, in sorrow or in joy, to Christians everywhere.

b. In the next vision (Revelation 4:1-8:1), Patmos and the Divine Person whom he saw are gone. Only the trumpet voice is heard again calling him to a change of place. He is in the highest court of heaven, and sees God sitting on his throne. The seven-sealed book or roll is produced, and the slain lamb, the Redeemer, receives it amid the sound of universal adoration. As the seals are opened in order, the apostle sees

- (1) a conqueror on a white horse;
- (2) a red horse, betokening war;
- (3) the black horse of famine;
- (4) the pale horse of death;
- (5) the eager souls of martyrs under the altar;
- (6) an earthquake, with universal commotion and terror. After this there is a pause, the course of avenging angels is checked while 144,000, the children of Israel, servants of God, are sealed, and an innumerable multitude of the redeemed of all nations are seen worshipping God. Next
- (7) the seventh seal is opened, and half an hour's silence in heaven ensues.

c. Then (~~and~~ Revelation 8:2-11:19) seven angels appear with trumpets, the prayers of saints are offered up, the earth is struck with fire from the altar, and the seven trumpets are sounded.

(1) The earth, and

(2) the sea, and

(3) the springs of water, and

(4) the heavenly bodies are successively smitten;

(5) a plague of locusts afflicts the men who are not sealed (the first woe);

(6) the third part of men are slain (the second woe), but the rest are impenitent. Then there is a pause: a mighty angel with a book appears and cries out; seven thunders sound, but their words are not recorded; the approaching completion of the mystery of God is announced; the angel bids the apostle eat the book, and measure the temple with its worshippers, and the outer court given up to the Gentiles; the two witnesses of God, their martyrdom, resurrection, ascension, are foretold. The approach of the third woe is announced, and

(7) the seventh trumpet is sounded, the reign of Christ is proclaimed, God has taken his great power, the time has come for judgment and for the destruction of the destroyers of the earth.

The three preceding visions are distinct from one another. Each of the last two, like the longer one which follows, has the appearance of a distinct prophecy, reaching from the prophet's time to the end of the world. The second half of the Revelation (chapters 12-22) comprises a series of visions which are connected by various links. It may be described generally as a prophecy of the assaults of the devil and his agents (i.e. the dragon, the ten-horned beast, the two-horned beast or false prophet, and the harlot) upon the Church, and their final destruction. It appears to begin with a reference to events anterior, not only to those which are predicted in the preceding chapter, but also to the time in which it was written. It seems hard to interpret the birth of the child as a prediction, and not as a retrospective allusion.

d. A woman (ch. 12) clothed with the sun is seen in heaven, and a great red dragon with seven crowned heads stands waiting to devour her offspring;

her child is caught up unto God, and the mother flees into the wilderness for 1260 days. The persecution of the woman and her seed on earth by the dragon is described as the consequence of a war in heaven in' which the dragon was overcome and cast out upon the earth.

The Revelator (ch. 13), standing on the sea-shore, sees a beast with seven heads, one wounded, with ten crowned horns, rising, from the water, the representative of the dragon. All the world wonders at and worships him, and he attacks the saints and prevails. He is followed by another two-horned beast rising out of the earth, who compels men to wear the mark of the beast, whose number is 666.

Next (ch. 14) the lamb is seen with 144,000 standing on Mount Zion, learning the song of praise of the heavenly host. Three angels fly forth calling men to worship God, proclaiming the fall of Babylon, denouncing the worshippers of the beast. A blessing is pronounced on the faithful dead, and the judgment of the world is described under the image of a harvest reaped by angels.

John (chapters 15 and 16) sees in heaven the saints who had overcome the beast, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Then seven angels come out of the heavenly temple having seven vials of wrath, which they pour out upon the earth, sea, rivers, sun. the seat of the beast, Euphrates, and the air, after which there are a great earthquake and a hail-storm.

One (chapters 17, 18) of the last seven angels carries John into the wilderness and shows him a harlot, Babylon, sitting on a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She is explained to be that great city, sitting upon seven mountains, reigning over the kings of the earth. Afterwards John sees a vision of the destruction of Babylon, portrayed as the burning of a great city amid the lamentations of worldly men and the rejoicing of saints.

Afterwards (ch. 19) the worshippers in heaven are heard celebrating Babylon's fall and the approaching marriage-supper of the lamb. The Word of God is seen going forth to war at the head of the heavenly armies; the beast and his false prophet are taken and cast into the burning lake, and their worshippers are slain.

An angel (Revelation 20- ~~6218~~ Revelation 22:5) binds the dragon, i.e. the devil, for one thousand years, while the martyred saints who had not worshipped the beast reign with Christ. Then the devil is unloosed, gathers

a host against the camp of the saints, but is overcome by fire from heaven, and is cast into the burning lake with the beast and false prophet. John then witnesses the process of the final judgment, and sees and describes the new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, with its people and their way of life.

In the last sixteen verses (~~6216~~ Revelation 22:6-21) the angel solemnly asseverates the truthfulness and importance of the foregoing sayings, pronounces a blessing on those who keep them exactly, gives warning of his speedy coming to judgment, and of the nearness of the time when these prophecies shall be fulfilled.

V. Schemes of Interpretation. — Few, if any, books of the Bible have been the sport of so great differences of view as this, arising largely from prejudice and the passion of the times. We can give here but a brief outline of these conflicting opinions, which prevail even to the present day.

1. Historical Review. — The interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the Chiliastic period of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of John were chiefly regarded as representations of general Christian truths, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the coming of Christ, the millennium, and the day of judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecution they endured, taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and comfort. They did not entertain the thought of building up a definite consecutive chronological scheme even of those symbols which some moderns regard as then already fulfilled; although from the beginning a connection between Rome and Antichrist was universally allowed, and parts of the Revelation were regarded as the filling up of the great outline sketched by Daniel and Paul. The only extant systematic interpretations in this period are the interpolated commentary on the Revelation by the martyr Victorinus, cir. A.D. 270 (*Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, 3, 414, and Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 5, 318; the two editions should be compared), and the disputed treatise on Antichrist by Hippolytus (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 10:726). But the prevalent views of that age are to be gathered also from a passage in Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 80, 81), from the later books, especially the fifth, of Irenaeus, and from various scattered passages in Tertullian, Origen, and Methodius. The general anticipation of the last

days of the world in Lactantius, 7:14-25, has little direct reference to the Revelation.

Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy advent and their spiritual conception of his kingdom, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfilment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene of a millennial development. This view, however, was soon met by the figurative interpretation of the millennium as the reign of Christ in the hearts of all true believers. As the barbarous and heretical invaders: of the falling empire appeared, they were regarded: by the suffering. Christians as fulfilling the woes denounced in the Revelation. The beginning of a regular chronological interpretation is seen in Berengaud (assigned by some critics to the 9th century), who treated the Revelation as a history of the Church from the beginning of the world to its end. The original *Commentary* of the abbot Joachim is remarkable, not only for a further development of that method of interpretation, but for the scarcely disguised identification of Babylon with papal Rome, and of the second beast or Antichrist with some universal pontiff. The chief commentaries belonging to this period are that which is ascribed to Tichonius (cir. A.D. 390), printed in the works of Augustine; Primasius of Adrumetum in Africa (A.D. 550), in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 148, 1406; Andreas of Crete (cir. A.D. 650), Arethas of Cappadocia, and Ecumenius of Thessaly in the 10th century, whose commentaries were published together in Cramer's *Catena* (Oxon. (1840); the *Explanatio Apoc.* in the works of Bede (A.D. 735); the *Expositio* of Berengaud, printed in the works of Ambrose; the *Commentary* of Haymo (A.D. 853), first published at Cologne in 1531; a short treatise on the (*seals* by Anselm, bishop of Havilberg (A.D. 1145), printed in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, i, 161; the *Expositio* of abbot Joachim of Calabria (A.D. 1200), printed at Venice in 1527.

In the dawn of the Reformation, the views to which the reputation of abbot Joachim gave currency were taken up by the harbingers of the impending change, as by Wycliffe and others; and they became the foundation of that great historical school of interpretation, which up to this time seems the most popular of all (For the later commentaries, see § 6 below.)

2. Approximate Classification of Modern Interpretations. — These are generally placed in three great divisions.

(1.) The *Praeterist* expositors, who are of opinion that the Revelation has been almost, or altogether, fulfilled in the time which has passed since it was written; that it refers principally to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. The most eminent expounders of this view are Alcasar, Grotius, Hammond, Bossuet, Calmet, Wettstein, Eichhorn, Hug, Herder, Ewald, Lucke, De Wette; Dusterdieck, Stuart, Lee, and Maurice. This is the favorite interpretation with the critics of Germany, one of whom goes so far as to state that the writer of the Revelation promised the fulfilment of his visions within the space of three years and a half from the time in which he wrote.

Against the *Proeterist* view it is urged that prophecies fulfilled ought to be rendered so perspicuous to the general sense of the Church as to supply an argument against infidelity; that the destruction of Jerusalem, having occurred twenty-five years previously, could not occupy a large space in a prophecy; that the supposed predictions of the downfall of Jerusalem and of Nero appear from the context to refer to one event, but are by this scheme separated, and, moreover, placed in a wrong order; that the measuring of the Temple and the altar, and the death of the two witnesses (ch. 11), cannot be explained consistently with the context.

(2.) The *Futurist* expositors, whose views show a strong reaction against some extravagances of the preceding school. They believe that the whole book, excepting perhaps the first three chapters, refers principally, if not exclusively, to events which are yet to come. This view, which is asserted to be merely a revival of the primitive interpretation, has been advocated in recent times by Dr. J. H. Todd, Dr. S. R. Maitland, B. Newton, C. Maitland, I. Williams, De Burgh, and others.

Against the *Futurist* it is argued that it is not consistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfilment at the beginning and end of the book itself (see ~~REV~~ Revelation 1:3; 22:6, 7, 12, 20). Christians, to whom it was originally addressed, would have derived no special comfort from it had its fulfilment been altogether deferred for so many centuries. The rigidly literal interpretation of Babylon, the Jewish tribes, and other symbols which generally forms a part of *Futurist* schemes, presents peculiar difficulties.

(3.) The Historical or *Continuous* expositors, in whose opinion the Revelation is a progressive history of the fortunes of the Church from the first century to the end of time. The chief supporters of this most interesting interpretation are Mede, Sir L. Newton, Vitringa, Bengel, Woodhouse, Faber, E. B. Elliott, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, and others. The recent *Commentary* of dean Alford belongs mainly to this school.

Against the historical scheme it is urged that its advocates differ very widely among themselves; that they assume without any authority that the 1260 days are so many years; that several of its applications — e.g. of the symbol of the ten-horned beast to the popes, and the sixth seal to the conversion of Constantine are inconsistent with the context; that attempts by some of this school to predict future events by the help of Revelation have ended in repeated failures.

Two methods have been proposed by which the student of the Revelation may escape the incongruities and fallacies of the different interpretations, while he may derive edification from whatever truth they contain. It has been suggested that the book may be regarded as a prophetic poem, dealing in general and inexact descriptions, much of which may be set down as poetic imagery — mere embellishment. But such a view would be difficult to reconcile with the belief that the book is an inspired prophecy. A better suggestion is made, or rather is revived, by Dr. Arnold in his sermons *On the Interpretation of Prophecy*: that we should bear in mind that predictions have a lower historical sense, as well as a higher spiritual sense; that there maybe one, or more than one, typical, imperfect, historical fulfilment, of a prophecy, in each of which the higher spiritual fulfilment is shadowed forth more or less distinctly. *SEE DOUBLE SENSE.*

In choosing among the various schemes of interpretation, we are *inclined* to adopt that which regards the first series of prophetic visions proper (ch. 4-12) as indicating the collapse (in part at the time already transpired) of the nearest persecuting power, namely, Judaism; the second series (ch. 13-19) as denoting the eventual downfall of the succeeding persecutor, i.e. Rome (first in its pagan and next in its papal form); and the third series (20:1-10) as briefly outlining the final overthrow of a last persecutor, some yet future power or influence (figuratively represented by a name borrowed from Ezekiel). These three opponents of Christianity are set forth as successive developments of Antichrist, and the symbols employed are

cumulative and reiterative rather than historical and consecutive. For special explanations, *SEE ANTICHRIST; SEE MAGOG; SEE NUMBER OF THE BEAST, ETC.*

VI. Commentaries. — Most of the above questions are treated in the regular commentaries and introductions, and in numerous monographs, published separately, or in periodicals. The following are the exegetical helps solely on the whole book; to the most important we prefix an asterisk: St. Anthony, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* p. 645); Victorinus, *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 3, 414; Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* 4:49; also Par. 1549, 1609, 8vo); Berengaud, *Expositio* (in *Ambrosii Opp.* ii, 499); Trichonius, *Expositio* (in *Augustini Opp.* 16:617); Primasius, *Commentarius* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. x*); Andreas Caesar, *Commentarius* (*ibid.* v, 590); Arethas, *Explanationes* (*ibid.* 9:741; also in *Ecumenii Opp.* vol. ii); Bede, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* v, 701; also in *Works, i*, 189; 12:337); Ambrosius Autpert. In *Apocal.* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 13:403); Alcuin, *Commentarii* (in *Mai, Script. Vet.* 9:257); Bruno, in *Apocal.* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Hervaeus, *Enarrationes* (in *Anselmi Opp.* ed. Picard, 1612); Rupert, In *Apocal.* (in *Opp.* ii, 450); Anon. *Glossa* (Lips. 1481, 4to); Albert, *Comment.* (Basil. 1506, 4to; also in *Opp.* vol. xi); Joann. Viterb. *Glossa* (Colon. 1507, 8vo); *Joachim, In *Apocal.* (Ven. 1519, 527, 4to); Huss, *Commentarius* (ed. Luther, Vitemb. 1528, 8vo); Lambert, *Exegesis* (Marp. 1528; Basil. 1539, 8vo); Aimo, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1529, 1531, 1534; Par. 1540, 8vo); Melch. Hoffmann, *Auslegung* (Argent. 1530, 8vo); Bullinger, *Conciones* (Basil. 1535, 1570, and often, fol.; also in English, Lond. 1573, 4to); Thompas of Wales, *Expositio* (Flor. 1549, 8vo; also in Aquinas, *Comment.* Paris, 1641); Bibliander, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1549, 8vo); Meyer, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1554, 1603, fol.); Fulke, *Prelectiones* (Lond. 1557, 1573, 4to); Conrad, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1560, 1574, 8vo); Borrhau, *Conzmmnentarius*, (*ibid.* 1561; Tigsur. 1600, fol.); Serranus, *Commentaria* (Complut. 1563, fol.); Chytraeus, *Commnentarius* (Vitemb. 1563, 1571, 1575, 8v-; Rost. 1581, 4to); Artopoeus, *Explicatio* (Basil. 1563, 8vo); Selnecker, *Erklirung* (Jen. 1567, 1568, 1608, 4to); (Tyfford, *Sermons* (Lond. 1573, 4to); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Latin, *ibid.* 1574, 4to); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* (L. B. 1580, 1590, 8vo; also in English, Lond. 1583, 4to); De Fermo [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratio* (from the Italian, Antw. 1581, 8vo); De Melo [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Pint. 1584, fol.) Foxe, *Proelectiones* (Lond. 1587, fol.; Geneva, 1596, 1618, 8vo); Bulenger [Rom. Cath. l, *Ephrasis* (Paris; 15.89, 1597, 8vo); Junius,

Illustratio (Heidelb. 1591; Basil. 1599, 8vo; and in *Opp.* vol. i, 1694; also in French, Basle, 1592, 1598.; in English, Lond. -1592, 1596, 4to; 1616, 8vo); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Salam. 1591, fol.; Lugd. 1593, 4to; Antw. 1603: Duoc. 1623, 8vpo); Gallus, *Clavis* (Antw. 1592, 8vo); *Napier, *Interpretation* (Edinb. 1593, 1611, 1645. 4to; in French, Rupp. 1603, 1607; Geneva, 1643, 4to; in Dutch, Magdeb. 1618; in German, Leips. 1611; Frankf. 1615, 627, 8vo; Ger. 1661, 4to); Funcke, *Erklärung* (Fr. a. M. 1596, 4to); Du Jon, *Exposition* (from the French, Lond. 1596, 4to); Foorthe, *Revelatio* (ibid. 1597, 4to); Winckelmann. *Commentarius* (Francf. 1600, 1609; Lub. 1615, 8vo); De la Perie, *Paraphrase* (French, Geneva, 1600, 1651, 4to); Eglin, *Epilysis* (Tigur. 1601, fol.; Hanov. 1611, 4to); Viegas [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Ebor. 1601, fol.; Lugd. 1602, 1606; Ven. 1602, 1608; Colon. 1603, 1607-; Par. 1606, 1615, 1630, 4to); Richter, *Die Offenbarung* (Leips. 1602, 4to); Dent, *Exposition* (Lond. 1603, 1607, 4to; 1623, 8vo; 1644, 4to); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Lugd. 1606; Ven. 1607, 4to); Brightmann. *Scholia* (Francf. 1609, 4to; 1618; Heidelb. 1612, 8vo; also in English, Amst. 1611, 1615, 4to; Lond. 1616; Leyd. 1644, 8vo; and in *Works*, Lond. 1644, 4to); Taffin, *Exposition* (French, Fless. 1609; Middelb. 1614, 8vo); Hoe. *Commentarii* (Lips. 1609-11, 2 vols. 4to; 1671, fol.); Broughton, *Revelation* (Lond. 1610, 4to; also in *Works*, p. 408); Becan, *Commentarius* (Mogunt. 1612, 12mo); Lucius, *Notoe* (Hanov. 1613, 8vo); Forbes. *Commentary* (Lond. 1613, fol.; also in Latin, Amst. 1646, 4to); CottiBre, *Expositio* (Salm. 1614; Sedan, 1625, 4to); Alccassar. [Rom. Cath.], *Investigatio* (Antw. 1614; Lugd. 1618, fol.); also 5 additional *Libri* (Lugd. 1632, fol.); Graser, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1614, 4to); Cramer, *Erklärung* (Stet. 1618, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Heidelberg, 1618, 1622, 4to; also in English, Amst. 1644, fol.); Lautensack, *Erklärungq* (Frankf. 1619, 4to); Cowper, *Commentary* (Lond. 1619, 4to; and in *Works*, p. 811; also in Dutch. Amst. 1656, fol.; and in German, Leips. 1671, 8vo); Montacut, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1619, fol.); Cluver, *Morgenlicht* (Gosl. 1620, 8vo; in Latin, Lub. 1647, fol.); Wolter, *Auslegung* (Rost. 1625, 1629, 4to); De Dieu, *Animadversiones* (L. B. 1627, 4to); *Mede, *Clavis* (Cambr. 1627, 1629, 1649, 4to; also in English, ibid. 1632; Lond. 1643, 1650, 4to; 1831, 12mo; 1833, 8vo; both with additional notes in: *Works*, vol. ii); Baaz, *Commentary* (in Swedish, Calmar, 1629, 8vo); Anon. *Explication* (French, Leyd. 1633, 4to); Le Bux, *Paraphrase* (French, Genev. 1641, 4to); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1643, 1645; Lips. 1712, 4to); Gravins, *Tabuloe* (L. B. 1647, fol.); also *Ausleguy* (Hamb. 1657, 4to); Holland,

Exposition (Lond. 1650, 4to); Hartlib, *Revelation* (from the Dutch, *ibid.* 1651, 8vo); Ferrarius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Mediol. 1654, 3 vols. fol.); De la Haye [Rom. Cath.]; *Commentarii* (Par. 1654 sq., 2 vols. fol.); Guild, *Explanation* (Aberdeen, 1656, 12mo); Fromond [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lov. 1657, 4to; also [with other books] Par. 1670, fol.); Durham, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1658, fol.; 1680, 1764, 1788, 4to; Edinb. 1680, 4to; Amst. 1660, 4to; Falkirk, 1799, 2 vols. 8vo): Amyrald, *Introduction* (French, Hag, 1658, 4to); Bordes, *Elucidatio* (Par. 1658, 2 vols. fol.); also *Explicatio* (*ibid.* 1659, fol.); Kromayer [J.], *Commentarius* (Lips. 1662, 1674, 4to); DeSylveira [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1663, 1669, 1700, 2 vols. fol.); Diest [A.], *Analysis* (Arnh. 1663, 4to); More, *Apocalypsis* (Lond. 1666, 1680, 4to); and *Ratio* (*ibid.* 1666, 4to; in English, *ibid.* 1680, 4to; both in his *Opp.* *ibid.* 1675, fol.); Brenius, *Verklaaringe* [includ. Joh.] (Amst. 1666, 4to); Pegan, *Erklärung* (Frankf. 1670, 1676, 12mo); Schindler, *Delineation* (German, Brunlsen. 1670, 4to); Grellet, *Prodromus* (L. B. 1675, 4to); Kircher [Rom. Cath.], *Explicatio* (Colon. 1676, 4to); Matthew Hoffman, *Chronotaxis* (Jen. 1678, 1687, 4to); Heunisch, *Synopsis* (*ibid.* 1678, 4to); also *Hauptschli'ssel* (Schleus. 1684, 4to; Leips. 1697, 8vo; and in Latin, Rottenb. 1684; Lips. 1698, 4to); Muller, *Elucidatio* (Hard. 1684, 2 vols. 4to); Hierve [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Lugd. 1684, 4to); Heidegger, *Diatribes* (L. B. 1687, 2 vols. 4to); Van Wesel, *Verklaaring* (Ench. 1688, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (French, Par. 1689, 8vo); Cressener, *Explication* (Lond. 1689, 4to); also *Demonstration* (*ibid.* 1690, 4to); also *Paraphrase* (*ibid.* 1693, 4to); Marck, *Commentarius* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1689, 1699, 4to); La Cherlardie [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (French, Par. 1692, 8vo; 1702, 1708, 4to); Petersenias, *Anleitung* (Leips. 1696, fol.); Brunsmann, *Phosphorus* (Hafn. 1696, 1699, 8vo); Gebhard, *Isagoge* (Gryphsw. 1696, 1697, 4to); Durer, *Erkl'dirung* (Hanov. 1701, 12mo); Biermann, *Clavis* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1702, 4to); Vitringa, *Anacrisis* (Franeck. 1705; Amst. 1719; Wessenf. 1721, 4to); Whiston, *Essay* (Cambr. 1706, 1744, 4to); M. Kromayer, *Erkl'drung* (Leips. 1708, 4to); Scliweizer, *Erklärung* (Ulm, 1709, 8vo); Gronewegen, *Auslegung* (from the Dutch, Frankf. 1711, 4to); Kerckerdere [Rom. Cath.], *Systemma* (Lov. 1711, 12mo); Brussken, *Schlissel* (Offenb. 1713, 4to); Mandcit [Rom. Cath.], *Analyse* (Par. 1714, 8vo); Weple, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1715, 4to); Boekholt, *Verklaaring* (Had. 1717, 4to); Driessen, *Meditationes* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1717, 4to); Wells, *Help* (Oxf. 1718, 8vo); *Daubuz, *Commentary* (Lond. 1720, fol.); Abbadie, *Ouverture* (Amst. 1721, 2 vols. 12mo; also in Dutch, by Monbach, *ibid.* 1726, 2 vols.

4to); Bomble, *Chronotaxis* (ibid. 1721, 4to); Reinbeck, *Errtferung* (Berl. 1722, 8vo); Scheuermann, *Erklärung* (Lipstad. 1722, 4to); Andola, *Clavis* [includ. other passages] (Leon. 1726, 4to); De Dioneus, *Essai* (Amst. 1729, 4to); Lange [J.], *Eklärung* (Hal. 1730, fol.); Dimpel, *Einleitung* (Leips. 1730, 8vo); Lancaster, *Commentary* (Lond. 1730, 4to); Robertson, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1730, fol.); Losecken, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1731, 4to); Sir I. Newton, *Observations* (Lond. 1733, 4to; also in Latin, Amst. 1737, 4to); Pyle, *Paraphraase* (Lond. 1735, 1795, 8vo); Van den Hornet, *Dissertationes* (L. B. 1736, 4to); Lowman, *Notes* (Lond. 1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo; and since); *Bengel, *Erklrdung* (Stuttg. 1740, 1746, 8vo; new ed. ibid. 1834, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1757, 8vo); Reinhard, *Chronotaxis* (Vinar. 1741, 4to); Cremer, *Commentarius* (Zutph. 1757, 4to); Harenberg, *Erklärung* (Brunsw. 1759, 4to); Fehr, *Anleitung* (Altenb. 1761, 4to); Taylor, *Essay* (Lond. 1763, 8vo); Swedenborg, *Revelatio* (Amst. 1766, 4to; in English, Lond. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Gill, *Exposition* (ibid. 1776, 4to); Murray E.J., *Sermons* (ibid. 1778, 8vo); Reader, *Remarks* (ibid. 1778, 8vo); Herrnschneider, *Tentamen* (Argent. 1786, 4to); Mrs. Bowdler, *Observations* (Bath, 1787, 1800, 8vo); Pfeiffer, *Anleitung* (Stuttg. 1788, 8vo); Purves, *Observations* (Edinb. 1789-93, 2 vols. 8vo); *Eichhorn, *Commentarius* (Gott. 1791, 2 vols. 8vo); Johnstone, *Commentary* (Edinb. 1794, 1807, 2 vols. 8vo); Semler, *Eklärung* (Leips. 1794, 1811, 8vo); Hagen, *Anmerk.* (Ell. 1796, 8vo); Gilbert, *Reflections* (French, Guernsey, 1796, 8vo); Sniodgrass, *Commentary* (Paislev, 1799, 8vo); Jung, *Erklärung* (Niirnb. 1799, 1822, 8vo); Mitchell, *Exposition* (Lond. 1800, 8-v); J. Galloway, *Commentaries* (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Whitaker, *Commentary* (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Woodhotlse, *Notes* (ibid. 1805, 8vo); also *Annotations* (ibid. 1828, 8vo); Thruston, *Researches* (Coventry, 1812, 2 vols. 8vo); Fuller, *Discourses* (Lond. 1815, 8vo; also in *Works*, p. 436); Holmes, *Elucidation* (ibid. 1815, 8vo); also *Fulfilment* (ibid. 1819, 8vo); *Heinrichs, *Annotatio* (Gott. 1818, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; also in Koppe's *New Test.*); Culbertson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1818, 8vo); Girdlestone [C.], *Observations* (Oxf. 1820, 8vo); Herder, *Commentary* (from the German, Lond. 1821, 12mo); Gauntlett, *Exposition* (ibid. 1821, and later, 8vo); Laurmann, *Proelectio* (Groning. 1822, 8vo); Tilloch, *Dissertations* (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Park, *Exposition* (ibid. 1823, 8vo); also *Explanation* (ibid. 1832, 12mo); Murray [R.], *Introduction* (Dubl. 1826, 8vo); Holzhauser, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1827, 8vo); Croly, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1827, 4to; 1838, 8vo); *Ewald, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1828, 8vo; in German, Gott. 1862, 8vo); Matthaii: *Erklärung* (Gott. 1828, 8vo); Scholz, *Erilduternung*

(Frankf. 1828, 8vo): Allwood, *Key* (Lond. 89, 2 vo8o) *or N.Y. 1892 s8vo; *Lord,.. 1831, 8vo); Irving, *Lectures* (Lond. 1831, 4 vols. 12mo); Losecke, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1831, 4to); *Lucke, *Einleitung* (Bonn. 1832, 1852, 8vo); Basset, *Explication* (French, Par. 1832-33, 3 vols. 8vo); Cooper, *Commentary* (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Anon. *Unveiling* (ibid. 1833, 12mo); Roe, *Arrangement* (Dubl. 1834, 4to); Ashe, *Notes* (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Boost, *Erklärung* (Darmst. 1835, 8vo); Hutchinson, *Guide* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Pearson, *Consideration* (Camb. 1835, 8vo); Jones, *Interpreter* (Lond. 1836, 12mo); Vivien, *Explication* (French, Par. 1837, 12mo); Sanderson, *Essays* (Lond. 1838, 12mo); Lovett, *Explanation* (ibid. 1838, 8vo); Anon. *Studies* (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Franz, *Betrachtungen* (Quedlinb. 1838-40, 3 vols. 8vo); Tinius, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1839, 8vo); *Tullig, *Erklärung* (ibid. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Habershon, *Exposition* (Lond. 1841, 8vo; 1842, 1844, 2 vols.); Paulus [H.E. G.], *Philosophie* (Berl. 1843, 8vo); Govett, *Revelation* (Lond. 1843, 12mo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (Andover and Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); Clifford, *Exposition* (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo); Storey, *Notes* (ibid. 1845, 12mo); Von Brandt, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1845, 1847, 8vo); De Burgh, *Exposition* (Dubl. 1845, and later, 12mo); Galloway [W. B.], *Exposition* (Lond. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Newton [B. W.], *Thoughts* (ibid. 1846, 1853, 8vo); Hooper [J.], *Explanation* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Girdlestone [H.], *Notes* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Rogers, *Lectures* (ibid. 1847, 12mo); *De Wette, 'Erklärung (Leips. 1848, in his *Exeg. Handb.*); Hoare, *Harmony* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Tregelles, *Translation* (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Wordsworth, *Lectures* (ibid. 1848, 8vo), also *Notes* (ibid. 1849, 12mo); also *Harmony* (ibid. 1851, 4to); Kelly, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1849-51, 2 vols. 12mo); Cumming, *Lectures* (ibid. 1849-52, 3 vols. 12mo); also *Readings* (ibid. 1853, 12mo); Graber, *Erklärung* (Heidelb. 1850, 8vo); Frere, *Notes* (Lond. 1850, 8vo); *Elliott, *17orçe Apoc.* (English, ibid. 1851, 4 vols. 8vo), Goodwin, *Exposition* (ibid. 1851, 8vo); Wickes, *Exposition* (ibid. 1851, 8vo); James, *Lectures* (ibid. 1851, 12mo); *Hengstenberg, *Erläuterung* (Berl., 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; in English, Edinb. and N. Y. 1851-53, 2 vols. 8vo); *Jenour, *Rationale Apoc.* (English, Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Williams, *Notes* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); *Ebrard, *Erklärung* (Konigsb. 1853, 8vo, in Olshausen's *Commentar*); Scott, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Auberlen, *Quenbarung*, etc. (Basel, 1854, 1857, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Graham, *Readings* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Sutcliffe, *Lectures* (ibid. 1854, 8vo); Stern [Rom. Cath.], *Commentar* (Schaffh. 1854, 8vo); Wichtler, *Predigten* (Essen. 1854-55, 2 vols. 8vo); Grieves, *Analysis*

(Lond. 1855, 8vo); Desprez, *Fuifilment* (ibid. 1855, 8vo); Pollok, *Lectures* (ibid. 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Godwin, *Translation* (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Skeen, *Lectures* (ibid. 1857, 8vo); C. Paulus, *Blicke* (Stuttg. 1857, 12mo); Winslow, *Examination* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Huntingford, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1858, 12mo; 1871, 1873, 8vo); Porter, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); *Diisterdieck, *Handbuch* (Gott. 1859, 8vo, in Meyer's *Commentar*); Monk, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1859, 12mo); Galton, *Lectures* (ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo); Brandt, *Anleitung* (Amst. 1860, 8vo); Kelly [W.], *Lectures* (Lond. 1860, 1871, 8vo); Curzon, *Key* (ibid. 1860, 12mo); Benno [Rom. Cath.], *Er-klarung* (Munich, 1860, 8vo); Maurice, *Lectures* (Cambr. 1861, 8vo); Hooper [F. B.], *Exposition* (Lond. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Harper, *Exposition* (ibid. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Smith, *Exposition* (ibid. 1861, 8vo); Luthardt, *Erklcrung* (Leips. 1861, 8vo); Williams, *Notes* (Lond. 1861, 1873, 8vo); *Volkmar, *Commentar* (Ziir. 1862, 8vo); Sabel, *Erklarun;g* (Heidelb. 1862, 8vo); Tucker, *Explanation* (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Kemmler, *Erdluterung* (Tiib. 1863, 8vo); Vaughan, *Lectures* (Lonl. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* (Berl. 1863, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1875, 8vo); Jessin, *Erklrdung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Blech; *Uebersicht* (Dantz. 1864, 8vo); Pacificus, *Erlauterung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Lammert, *Auslegung* (Stuttg. 1864, 8vo); Clay, *Exposition* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Richter, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo). Hirschfeld, *Erluterung* (Saarb. 1865, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erlauterung* (Neu Rupp. 1865, 8vo); W. .A. B.: *Lectures* (Dubl. 1865, 8vo); De Rougemont, *Explication* (French, Neucliatel, 1866, '8-o)'; Boihm'er, *Versuch* (Bres. 1866, 8vo); Garrett, *Canmeifa-y j* (Lond./1866, 8vo); Harvey, *-Exposition:* (ibid. 1867, 8vo); Riemann, *Erlauterung* (Halle, 1868, 8vo); Armstrong, *Illustration* (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Tomlin, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1868, 8vo); Snell, *Notes-*(2d ed. ibid. 1869, 8vo); Seirs, *Lectures* (ibid. 1869, 8vo); Stone, *Explanation* (ibid. 1869, 12mo); Vaughan, *Lectures'* (3d ed. ibid. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Kienlen, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1870. 8vo); Anon. *Commentary* (Lond. 1870, 8vo); *Cowles, *'Notes* (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); Anon. *Exposition* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Pond, *Opening* (Edinb. 1871, 8vo); Glasgow, *Exposition* (ibid. 1872, 8vo); Gartner, *Erklarung* (Stuttg. 1872, 8vo); Harms, *Erdluterung* (Leips. 1873, 8vo); *Kliefoth, *Erklarung* (ibid. 1874, 3 vols. 8vo); Lincoln, *Lectures* (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Filler, *Erklarung* (Nordl. 1874, 8vo); Henley, *Musings* (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Robinson, *Expositions* (ibid. 1876, 8vo); Baylee, *Commentary* (ibid. 1877, 8vo); Wolfe, *Exposition* (ibid. 1877, 8vo). **SEE NEW TESTAMENT.**

The following are exclusively on the epistles to the seven churches: Laurentius, *Expositio* (Amst. 1649, 4to); Ramirez, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1652, fol.); More, *Exposition* (Lond. 1669, 12mo); Smith, *Epistola* [topographical] (ibid. 1678, 8vo); Johnson, *Laodicean Age* (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Allen, — *Improvement* (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Wadsworth, *Lectures* (Idle, 1825, 12mo); Theime, *Commentatio* (L. B. 1827, 4to); Wichelhaus, *Predigten* (Elberf. 1827, 8vo); *Arundel, *Visit* [descriptive] (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Milner [J.]. *Sermons* (ibid. 1830, 8vo); Milner [T.], *History* (ibid. 1832, 8vo); Withy, *Lectures* (ibid. 1833, 8vo); Hyatt, *Sermonois* (ibid. 1834, 12mo); Muir, *Sermons* (ibid. 1835, 12mo); *M'Farlane, *Seven Churches* [descriptive, with etchings] (ibid. 1836, 4to); Blunt, *Exposition* (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Carr, *Sermons* (ibid. 1840, 12mo); Wallace, *Con C-rdition* (ibid. 1842, 8vo); West, *Discourses* (ibid. 1846, 12mo); Thompson, *Sermons* (ibid. 1848, 8vo); Stathan, *Lectures* (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Heubner, *Predigten* (Berl. 1850, 8vo); Tom, *Die sieben Sendschr.* (Bayr. 1850, 8vo); Cumming, *Lectures* (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Parker, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Chamberlain, *Seven Ages* (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Biber, *Sermons* (ibid. 1857, 12mo); *Trench, *Commentary* (ibid. and N. Y. 1861, 12mo); *Svobode, *Seven Churches* [with 20 photographs, and *Notes* by Tristram] (Lond. 1869, 4to); *Plumptre, *Exposition* (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Anon. *Symbolic Parables* (Edinb. 1877, 12mo). **SEE ASIA MINOR.**

Revelations, Spurious.

The Apocalyptic character, which is occupied in describing the future splendor of the Messianic kingdom and its historical relations, presents itself for the first time in the book of Daniel. which is thus characteristically distinguished from the former prophetic books. In the only prophetic book of the New Test., the Apocalypse of John, this idea is fully developed, and the several apocryphal revelations are mere imitations, more or less happy, of these two canonical books, which furnished ideas to a numerous class of writers in the first ages of the Christian Church. We here consider those especially which profess to be of a prophetic character. The principal spurious revelations extant have been published by Fabricius, in his *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.*, and *Cod. Apoc. N.T.*, and their character has been still more critically examined in recent times by archbishop Laurence (who has added to their number), by Nitzsch, Bleek, and others, and especially by Dr. Liicke, in his *Einleit. in die Offenbarung Johazn. und die gesammte apocalyptische iteratur.* , (See the preceding article.) Tischendorf, in his *Apocalypses Apocryphic* (Lips. 1866, 8vo), has

published the following: “Apocalypsis Mosis” (Gr. ed. princeps); “Apocalypsis Esdrae” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Apocalypsis Pauli” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Apocalypsis Johannis” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Johannis Liber de Dominatione Mariae” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Translatio Marise” (Lat. ed. pr.); another “Translatio Mariae” (Lat.); “Ad ditamenta ad Acta Apost. Apocrypha;” “Ad Acta Andreae et -Matthise, ex codice unciali;” “Ad Acta Philippi, ex codd. Parisiensi et Barocciano;” “Ad Acta Thomae, e codd. Moncrensi et Bodleiano;” “Acta Petri et Andreae, in fine mutila, e cod. Barocciano.” In the ac’count below we have brought together the most important of these works. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

I. *Pseudo-Revelations Purporting to Refer to Hebrew Characters.* — These are principally the following:

- 1, 2.** The *Apocalypse of Adam* and that of *Abraham* are cited by Epiphanius (*Hoeres.* 31, 8) as Gnostic productions. They are now wholly lost.
- 3.** The *Book of Enoch* is one of the most curious of the spurious revelations, resembling in its outward form both the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse; but it is uncertain whether this latter work or the book of Enoch was first written. *SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF.*
- 4.** The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is a similar apocryphal production. *SEE TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.*
- 5.** The *Apocalypse of Moses*, mentioned by Syncellus (*Chronog.*) and Cedrenus (*Comp. Hist.*), fragments of which have been published by Fabricius (ut sup.), is conjectured by Grotius to have been a forgery of one of the ancient Christians.

In addition to this and the above work published by Tischendorf, there has lately been discovered an “Ascension” or “Assumption (*Ἀνάληψις*) of Moses,” in the library at Milan, which has been published by Ceriani (*Monumenta Sacra* [Mediol. 1861]); Hilgenfeld (*N.T. extra Canonem* [Lips. 1866]); Volkmar (*Handb. z. d. Apokr.* [Leips. 1867, vol. iii]); and Merx (*Archiv f. wiss. Erforsch.* etc. [ibid. 1867, vol. ii]). It represents an interview between Moses and Joshua just before the death of the former, and professes to depict the future history of Israel. It seems to have been written by a Jew of the early Christian times (Ewald, *Jahrbucher*, 1852, 1853). *SEE MOSES.*

These are different, works from the so-called “Little Genesis.” *SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF.*

6. *The Ascension and Vision of Isaiah* (Ἀναβατικὸν καὶ Ὅρασις Ἡσαίου), although for a long time lost to the world, was a work well known to the ancients, as is indicated by the allusions of Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius. The first of these writers (*Dial. c. Tryph.* ed. ri, p. 49) refers to the account therein contained of the death of Isaiah, who “was sawn asunder with a wooden saw — a fact,” he adds, “which was removed by the Jews from the sacred text.” Tertullian, also (*De Patientia*), among other examples from Scripture, refers to the same event; and in the next (the 3d) century Origen (*Epist. ad African.*), after stating that the Jews were accustomed to remove many things from the knowledge of the people which they nevertheless preserved in apocryphal or secret writings, adduces as an example the death of Isaiah, “who was *sawn asunder*, as stated in a certain apocryphal writing, which the Jews perhaps corrupted in order to throw discredit on the whole.” In his *Comm. on Matthew* he refers to the same events, observing that if this apocryphal work is not of sufficient authority to establish the account of the prophet’s martyrdom, it should be believed upon the testimony borne to that work by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ⲈⲚⲒⲐⲮ Hebrews 11:37); in the same manner as the account of the death of Zechariah should be credited upon the testimony borne by our Saviour to a writing not found in the common and published books (κοίνοις καὶ δεδημευμένοις βιβλίοις), but probably in an apocryphal work. Origen cites a passage from the apocryphal account of the martyrdom of Isaiah in one of his *Homilies* (ed. De la Rue, 3:108). The *Apostolical Constitutions* also refer to the apocryphal books of Moses, Enoch, Adam, and Isaiah as writings of some antiquity.

The first writer, however, who mentions the Ascension of Isaiah by name is Epiphanius, in the 4th century, who observes (*Hoeres.* 40.) that the apocryphal Ascension of Isaiah was adduced by the Archonites in support of their opinions respecting the seven heavens and their archons, or ruling angels, as well as by the Egyptian Hieracas and his followers in confirmation of their heretical opinions respecting the Holy Spirit; at the same time citing the passage from the Ἀναβατικόν to which they refer (Ascens. of ⲈⲚⲒⲐⲮ Isaiah 9:27, 32-36; 11:32,33). Jerome also (in *Esai. lxiv*, 4) expressly names the work, asserting it to be an apocryphal production originating in a passage in the New Test. (ⲈⲚⲒⲐⲮ 1 Corinthians 2:9). St.

Ambrose (*Opp.* i, 1124) cites a passage contained in it, but only as a traditionary report, “plerique ferunt” (Ascens. of ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 5:4-8); and the author of the *Imperfect Work on Matthew*, a work of the 5th century erroneously attributed to St. Chrysostom (Chrysost. *Opp.* hom. 1), evidently cites a passage from the same work (Ascens. of ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 1:1, etc.). After this period all trace of the book is lost until the 11th century, when Euthymius Zigabenus informs us that the Messalian heretics made use of that “abominable pseudepigraphal work the *Vision of Isaiah*.” It was also used (most probably in a Latin version) by the Cathari in the West (P. Moneta, *Adv. Catharos*, ed. Rich. p. 218). The *Vision of Isaiah* is also named in a catalogue of canonical and apocryphal books in a Paris MS. (No. 1789), after the *Qucest. et Resp.* of Anastasius (Cotelierius, *PP. Apost. i*, 197, 349). Sixtus of Sienna (*Bibl. Sanct.* 1566) states that the *Vision of Isaiah*, as distinct from the *Anavasis* (as he calls it), had been printed at Venice. Referring to this last publication, the late archbishop Laurence observes that he had hoped to find in some bibliographical work a further notice of it, but that he had searched in, vain; concluding, at the same time, that it must have been a publication extracted from the *Ascension of Isaiah* or a Latin translation of the *Vision*, as the title of it given by Sixtus was “*Visio Admirabilis Esaise Prophetse in Raptu Mantis, qun e Divinae Trinitatis Arcana et Lapsi Generis Humani Redemptionem continet.*” Dr. Laurence observes also that the mode of Isaiah’s death is further in accordance with a Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud (*Yebammoth*, iv); and he supposes that Mohammed may have founded his own journey through seven different heavens on this same apocryphal work. He shows, at the same time, by an extract from the *Raboth*, that the same idea of the precise number of *seven* heavens accorded with the Jewish creed.

There appeared now to be little hopes of recovering the lost *Ascension of Isaiah*, when Dr. Laurence (then regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford) had the good fortune to purchase from a bookseller in Drury Lane an Ethiopic MS. containing the identical book, together with the canonical book of *Isaiah* and the fourth (called in the Ethiopic the *first*) book of *Esdras*. It is entitled the *Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah*, the first chapters containing the martyrdom, and the rest (for it is divided in the MS. into chapters and yerses) the *Ascension*, or *Vision*, of *Isaiah*. At the end of the canonical book are the words, “Here ends the prophet *Isaiah*;” after which follows the *Ascension*, etc.; concluding with the words, “Here

ends Isaiah the prophet with his Ascension." Then follows a postscript, from which it appears that it was transcribed for a priest named Aaron, at the cost of a piece of fine cloth twelve measures long and four broad. The Ascension of Isaiah was published by Dr. Laurence at Oxford in 1819, with a new Latin and an English version. This discovery was first applied to the illustration of Scripture by Gesenius (*Comm. on Isaiah*). Some time afterwards the indefatigable Dr. Angelo Mai (*Nova Collect. Script. Vet. e Vat. Codd.* [Rome, 1828]) published two Latin fragments as an appendix to his *Sermon. Arian. Fragment. Antiquiss.*, which he conjectured to be portions of some ancient apocryphal writings. Niebuhr, however, perceived them to be fragments of the Ascension and Vision of Isaiah; and Dr. Nitzsch (*Nachweisung zweyer Bruchstücke*, etc., in the *Theolog. Stud. und Kritik*. 1830) was enabled to compare them with the two corresponding portions (2:14-3:12; 7:1-19) of the Ethiopic version. Finally, in consequence of the more complete notice of the Venetian edition of the Latin version given by Panzer (*Annal. Typog.* 8:473), Dr. Gieseler had a strict search made for it, which was eventually crowned with success, a copy being discovered in the library at Munich. This work, the date of whose impression was 1522, contained also the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and *the Letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate*. The Latin version contains the Vision only, corresponding to the last chapters of the Ethiopic version.

The subject of the first part is the martyrdom of Isaiah, who is here said to have been sawn asunder; in consequence of the visions which he related to Hezekiah, in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of that monarch, different from those in the canonical book. These relate principally to the coming of "Jesus Christ the Lord" from the seventh heaven; his being changed into the form of a man; the preaching of his twelve apostles; his final rejection and suspension on a tree, in company with the workers of iniquity, on the day before the Sabbath; the spread of the Christian doctrine; the last judgment; and his return to the seventh heaven. Before this, however, the arch-fiend Berial is to descend on earth in the form, of an impious monarch, *the murderer of his mother*, where, after his image is worshipped in every city for three years seven months and twentyseven days, he and his powers are to be dragged into Gehenna.

The second portion of the work gives a prolix account of the prophet's ascent through seven heavens, each more resplendent and more glorious than the other. It contains distinct prophetic allusions to the miraculous birth of Christ of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem; his crucifixion,

resurrection, and ascension; and the worship of “the Father, his beloved Christ, and the Holy Spirit.” The mode of the prophet’s own death is also announced to him. “The whole work,” observes its learned translator, “is singularly characterized by simplicity of narration, by occasional sublimity of description, and by richness as well as vigor of imagination.” Dr. Laurence conceives that the writer had no design of imposing upon the world a spurious production of his own as that of the prophet, but rather of composing a work, avowedly fictitious, but accommodated to the character and consistent with the prophecies of him to whom it is ascribed.

As to the age of this work, Dr. Laurence supposes, from the obvious reference to Nero and the period of three years seven months and twenty-seven days, and again of three hundred and thirty-two days, after which Berial was to be dragged to Gehenna, that the work was written after the death of Nero (which took place on June 9. A.D. 68), but before the close of the year 69. Lucke, however (*Einleitung*), looks upon these numbers as purely arbitrary and apocalyptic, and maintains that the dogmatical character of the work, the allusion to the corruptions of the Church, the absence of all reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Chiliastic view, all point to a later period. All that can be considered as certain respecting its date is that the first portion was extant before the time of Origen and the whole before Epiphanius. It has been doubted whether the work does not consist of two independent productions, which were afterwards united into one, as in the Ethiopic version; but this is a question impossible to decide in the absence of the original. The Latin fragments discovered by Mai correspond literally with the Ethiopic; while they not only differ from the Venetian edition in single phrases, but the latter contains passages so striking as to induce the supposition that it is derived from a later recension of the original text.

The author was evidently a Jewish Christian, as appears from the use made of the Talmudical legend already referred to, as well as by his representing the false accuser of Isaiah as a Samaritan. The work also abounds in Gnostic, Valentinian, and Ophitic notions, such as the account of the seven heavens and the presiding angels of the first five, the gradual transmutation of Christ until his envelopment in the human form, and finally the docetic conception of his history on earth. All this has induced Lucke (ut sup.) to consider the whole to be a Gnostic production of the 2d or 3d century, of which, however, the martyrdom was first written. Dr. Laurence finds so strong a resemblance between the account of the seven heavens here and in

the testament of Levi (*Twelve Patriarchs*), that he suspects the latter to “betriy a little plagiarism.” If this learned divine were right in his conjecture respecting the early age of this production, it would doubtless afford an additional testimony, if such were wanting, to the antiquity of the belief in the miraculous conception and the proper deity of Jesus, who is here called the Beloved, the Lord, the Lord God, and the Lord Christ. In respect, however, to another passage, in which the Son and Holy Spirit are represented as worshipping God, the learned prelate truly observes that this takes place only in the character of angels, which they had assumed.

Dr. Lucke observes that the drapery only of the apocalyptic element of this work is Jewish, the internal character being altogether Christian. But in both form and substance there is an evident imitation, if not of the Apocalypse of St. John, at least of the book of Daniel and of the Sibylline oracles. The use of the canonical Apocalypse Lucke (op. cit. § 16) considers to be undeniable in 8:45. Comp. ~~Rev~~ Revelation 7:21-23; 19:10; 22:8, 9. *SEE ISAIAH.*

7. The *Epistle of Baruch* is given as the “First Book of Baruch” in the Paris and London Polyglots in Syriac and Latin, the “Second Book of Baruch” being there what is commonly known as the apocryphal book of Baruch. This letter is also contained in the Svriac “Apocalypse of Baruch” noticed below.

(I.) *The Design of this Epistle* is to comfort the nine tribes and a half who were beyond the river Euphrates, by assuring them that the sufferings which they have to endure in their captivity, and which are far less than they deserve, are but for a season, and are intended to atone for their sins; and that God, whose love towards Israel is unchangeable, will speedily deliver them from their troubles and requite their oppressors. They are therefore not to be distracted by the prosperity of their wicked enemies, which is but momentary, but to observe the law of Moses, and look forward to the day of judgment, when all that is now perplexing will be rectified.

(II.) *The Method or Plan* which the writer adopted to carry out the design of this epistle will best be seen from a brief analysis of its contents. Being convinced of the unchangeable love of God towards his people (~~Rev~~ Revelation 1:2), and of the close attachment subsisting between all the tribes (ver. 3), Baruch feels constrained to write this epistle before he dies (ver. 4) to comfort his captive brethren under their sufferings (ver. 5),

which are far less than they deserve (ver. 6), and are designed to atone for (ver. 7,8), as well as to wean them from, their sins (ver. 9), so that God might gather them together again. Baruch then informs them, first of all, that Zion has been delivered to Nebuchadnezzar because of the sins of the children of Israel (ver. 11, 12). That the enemy, however, might not boast that he had destroyed the sanctuary of the Most High by the strength of his own arm, God sent angels from heaven to destroy the forts and walls, and also to hide some of the vessels of the Temple (ver. 13-16); whereupon the enemy carried the Jews as captives to Babylon, and left only few in Zion (ver. 17), this being the burden of the epistle (ver. 18, 19). But they are to be comforted (ver. 20), for while he was mourning over Zion and praying for mercy (ver. 21, 22) the Lord revealed words of consolation to Baruch that he might comfort his brethren, which is the cause of his writing this epistle (ver. 23, 24), viz. 1 that the Most High will punish their enemies, and that the day of judgment is nigh (ver. 25, 26). The great prosperity of the world (ver. 27), its splendid government (ver. 28), great strength (ver. 29) and glory (ver. 30), luxurious life (ver. 31), barbarous cruelty (ver. 32), and glorious dominion (ver. 33) which the Gentiles now enjoy; notwithstanding their wickedness, will speedily vanish, for the day of judgment is at hand (ver. 34), when every thought and deed will be examined and made manifest (ver. 35, 36). The captive Jews are therefore not to envy any of the present things, but patiently to look forward to the promises of the latter days (ver. 37, 38), the fulfilment of which is rapidly approaching, and for which they are to prepare themselves, lest, by neglecting this, they might lose both this world and the world to come (ver. 39-41). All that now happens tends to this truth (~~Gen~~ Revelation 2:1-7). This Baruch sets forth to lead his brethren to virtue (ver. 8), and to warn them of God's judgment before he dies (ver. 9), that they may give heed to the words of Moses, who, in ~~Gen~~ Deuteronomy 4:26; 28:30; 31:28, foretold what would befall them for leaving the law (ver. 9-12). Baruch also assures them that after they have suffered and become obedient they shall receive the reward laid up for them (ver. 13, 14), charges them to regard this epistle as a testimony between him and his brethren that they may be mindful of the law, the holy land, their brethren, the covenant of their forefathers, the solemn feasts and Sabbaths (ver. 15, 16), to transmit it, together with the law, to their children (ver. 17), and to be instant in prayer to God that he may pardon their sins and impute unto them the righteousness of their forefathers (ver. 18, 19), for "unless God judges us according to the multitude of his mercies, woe to us all who are born" (ver.

20). He, moreover, assures them that notwithstanding the fact that they have now no prophets and holy men in Zion to pray for them as in former days, yet if they rightly dispose their hearts they will obtain incorruptible treasures for their corruptible losses (ver. 21-27), and admonishes them constantly to remember these things, and prepare themselves, while in possession of this short life, for the life that is to come (ver. 28-35), when repentance will be impossible, as the judgment pronounced upon every one will be final (ver. 36-39); and to read the epistle on the solemn fast (ver. 40, 41).

(III.) *The Unity of the Epistle.* — The foregoing analysis will show that every part of this epistle contributes to the development of the main design of the writer, thus demonstrating the unity of the whole. This is, moreover, corroborated by the uniformity of diction which prevails throughout this document. It must, however, be admitted that hypercriticism may find some ground for scepticism in the latter part of it, viz. ii, 2141. But even if it could be shown that this is a later addition, it would not interfere with the design of the whole.

(IV.) *The Author, Date, and Canonicity of the Epistle.* — With the solitary exception of the learned and eccentric William Whiston (who has translated it in *A Collection of Authentic Records* [Lond. 1727]), this epistle has been, and still is, regarded by all scholars as pseudepigraphic, and we question whether a critic could be found in the present day bold enough to defend its Baruchic authorship. All that we can gather from the document itself is:

1. That it was written by a *Jew*, as is evident

(a) from the Hagadic story, mentioned in 1:13-15, about the destruction of the walls and forts by the angels and the hiding of the holy vessels (comp. also 2 Maccabees 2:1-4);

(b) from the solemn admonition strictly to adhere to *the law of Moses*;

(c) from the charge that this epistle be transmitted by the Jews to their posterity, together with the law of Moses, and be read in their assemblies at their fasts; and

2. That it was written most probably about the middle of the 2d century B.C., as appears from the admonition to be patient under the sufferings from the Gentiles, and to wait for the day of judgment which is close at

hand (1:37-41), and the frequent reference to a future life. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 4:233) and Fritzsche (*Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokr.* i, 175) contemptuously dismiss it in a few lines, and most unjustly regard it as written “in a prolix and senseless style” by a monk. Besides the London and Paris Polyglots, the Syriac is contained in the beautiful edition of the Apocrypha just published (*Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace, recogn. Paul. Anton. de Lagarde, Lond. 1861*), and the Latin may be found in Fabricii *Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T.* ii, 147 sq. **SEE BARUCH.**

8. The *Apocalypse of Baruch* was discovered in a Syrian manuscript, judged by Curetoni to belong to the 6th century, and was first published by Cerrain in 1866 in a close Latin translation (*Mon. Sac. et Prof: I, ii, 7398*), and in 1871 in the original Syriac (*ibid.* 5, ii). The last few chapters, however, had long been known as the “Epistle of Baruch” noticed above.

(I.) Contents. — The composer of this work has, like the author of the book of Baruch in the ordinary Apocrypha of the Old Test., chosen as the fictitious writer of his revelations the friend and amanuensis of Jeremiah. The scene is laid in or near Jerusalem; and the supposed time is that immediately preceding and following the destruction of the city and the transportation of the people to Babylon. The author professes to give the exact year, “the twenty-fifth of Jechoniah of Judah.” Jechoniah must here stand for Jehoiakim, and the twenty-fifth year ought to be the eleventh. The work divides itself into seven parts, if we treat the letter to the nine and a half tribes as a kind of appendix. Baruch is throughout represented as the speaker, referring to himself in the first person, except in the opening of ch. 1 and 78, which are of the nature of a title.

The first part (ch. 1-9) opens by telling how the Word of the Lord came to Baruch, and warned him of the destruction impending over Jerusalem on account of the wickedness of its inhabitants. The punishment should last only for a time, and the ruin of the city should not be accomplished by the hands of its enemies. The next day the army of the Chaldaeans surrounded Jerusalem; and when the sacred vessels had been committed to the safe custody of the earth, to be kept till the last times, angels overthrew the walls, the enemy were admitted, and the people were led captive to Babylon. Then Baruch and Jeremiah rent their clothes and fasted seven days.

In the second part (ch. 10-12) Jeremiah is sent to Babylon, but Baruch is told to remain amid the desolation of Zion, that God may show him what will come to pass at the end of days. So Baruch sits before the gates of the Temple and utters a lamentation over the fate of Zion, and prophesies vengeance against the victorious land now so prosperous. Having thus given vent to his grief, he again fasts for seven days.

In the third part (ch. 13-20) he stands upon Mount Zion, and is told that he shall be preserved till the end of times, that he may bear testimony against the nations which oppressed his people. He answers that only few shall survive in those days to hear the word of the Lord, and complains that those who have not walked in vanity like other peoples have derived no advantage from their faithfulness. The Lord answers that the future world was made on account of the just, "for this world is a contest and trouble to them in much labor, and therefore that which is to come is a crown in great glory." In further conversation Baruch is advised not to estimate the blessings of life by its length, and to look rather to the end than the beginning. He is then desired to sanctify himself and fast for seven days.

In the fourth part (ch. 21-30) he comes from a cave in the valley of Cedron, whither he had withdrawn, to the place where God spoke with him before. It is sunset, and he begins to deplore the bitterness of life, and calls upon God to hasten the promised end. In reply he is reminded of his ignorance, and told that the predetermined number of men must be completed, but "that the end is not far distant." Baruch then says that he does not know what will happen to the enemies of his people, or at what time God will visit them. The signs of the end are accordingly enumerated, the last time being divided into twelve parts, each with its distinguishing characteristic. These parts, however, are to be mixed together and to minister to one another. The specified signs shall affect the whole earth, "and then Messiah will begin to be revealed." A description of the Messianic period follows, on which we need not dwell. With this the conversation terminates, and though the usual fast is not mentioned, the section evidently comes to a close.

In the fifth part (ch. 31-43), having consoled the people by telling them of the future glory of Zion, he goes and sits upon the ruins of the Temple. While he laments he falls asleep, and has a vision of a vine and a cedar, of which the interpretation is afterwards given to him. The vision relates to the triumph of the Messiah. Baruch then asks, To whom and to how many

shall these things be, or who shall be worthy to live in that time? for many of God's people have thrown away the yoke of the law, but others have left their vanity and fled for refuge under God's wings. God answers him, To those who have believed will be the predicted blessings, and to those who despise will be the opposite of this. Baruch is then commanded to go and instruct the people, and afterwards to fast for: seven days, preparatory to further communications.

In the sixth part (ch. 44-47) he calls together his first-born son, his friend Gadelii, and seven of the elders of the people, and tells them that he is going to his fathers, according to the ways of all the earth. He exhorts them not to depart from the law, and promises that they shall see "the consolation of Zion." He dwells on the rewards and punishments of the future world, desires them to advise the people, and assures them that, though he must die, "a wise man shall not be wanting to Israel, nor a son of the law to the race of Jacob." He then goes to Hebron, and fasts for seven days.

In the seventh part (ch. 48-76) he prays for compassion on this people, the people whom God has chosen, and who are unlike all others. He is told that the time of tribulation must arise, and many of its circumstances are recounted. He deplores such sad consequences of the sin of Adam, and in answer to an inquiry he is informed about the resurrection and its results. At last he falls asleep and has a vision. As this vision (ch. 53) and its interpretation (ch. 56-74), though they bring us to no definite date, throw an interesting light upon the uncertain methods in which history was parcelled out into periods, we may notice them at more length than would otherwise be necessary. A cloud ascended from the great sea, and it was full of white and black waters, and a similitude of lightning appeared at its extremity. It passed quickly on and covered the whole earth. Afterwards it began to discharge its rain; but the waters which descended from it were not all alike, for first there were very black waters for a time, and afterwards the waters became bright, but of these there were not many. Black waters succeeded and again gave place to bright, and so on for twelve times; but the black waters were always more than the bright. At the end of the cloud it rained black waters, and these were darker than all that had been before, and fire was mingled with them, and they brought corruption and ruin. After these things the lightning which he had seen in the extremity of the cloud flashed so that it illumined the whole earth, and it healed those regions where the last waters had descended. After this

twelve rivers ascended from the sea and surrounded that lightning, and were made subject to it. At this point Baruch awoke through fear. In answer to his prayer for the interpretation of the vision, the angel Ramiel was sent to satisfy his request. The cloud symbolized the length of the age." The first black waters were the sin of Adam, with its consequences, including the fall of the angels and the flood. The second — the bright waters — were Abraham and his descendants, and those who were like them. The third (black) waters were the mixture of all the sinners after the death of these just men, and the iniquity of the land of Egypt. The fourth (bright) waters were the advent of Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and all who were like them, in whose time "the lamp of the eternal law shone upon all who were sitting in darkness." The fifth (black) waters were the works of the Amorites, and the sins of the Israelites in the days of the judges. The sixth (bright) waters were the time of David and Solomon. The seventh (black) waters were the perversion of Jeroboam, and the sins of his successors, and the time of the captivity of the nine and a half tribes. The eighth (bright) waters were the righteousness of Hezekiah. The ninth (black) waters were the universal impiety in the days of Manasseh. The tenth (bright) waters were the purity of the generations of Josiah. The eleventh (black) waters were the calamity which had just happened to Zion. The rest of the interpretation is, of course, given in the future tense. "As for the twelfth (bright) waters which thou hast seen, this is the world. For the time shall come after these things when thy people shall fall into calamity, so as to be in danger of all perishing together. But nevertheless they shall be saved, and their enemies shall fall before them. And they shall for some time have much joy. And in that time, after a little, Zion shall be again built, and its oblations shall be again established, and the priests shall return to their ministry, and the nations shall again come to glorify it, but nevertheless not fully, as in the beginning. But it shall come to pass after these things that there shall be the ruin of many nations. These are the bright waters which thou hast seen." The other waters, which were blacker than all the rest, after the twelfth, belonged to the whole world, and they represented times of trouble and conflict, which are described at some length; and all who survived these should be delivered into the hands of the Messiah. These last black waters are, in the interpretation, succeeded simply by bright waters, representing the blessedness of the Messianic time. Baruch, having heard the words of the angel, expressed his wonder at the goodness of God. He is informed that, though he must depart from the

earth, he shall not die. But before his removal he must go and instruct the people.

We are next told (ch. 77) how Baruch went to the people and admonished them to be faithful, holding out hopes that their brethren might return from the captivity. The people promised to remember the good that God had done to them, and requested him to write a letter before his departure to their brethren in Babylon. He promised to do so, and send the epistle by the hands of men, and also to forward a letter to the nine and a half tribes by means of a bird. Accordingly, he sat alone under an oak and wrote two letters. One he sent by three men to Babylon, and the other to the tribes beyond the Euphrates by an eagle which he called. He charged the eagle not to pause till he reached his destination, and, to encourage him, reminded him of Noah's dove, of Elijah's ravens, and how "Solomon, in the time of his reign, whithersoever he wished to send or to seek anything, commanded a bird, and it obeyed him as he had commanded it." Then the letter is subjoined (ch. 77-86). It consists of a general exhortation to the captive tribes to be faithful, in the hope of being soon restored to a happier lot. The last chapter (87) relates how he folded and sealed the letter, tied it to the eagle's neck, and despatched it.

(II.) *Author, Date, etc.* — The work, according to its title in the MS. in which it has been preserved, was "translated from Greek into Syriac." Notwithstanding the Hebraic coloring of its thought and language, it may very well have been written originally in Greek. There can be no doubt that it was written by a non-Christian Jew. Though it is rich in Messianic passages, no expression betrays a Christian hand. The book is pervaded by the strong and exclusive feeling of a Jew, confident, amid the most terrible humiliation, in the divine election of his race. It bears a strong resemblance in general structure, and even in particular thoughts and expressions, to the fourth book of Ezra. We must, of course, assign it a similar time and authorship to the epistle of Baruch above noticed, which Ewald locates in the reign of Domitian (*Gesch. Isr.* 7:84 sq.). This is confirmed by allusions to the destruction of the Temple (ch. 39), and the references to Daniel's "times" as if fulfilled. See Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (Lond. 1877), p. 117 sq. *SEE BARUCH.*

9. The *Fourth Book of Ezra* (the *first* according to the Ethiopic and Arabic) is, from its apocalyptic character, styled by Nicephorus (ⲚⲓⲢⲏⲔ Song

of Solomon 3:4) the *Apocalypse of Ezra* (Ἀποκάλυψις Ἐσδρά). *SEE ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF.*

10, 11. The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* and that of *Zechariah* are referred to by Jerome (*Ep. ad Pammach.*), and cited as lost apocryphal books in an ancient MS. of the Scriptures in the Coislinian Collection (ed. Montfaucon, p. 194).

II. *Pseudo-Revelations Purporting to Refer to Christian Characters.* — Of these the most important are the following:

1. The *Apocalypse of St. Peter* is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3:3, 25), and was cited by Clement of Alexandria, in his *Adumbrations*, now lost (Euseb. *loc. cit.* 6:14). Some fragments of it have, however, been preserved by Clement, in his *Selections from the Lost Prophecies of Theodotus the Gnostic*, and are published in Grabe's *Spicilegium* (i, 74 sq.). From these we can barely collect that this apocalypse contained some melancholy prognostications, which seem to be directed against the Jews, and to refer to the destruction of their city and nation. This work is cited as extant in the ancient fragment of the canon published by Muratori, a document of the 2d or 3d century, with this proviso, that "some of us are unwilling that it be read in the Church," as is perhaps the signification of the ambiguous passage, "Apocalypsis Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus; quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt." Eusebius designates it at one time as "spurious," and at another as "heretical." From a circumstance mentioned by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* 7:19), viz. that it was read in some churches in Palestine on all Fridays in the year down to the 5th century, Lucke infers that it was a Jewish-Christian production (of the 2d century), and of the same family with the *Preaching of Peter*. It is uncertain whether this work is the same that is read by the Copts among what they call the apocryphal books of Peter.

There was also a work under the name of the *Apocalypse of Peter by his Disciple Clement*, an account of which was transmitted to pope Honorius by Jacob, bishop of Acre in the 13th century, written in the Saracenic language; but this has been conjectured to be a later work, originating in the time of the Crusades.

In the ancient Latin stichometry in Cotelierius (*Apostolic Fathers*), the *Apocalypse of St. Peter* is said to contain 2070 stichs, and that of John 1200. It is cited as an apocryphal book in the *Indiculus Scripturarum* after

tile *Questiones* of Anastasius of Nicaea, together with the *Apocalypse of Ezra* and that of Paul. There is in the Bodleian Library a MS. of an Arabic *Apocalypse of St. Peter*, of which Nicoll has furnished an extract in his catalogue, and which may possibly be a translation of the Greek apocalypse. *SEE PETER.*

2. The *Apocalypse of St. Paul* is mentioned by Augustine (*Tiact.* 98 in *Ev. Joan.*), who asserts that it abounds in fables, and was an invention to which occasion was furnished by ^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 12:2-4. This appears from Epiphanius (*Hoeres.* 38:2) to have been an anti-Jewish Gnostic production, and to be identical with the *Ἀναβατικόν* of Paul, used only by the anti-Jewish sect of Gnostics called Cainites. It is said by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* 7:19) to have been held in great esteem. It was also known to Theophylact and (Ecumenius (*on* ^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 12:4), and to Nicephorus in the 9th century (*Can.* 3:4). Whether this is the same work which Dupin (*Proleg. and Canon*) says is still extant among the Copts is rendered more than doubtful by Fabricius (*Cod. Apoc.* ii, 954) and Grabe (*Spicileg.* i, 85). The *Revelation of St. Paul*, contained in an Oxford MS., is shown by Grabe (*loc. cit.*) to be a much later work. Theodosius of Alexandria (*Ἐρωτήματα περὶ προσωδιῶν*) says that the *Apocalypse*: of St. Paul is not a work of the apostle, but of Paul of Samosata, from whom the Paulicians derived their name. The *Revelation of St. Paul* is one of the spurious works condemned by pope Gelasius, together with the *Revelations of St. Thomas* and *St. Stephen*.

3. There was an apocryphal *Revelation of St. John* extant in the time of Theodosius the Grammarian, the only one of the ancients who mentions it, and who calls it a pseudepigraphal book. It was not known what had become of it, until the identical work was recently published, from a Vatican as well as a Vienna manuscript, by Birch, in his *Auctarium*, under the title of "The *Apocalypse of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist John the Divine*." From the silence of the ancients respecting this work, it could scarcely have been written before the 3d or 4th century. Lucke has pointed out other internal marks of a later age, as, for instance, the mention of *incense*, which he observes first came into use in the Christian Church after the 4th century (although here the author of the spurious book may have taken his idea from ^{<4712>}Revelation 5:8; 8:3); also of *images* and *rich crosses*, which were not in use before the "4th and 5th centuries." The name *patriarch*, applied here to a dignitary in the Church, belongs to the same age. The time in which Theodosius himself lived is not certainly

known, but he cannot be placed earlier than the 5th century, which Lucke conceives to be the most probable age of the work itself. Regarding the object and occasion of the work (which is a rather servile imitation of the genuine Apocalypse), in consequence of the absence of dates and of internal characteristics, there are no certain indications. Birch's text, as well as his manuscripts, abounds in errors; but Thilo has collated two Paris manuscripts for his intended edition (see his *Acta Thome, Proleg.* p. 88). Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* III, i, 282) states that there is an Arabic version among the Vatican MSS.

III. *Pseudo-Revelations bearing Extracanonical Names.* — Of these the following deserve special notice:

1. The *Prophecies of Hystaspes* were in use among the Christians in the 2d century. This was apparently a pagan production, but is cited by Justin Martyr, in his *Apology*, as agreeing with the Sibylline oracles in predicting the destruction of the world by fire. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vi) and Lactantius (*Instit.* 7:15) also cite passages from these prophecies, which bear a decidedly Christian character.
2. The ancient romantic fiction entitled the *Shepherd of Hermas* is not without its apocalyptic elements. These, however, are confined to book 1:3, 4; but they are destitute of signification or originality. *SEE HERMAS.*
3. The *Apocalypse of Cerinthus* is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3:28), and by Theodoret (*Fab. Heret.* ii, 3). Eusebius describes it as a revelation of an earthly and sensual kingdom of Christ, according to the heresy of the Chiliasts. Of the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen, we know nothing beyond their condemnation by pope Gelasius, except that Sixtus of Sienna observes that, according to Serapion, they were held in high repute by the Manichees; but in the works of Serapion which we now possess there is no allusion to this. There is, however, an unpublished MS. of Serapion in the Hamburg Library, which is supposed to contain a more complete copy of his work. *SEE CERINTHUS.*
4. The *Sibylline Oracles* is the title of an apochryphal work, evidently of Christian origin, of the early centuries of our aera, written as a sort of parody on the famous Roman traditionary books of that name. *SEE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.*

Revenge

(ἡμῶν] ἐκδίκησις) means the return of injury for injury, or the infliction of pain on another in consequence of an injury received from him further than the just ends of reparation or punishment require. Revenge differs materially from resentment, which rises in the mind immediately on being injured; but revenge is a cool and deliberate wickedness, and is often executed years after the offence is given. By some it is considered as a perversion of anger. Anger, it is said, is a passion given to man for wise and proper purposes, but revenge is the corruption of anger, is unnatural, and therefore ought to be suppressed. It is observable that the proper object of anger is vice; but the object, in general, of revenge, is man. It transfers the hatred due to the vice to the man, to whom it is not due. It is forbidden by the Scriptures, and is unbecoming the character and spirit of a peaceful follower of Jesus Christ. *SEE ANGER.*

Revenues Of The Church.

It is clearly taught in the New Test. that it is the duty of Christians to give temporal support to their teachers. The general principle was laid down by our Lord (<2007> Luke 10:7) that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Paul says, “Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel” (1 Corinthians 19:14). The following passages treat of the relation which subsists between the ministers and the Church in this respect: <4808> Acts 18:3; 24:17; <4700> 2 Corinthians 11:7, 8; 12:13; <5046> Philippians 4:16-18; <5005> 1 Timothy 6:5; <5011> Titus 1:11. So we see that the Church is bound to provide for the maintenance of its pastors; but, at the same time, the pastor is to act in a liberal spirit, and not to make unnecessary demands upon the Church. These principles were carried out in the apostolic times and subsequently. Fixed stipends were not paid in early times because the Church did not possess property, and therefore the contributions were voluntary. These voluntary offerings were of two sorts:

1. The weekly or daily oblations that were made at the altar;
2. The monthly oblations that were cast into the treasury of the Church.

And then arose the custom of dividing up the monthly contribution and paying the clergy their share, according to their order. Another sort of revenue was such as arose annually from the lands and possessions given to the Church, which were greatly increased in the time of Gonstantine, who

authorized the bequeathing of property to the Church. A third source of revenue was the granting to the clergy an allowance out of the public money. Constantine both gave the clergy particular largesses, as their occasion required, and also settled upon them a standing allowance out of the exchequer. A fourth source of revenue was the estates of martyrs and confessors dying without heirs, which were settled upon the Church by Constantine. Still later rulers (Theodosius the younger and Valentinian III) settled upon the Church the estates of clergymen dying without heirs. Besides these sources of revenue, there were others, such as the donation of heathen temples and sometimes their revenues, heretical conventicles and their revenues, the temporal estates of clergymen or monks who became seculars again. Great care, however, at first was taken not to receive estates donated to the Church to the great detriment of others. Respecting the ancient way of managing and distributing these revenues, we may remark that the revenues of the whole diocese were in the hands of the bishop, and by his care distributed among the clergy. As a safeguard against mismanagement, he was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod; after a while this rule obtained in the Western Church. The division was usually into three or four parts—one to the bishop, a second to the rest of the clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the necessary uses of the Church. Suspension from participation in the revenues was one method of punishment visited upon the clergy. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. v, ch. 6 p. 1-6.

Reverence

(usually some form of **αἰσχύνη φόβος**, *to fear*), a respectful, submissive disposition of mind arising from affection and esteem, from a sense of superiority in the person revered. Hence children reverence their fathers even when their fathers correct them by stripes (**ῥαβδί**-Hebrews 12:9); hence subjects reverence their sovereign (**ῥαβδί**-2 Samuel 9:6); hence wives reverence their husbands (**ἠγάπη**-Ephesians 5:33); and hence all ought to reverence God. We reverence the name of God, the house of God, the worship of God, etc.; we reverence the attributes of God, the commands, dispensations, etc., of God; and we ought to demonstrate our reverence by overt acts, such as are suitable and becoming to time, place, and circumstances. For though a man may reverence God in his heart, yet unless he behave reverentially and give proofs of his reverence by demeanor, conduct, and obedience, he will not easily persuade his fellow-

mortals that his bosom is the residence of this divine and heavenly disposition; for, in fact, a reverence for God is not one of those lights which burn under a bushel, but one of those whose sprightly lustre illuminates .wherever it is admitted. Reverence is, strictly speaking, perhaps the internal disposition of the mind, φόβος (⁴⁵¹³⁷Romans 13:7); and honor, τιμή, the external expression of that disposition.

Reverend

a title prefixed by courtesy to the name of any clergyman, though “clerk” (*clericus*) is the legal and strictly proper description of clergymen, and is, in official documents, placed *after* (as “Reverend” is before) their names. In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches the title is given to ecclesiastics of the second and third orders, the bishops being styled “right reverend.” In some churches ordained abbesses and prioresses are called “reverend mothers.”

Revision Of The Bible.

SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

Revivals Of Religion,

a phrase commonly used to indicate renewed interest in religious subjects, or a period of religious awakening. It comes from *revive* (Lat. *revivo*), to *live again*, and is often improperly applied to excitements which can hardly be called religious, because they do not apprehend, or propose to *revive*, the real, inner, spiritual life of the soul, which alone constitutes true religion. Setting out with erroneous views as to the work to be effected, such excitements necessarily fall short of its accomplishment.

These words are also used to denote the conversion of sinners as well as the quickening of believers. This arises from the fact that the two events are generally (not always) coincident. Sinners, who withstand God himself, may resist the Church in her best estate; and they are sometimes converted when the Church, as a body, is spiritually asleep. Yet such is the influence of spiritual life, and such the usual sanction given by the Holy Ghost to its loving endeavors to save men, that a real revival of the Church leads directly to the conversion of others. Therefore “a revival is simply an increase of the best desires, affections, and exertions of persons who are already pious and benevolent, such an increase as, by the blessing of

Heaven, awakens in the ungodly an anxiety for their salvation. When these evidences of increased engagedness in the cause of Christ are unequivocally manifested anywhere, it is too late for an impartial observer to doubt that a genuine revival of religion has there commenced.” To understand this subject in its bearings upon the different classes to be benefited, it is necessary to have just conceptions of religion itself, the means of its attainment and revival, and the evidences by which it is distinguished. These points, with some others necessarily involved, are indicated by the following propositions.

1. That all men unrenewed by the grace of God are sinners. Paul represents them as dead in trespasses and in sins, walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and as by nature children of wrath.
2. This being their condition—corrupt in heart and disobedient in practice—they need two important works effected in and for them; namely, the *pardon* of all their sins, exempting them from the penalty of the law, and the *renewal* of their souls in righteousness, conforming them to the moral image of God, and thus fitting them to do his will from the heart here, and enjoy the holiness of heaven hereafter.
3. That the atonement of Christ provided for just these results, as may be seen by the following announcements: “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to *forgive* us our sins, and to *cleanse* us from *all unrighteousness*” (1 John 1:9). “But ye are *washed*, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (1 Corinthians 6:11). And to show the absolute necessity of this double work, Jesus said to Nicodemus, “Except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God” (John 3:3). Revivals which aim at anything short of this are not revivals of *religion* in the proper sense of that word. They may arouse the fears of men and improve their habits, but they do not *save* in the Gospel sense, nor will their results be satisfactory to the depraved and guilty sinner, or to any spiritual Church.
4. Another important fact to be remembered is, that this is the *work of God*. He only can forgive sins, or renew the heart. The object of a true revival is, therefore, not to absolve sinners, but to bring them to God; in other words, to persuade them to accept the terms of reconciliation, that he may save them. Pronouncing them converted on their avowing a “desire”

or “purpose” to seek the Lord is unauthorized, and exceedingly dangerous. We should instruct and encourage them to wait in the way of duty till God shall do the work, when then will need no absolution from man. Many, it is to be feared, have been misled right at this point, to their eternal sorrow. They have been taught to believe that religion is all their own work, a mere change of opinion or position; that they are to convert themselves. It is sometimes called a *growth*; whereas it is first a new *creation*, a *new life*, and adoption into the family of God by his own sovereign act. Like all other acts, it must be done at some *specific time* — in a moment. One must be born again before he can grow. If backslidden, he must repent and be forgiven as at the first, and have the old “joy of salvation” restored unto him.

5. When this work is accomplished, it will be verified, *first*, by the Holy Spirit witnessing to the fact as it witnesses in conviction to the sinner’s guilt, condemnation, and danger; and, *secondly*, by its fruits, “love, joy, peace, long suffering,” etc., and aversion to former sins and associations. How does an awakened sinner know that he is a sinner? *He feels* that he is, and this is confirmed by the uniform conflict of his life and temper with the Word of God. How does a real convert know that he is converted? Because he now feels the same assurance in his heart that he is a Christian which he felt before that he was a sinner, and he knows that he is living a life of obedience, whereas, before, he lived in rebellion. He can say from the heart, with Paul, “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, ... and *rejoice* in the hope of the “glory of God” (~~REF~~ Romans 5:1, 2); and, with John, “We *know* that we have passed from death unto life because we *love* the brethren” (~~REF~~ 1 John 3:14). Converts who stop short of a joyous experience of the love of God will go limping through life, if they do not utterly fall away.

6. The revival of this style of religion is best promoted by the inculcation of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, such as human depravity, natural and acquired; the sinfulness of men in rebellion against God, and in refusing to accept of offered mercy; the certainty of their loss of heaven, and the endurance of eternal punishment, if they do not repent; the amplitude of the atonement for every one who will deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Christ, according to the light that is in and around him: the ability of sinners, by grace, to so repent and believe as to be saved; and the blessedness on earth and in heaven which God will bestow upon all who seek him with their whole heart.

As to the best manner of presenting these truths, there is room for difference of opinion. Under ordinary circumstances, however, where the Word of God is freely circulated, their earnest, sympathetic, persuasive *proclamation* is more effective than any attempt to prove them. Many give infidelity too much credit, and spend their time and strength in defending to the understanding what they ought to preach to the *heart*. They controvert and argue where they should persuade and entreat. The people in the circumstances supposed generally *believe* the Gospel as really as their preachers, but neglect its claims from worldly considerations. These obstacles, need to be neutralized or removed. This can be more successfully done by showing their triviality in comparison with the tremendous interests at stake on the side of religion than by the explosion of heretical sentiments which their hearers would be glad to have true, but in which they have little confidence.

The most effective suggestion that we can make on this point is, perhaps, that the preacher *aim* to promote the revival of his Church and the conversion of sinners. Those who fail to do so seldom win souls to Christ. Revivals are not produced by such indifference. Says the immortal Richard Baxter to pastors: "If your heart is not set on the end of your labors, and if you do not long to see the conversion and edification of your hearers, and study and preach in *hope*, you are not likely to see much success. It is a sign of a false, self-seeking heart when a person is contented to be still doing without seeing any fruit of his labor... He never had the right ends of a preacher in view who is indifferent whether he obtains them or not; who is not grieved when he misses them, and rejoices when he can see the desired issue."

With this *aim*, and a proper understanding of human nature and the Gospel, one will not seriously err in the selection of subjects. Nor will he preach so much *about* the people as *to* them. Effective efforts have always been characterized by their directness. Said Nathan to David, "*Thou* art the *man*;" and Joshua to Israel, "Choose *you* this day whom you will serve." When Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, "Let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom *ye have crucified*, both Lord and Christ," his hearers were "pricked in their hearts, and said, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

But revivals must not be left alone to preachers, or preaching. Every talent of the Church should be enlisted in all appropriate ways. *Testimony* as to

personal experience is a powerful agency, and should be largely employed in private, and often in public. The same is true of lay instruction, exhortation; and persuasion. When these means fail, the object may be gained by a *tract* or *book*. The printed page has won grand fields inaccessible to living agencies, and where these have toiled in vain. *Prayer* is another powerful means of revivals, which often prevails where everything else fails. Their history glows with the wonders of its power. *Singing Gospel* truths in an impressive manner is often effective. It attracts and softens many who care little for preaching- or prayer. It has always been prominent in this work, but never more successful than at the present time.

7. Revivals are *necessary* from many considerations. First, because, as a matter of fact, most Christians do backslide more or less from their first love. The history of God's ancient people is little more than a consecutive account of their backslidings and recoveries. The apostolic age was clouded by similar defections, and followed by the "Dark Ages." The slumbers of that long night were unbroken until the revival trumpet of Luther was heard from Wittenberg calling for reform. Even the Puritans of New England declined. Says Mr. Tracy, in speaking of their condition at the commencement of the great revival under Edwards, Whitefield, and others, "Such had been the downward progress in New England that there were many in the churches, and even some in the ministry, who were yet lingering among the supposed preliminaries to conversion. The difference between the Church and the world was vanishing away, and yet never, perhaps, had the expectation of reaching heaven at last been more general or confident." That revival changed all this for the time, but in less than half a century there was another sad relapse. When the Wesleys and Whitefield awoke to the claims of religion in England, the new birth was a dead letter, and conversions were scarcely known; while drinking, gambling, cock-fighting, and every species of popular vice were patronized by the Church and many of the clergy.

In view of these facts, what would have become of religion but for revivals? Had Joshua, and David, and Josiah, and Ezra, and Luther, and Edwards, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and other revivalists, clung to established customs, and opposed innovations, as some did, and as others do now, the name of God would hardly have been preserved from oblivion.

The same tendency is observable in individuals and some churches now. They are in close fellowship with sin and the world, without God, and without any well-grounded hope.

Revivals are also necessary because there is no other cure for the evils to be remedied. Spiritual life can never spring out of the dead, worldly policy which eschews revivals: reason, common-sense, and history are all against it. We may fill the Church with man-made converts, who have been coaxed into a profession of religion without having the first elements of a Christian character; but that is not God's work, nor is it religious; it is rather an attempt to cover the wolf in sheep's clothing, to be stripped of his false pretence when it is too late to repent and be saved. Nearly all the religion of the ages is attributable to revivals. Every device to supersede their necessity has failed. It may be added with special emphasis that revivals are necessary to the triumph of *moral reforms*. Experience has taught many that they cannot reform without the grace of God. Such were their habits of licentiousness, profanity, intemperance, fraud, sinful amusements, etc., that all attempts at reform were fruitless until they came to God for salvation. Then they found deliverance, not from the *habit* only, but from all disposition to follow it. This is the only solid basis of reform, when bad appetites, passions, and habits are fully established. God only can save in these extreme cases.

8. Revival measures require great courage, zeal, and decision in their leaders to make them most effective. Because, first, they generally encounter opposition from without, and often from professors of religion. It may be silent, but still it is real and hurtful. Sometimes it takes the form of friendship, as in the case of Nehemiah and Sanballat, and suggests damaging complications, which require clear perception and invincible firmness. At others it is outspoken and threatening, which is less hurtful. But not unfrequently genuine but misguided friends of the work have to be restrained to prevent their hindering what they fain would help. To do this successfully often requires much decision and tact. But it must be done. A few weak and fanatical people have sometimes been allowed to neutralize the best efforts. But there seems to be little danger from that quarter at the present time. These measures suffer more from spiritual *death* than from overaction. And yet with some there is so much dread of excitement that they hardly dare to light the fires of revival for fear of an explosion. These circumstances call for courage to venture. But many who wish well to the cause have *no faith* in God or man. They cannot see how success isto be

achieved, and therefore they hesitate to attempt it. Here is another call for courage. Many of the great revivals of the ages commenced with one man. He alone believed, and worked it up; but when it became manifest that God was with him, others rallied to his support. In the progress of the work this same unbelief, during every little reverse, is prompt to predict that it is going to stop. This calls for more faith in the leader, who will do well to review the book of Nehemiah. Then churches sometimes get weary, and want their evenings for rest, business, or recreation, and propose to suspend the meetings. A proper zeal will suggest some little modification of measures, and strike for new achievements. Revivals have been successfully carried on for years under this policy; not so much by holding meetings every evening as by making every meeting, whether regular or extra, to advance the work.

Literature. — *Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England* [1740]; to which is prefixed *A Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in Northampton, Mass.* [1735] (N. Y.); Porter, *Revivals of Religion, showing their Theory, Means, Obstructions, Importance, and Perversions, with the Duty of Christians in regard to them* (N.Y. and Cincinnati, 1877); Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Oberlin, O. 1868); Fish, *Handbook of Revivals, for the Use of Winners of Souls* (Boston, 1874). See *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1860; *Mercersb. Rev.* Jan. 1872. (J. P.)

Revocatus

was a Christian martyr under Severus, a catechumen of Carthage, and a slave. On the day appointed for the execution, he was led to the amphitheatre, and, having denounced God's judgment upon his persecutors, was ordered to run the gantlet between the hunters. He was then destroyed by wild beasts, A.D. 205. — Fox, *Book of Martyrs*.

Revolution

The name given to that *change* in the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of England which took place when James II had been expelled from the throne in the year 1688, and his son-in-law, William, prince of Orange, was elected by the voice of the people. The immediate occasion of the Revolution was a fallacious proclamation issued by James, under the pretence of extending toleration; but the true object of which was to place all the offices of trust in the hands of the papists, whose hopes had been revived by the death of Charles II. Some Protestant Dissenters were

imposed upon by this specious pretence; but the sagacity of the bishops justly apprehending the intended consequences, they strenuously contended and petitioned against the proclamation, and alarmed the fears of Protestants throughout the kingdom.

Revolution Settlement

The settlement of the Church of Scotland under William and Mary is so-called. It was dictated by policy, and did not restore the platform of 1638, but adopted the ratification of 1592. Its object was to restore peace and order, to put an end to agitation, and by the appearance of moderation to curb extremes, to take away all pretext for violence, and induce all classes of the people to exhibit a loyal spirit to the new occupants of the British throne. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.*

Rex Christe Factor Omnium,

is the beginning of a hymn ascribed to Gregory the Great (q.v.). Luther is said to have pronounced this to be the best hymn. We subjoin the first verse in both Latin and English:

*“Rex Christe, factor omnium,
Redemptor et credentium,
Placare votis supplicum
Te laudibus colentium.”*

*“O Christ, our king, Creator, Lord,
Saviour of all who trust thy Word,
To them who seek thee ever near,
Now to our praises bend thine ear.”*

This is the translation as given in the *Lyra Domestica* p. 266. Into German it has been translated by Simrock, in his *Lauda Sion Salvatore*, p. 91, “Christ, König, Schöpfer aller Welt;” by Rambach, in his *Anthology, I*, 113, “Christus, König aller Welt;” by Kinigsfeld, in his *Hymnen u. Gesänge*, i, 72, “Christ, König, Schöpfer aller Welt,” which is also adopted by Bassler, in his *Auswahl altchristlicher Gesänge*, p. 67, and by Fortlage, in his *Gesänge christl. Vorzeit*, p. 76, “O Christus, Herr der Majestat.” Besides these translations, Koch enumerates a number of others (Opp. i, 74). (B. P.)

Rey, Claude

a French prelate, was born at Aix, Nov. 27, 1773. In 1800 he concluded his theological studies at the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and became secretary to the vicar-general. In 1816 he was titular canon of Aix, and prebend in 1821. In consequence of the stand he took concerning the new heads of the State, not considering it necessary to omit mentioning them in the public prayers, of the Church, he was obliged to defend his position by a pamphlet. Notwithstanding this controversy, he was made capitulary vicar-general, Nov. 24, 1830. In 1831 he was appointed bishop of Dijon. This was the first bishop appointed by Louis Philippe, whose claim to the throne was held by the high clergy to be illegitimate. The court of Rome hesitated to confirm the appointment, but finally Gregory XVI preconized Rey, and authorized that he should be consecrated by a single bishop, assisted by two dignitaries. But such was the feeling against the proceeding that for a long time no one would consent to consecrate him. At last the ceremony was performed by the bishop of Carthage. The episcopacy of Rey lasted for six years, and was a constant contest for the rights of his position. A remonstrance was at last issued against his exercising his public functions, and he was forced to resign. He left Dijon, June 21, 1838, and retired to Aix as canon of the Church of St. Denis, where he died, Aug. 17, 1858. His writings are, *Prieres pour la Consecration d'un Eveque* (1808): — *Precis Historique de Notre Dame d'Aix* (Aix, 1816): — *Reflexions sur les Affaires Ecclesiastiques du Diocese de Dijon*, etc. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reyes, Nathan Abbot

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born at Toilton, N. H., Dec. 26, 1807. He graduated at Dartmouth College with honor in 1835, and afterwards studied theology at Andover and at Lane seminary. Having been appointed by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions as a missionary to Syria, he sailed for Beirut in 1840. Political and other disturbances, together with his impaired health, induced him to return, which he did, with the approbation of the board, in 1844. He now spent some time in ministerial labor in Charlemont and South Royalton, Mass.; and in the spring of 1847 was called to the pastorate of the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Pa., in whose service he continued till 1855, when he resigned and took charge of a church in Princeton, Ill., and after one year was called to Griggsville, Ill. Before his removal, however,

he was called away by death, March 31, 1857. He was a man of fine talents, good education, warm zeal, and excellent life.

Reymond, Henri

a French prelate, was born at Vienne, Dauphine, Nov. 21, 1737. He studied in the Jesuit college of his native village, was ordained priest, and became vicar of St. George's at Vienne. At the time of the Revolution he embraced the popular ideas, and in 1792 was elected bishop of Isere. During the Reign of Terror he was arrested and kept in close confinement for nearly a year. He took part in the council of 1797, and was charged with publishing its acts. In 1802 he signed the formula of retraction required by the pope, and was consecrated bishop of Dijon. During the empire he advocated the cause of Napoleon, which caused his removal by Louis-XVIII, but he afterwards returned to his diocese. He died at Dijon, Feb. 20, 1820. His principal writings are. *Droits des Cures et des Paroisses*, etc. (Paris, 1776): — *Droits des Pauvres* (ibid. 1781): — *Observations sur l'Enseignement Elementaire de la Religion* (1804): — a *Memoire Justificatio* of his own life, printed in the *Chronique Religieuse*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reyna, Cassiodoro De

a Spanish Hebraist, was born at Seville. He embraced the ecclesiastical life, but renounced it upon leaving his native country. He established himself in Frankfort and engaged in business, which he abandoned to take charge of a French congregation in London. From thence he went to Antwerp, and again lived in Frankfort, where he openly avowed his acquiescence in the Confession of Augsburg. It is supposed he was living at Basle when his version of the Scriptures in Spanish was published. In the preface to this work he makes himself appear a Catholic, in order to secure a greater sale for the book. The title is *La Biblia, que es los Sacros Libros del . y N. Testamento, trasladada en Espanol* (Basle, 1569, 4to). Reyna pretended to have translated directly from the Hebrew, but it is said that he never saw any original except the Latin version of Pagnini. A new edition was prepared by Cyprian de Valera (Amst. 1596). Another work of Reyna is *Annotationes in Loca Selectiora Evangelii Joannis* (Frankfort, 1573). Reyna died at Frankfort, March 15, 1594. See Antonio, *Bibl. Nova Hispana*; Lelong, *Bibl. Sacra*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Reynolds, Edward

D.D., an English prelate, was born in Southampton, November, 1599. In 1615 he became postmaster of Merton College, and in 1620 probationer fellow. He was made preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and rector of Braynton, in Northamptonshire; but in the rebellion of 1642 he sided with the Presbyterians. In 1643 he was one of the Westminster Assembly divines, and took the covenant. In 1648 he became dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford. He refused the Engagement (1651) and was ejected from his deanery; was vicar of St. Lawrence's, Jewry, London; restored to his deanery in 1659, and in 1660 was made chaplain to Charles II. In the same year he was elected warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich. He died in July 1667. He published *Sermons*, *Theological Treatises*, *Meditations*, etc.

Reynolds, Joshua

(Sir), considered the founder of the English school of painting as regards its special characteristics, was born at Plympton, in Devonshire (where his father was rector), July 16, 1723. He was intended for the medical profession, but was induced by the perusal of Richardson's *Essays on Painting*, etc., to take up painting as a profession. A handsome edition of these essays was in 1773 dedicated to Sir Joshua by Richardson's son, comprising *The Theory of Painting*, *Essay on the Art of Criticism*, and *The Science of a Connoisseur*. Reynolds's first master was Hudson, the portrait-painter, with whom he was placed in 1741. He first set up as a portrait-painter at Devonport, but in 1746 settled in London, in St. Martin's Lane. In 1749 he accompanied Commodore Keppel in the Centurion to the Mediterranean, and remained altogether about three years in Italy. He commenced business again in London in 1752, and soon became the most prominent painter of the capital. In 1768, when the Royal Academy was established, Reynolds was unanimously elected president at the first meeting of the members, Dec. 14 of that year, and he was knighted by George III in consequence. In 1784 he succeeded Allan Ramsay as principal painter in ordinary to the king; and, after an unrivalled career as a portrait-painter, died at his house in Leicester Square, Feb. 23, 1792. He was buried with great pomp in St. Paul's Cathedral, where a fine statue by Flaxman is placed immediately below the dome, in honor of his memory. His large fortune, about £80,000, was inherited by his niece, Miss Palmer, who became afterwards marchioness of Thomond. His collection of works

of art sold for nearly £17,000. Sir Joshua Reynolds, notwithstanding his careless and feeble drawing, was indisputably a great painter; some of his portraits are among the first masterpieces of the art, whether as simple portraits or as fancy pieces; as, for instance, *Lord Heathfield*, in the National Gallery of the former class, and *Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse*, at Dulwich, of the latter. His pictures are necessarily very numerous. Their chief excellence is their natural grace, fulness of expression; substantial character, and frequently a charming richness of color and light and shade. Among the most remarkable are *The Cardinal and Christian Virtues*, *Nativity*, and *Holy Family*. His eulogium cannot be better expressed than in the words of Burke: "He was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country... The loss of no man of his time can be felt with more sincere, general, and unmixed sorrow." Sir Joshua has bequeathed to posterity, besides his paintings, fifteen elegant and valuable *Discourses*, of which a magnificent edition, edited by John Burnet, was published by James Carpenter in 1842. A later edition was published (Hudson, O. 1853, 12mo); and his *Life and Discourses* (N. Y. 1859, 12mo). There is a full *Life of Reynolds* by Northcote (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo).

Reys, Manoel Dos

a Portuguese Jesuit, was taught at Coimbra, and preached with great power and success. He died at Braga, April 21, 1699. His *Sermons* were printed at Evora (1717-24).

Re'zeph

(Heb. *Re'tseph*, פֶּזֶף, a hot stone, as in ^{<11906>}1 Kings 19:6; Sept. Ραζέφ, Ραφεΐς, v. r. Ραφέθ), one of the places which Sennacherib mentions, in his taunting message to Hezekiah, as having been destroyed by his predecessor (^{<12912>}2 Kings 19:12; ^{<23712>}Isaiah 37:12). He couples it with Haran and other well-known Mesopotamian spots. It is supposed to be the same that Ptolemy mentions under the name of *Rhesopha* (Ρησώφα) as a city of Palmyrene (*Geog.* v, 15); and this, again, is possibly the same with the *Rasapha* which Abulfeda places at nearly a day's journey west of the Euphrates. The name is still a common one, Yakut's *Lexicon* quoting these two and seven other less important towns so called. **SEE SENNACHEIRIB.**

Rezi'a

(Heb. *Ritsyah*’, *hyxʿ*] *delight*; Sept. *ῚΡασιά*), the third named of three sons of Ulla, of the tribe of Asher (^{<1379>}1 Chronicles 7:39). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Re'zin

(Heb. *Retsin*’, *ʿyxʿ*] *firm*, perhaps *prince*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. *ῚΡασίν*, *ῚΡαασών*.) A king of Damascus, contemporary with Pekah in Israel, and with Jotham and Ahaz in Judaea. The policy of Rezin seems to have been to ally himself closely with the kingdom of Israel, and, thus strengthened, to carry on constant war against the kings of Judah. He attacked Jotham during the latter part of his reign (^{<1257>}2 Kings 15:37); but his chief war was with Ahaz, whose territories he invaded, in company with Pekah, soon after Ahaz had mounted the throne (B.C. cir. 740). The combined army laid siege to Jerusalem, where Ahaz was, but “could not prevail against it” (^{<2301>}Isaiah 7:1; ^{<12165>}2 Kings 16:5). Rezin, however, “recovered Elath to Syria” (ver. 6); that is, he conquered and held possession of the celebrated town of that name at the head of the Gulf of ‘Akabah, which commanded one of the most important lines of trade in the East. Soon after this he was attacked by Tiglath-pileser II, king of Assyria, to whom Ahaz in his distress had made application. His armies were defeated by the Assyrian hosts; his city besieged and taken; his people carried away captive into Susiana; and he himself slain (ver. 9; comp. Tiglath-pileser’s own inscriptions, where the defeat of Rezin and the destruction of Damascus are distinctly mentioned). This treatment was probably owing to his being regarded as a rebel, since Damascus had been taken and laid under tribute by the Assyrians some time previously (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 467).

2. The head of one of the families of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon (^{<1528>}Ezra 2:48; ^{<1673>}Nehemiah 7:50). B.C. ante 536.

Re'zon

(Heb. *Rezon*’, *ʿwzr*] *prince*; Sept. *ῚΡαζών* v. r. *Ἐσρόμ*), the son of Eliadah, a Syrian, who, when David defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, put himself at the head of a band of freebooters and set up a petty kingdom at Damascus (^{<11123>}1 Kings 11:23). B.C. post 1043. Whether he was an

officer of Hadadezer, who, foreseeing the destruction which David would inflict, prudently escaped with some followers, or whether he gathered his band of the remnant of those who survived the slaughter, does not appear. The latter is more probable. The settlement of Rezon at Damascus could not have been till some time after the disastrous battle in which the power of Hadadezer was broken, for we are told that David at the same time defeated the army of Damascene Syrians who came to the relief of Hadadezer, and put garrisons in Damascus. From his position at Damascus he harassed the kingdom of Solomon during his whole reign. With regard to the statement of Nicolaus in the 4th book of his history, quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* 7:5, 2), there is less difficulty, as there seems to be no reason for attributing to it any historical authority. He says that the name of the king of Damascus whom David defeated was Hadad, and that his descendants and successors took the same name for ten generations. If this be true, Rezon was a usurper, but the origin of the story is probably the confused account of the Sept. In the Vatican MS. of the Sept. the account of Rezon is inserted in ver. 14 in close connection with Hadad, and on this Josephus appears to have founded his story that Hadad, on leaving Egypt, endeavored without success to excite Idumea to revolt, and then went to Syria, where he joined himself with Rezon, called by Josephus *Raazarus* (*Παράζαρος*), who, at the head of a band of robbers, was plundering the country (*Ant.* 8:7, 6). It was Hadad, and not Rezon, according to the account in Josephus, who established himself king of that part of Syria and made inroads upon the Israelites. In ^{<1158>}1 Kings 15:18, Benhadad, king of Damascus in the reign of Asa, is described as the grandson of Hezion; and from the resemblance between the names *Rezon* and *Hezion*, when written in Hebrew characters, it has been suggested that the latter is a corrupt reading for the former. For this suggestion, however, there does not appear to be sufficient ground, though it was adopted by Sir John Marsham (*Chron. Can.* p. 346) and Sir Isaac Newton (*Chronol.* p. 221), as well as by some later translators and commentators (Junius, Kohler, Dathe, Ewald). Against it are,

(a) that the number of generations of the Syrian kings would then be one less than those of the contemporary kings of Judah. But then the reign of Abijam was only three years, and, in fact, Jeroboam outlived both Rehoboam and his son.

(b) The statement of Nicolaus of Damascus (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:5, 2) that from the time of David for ten generations the kings of Syria were one

dynasty, each king taking the name of Hadad, "as did the Ptolemies in Egypt." But this would exclude not only Hezion and Tabrimoln, but Kezon, unless we may interpret the last sentence to mean that the official title of Hadad was held in addition to the ordinary name of the king. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, 1, 271) makes Hezion contemporary with Rehoboam, and probably a grandson of Rezon. The name is Aramaic, and Ewald compares it with *Rezin*.

END OF VOL. VIII.